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Beginning with the Land Ordinance of 1785, the American federal government passed a series of laws that regulated the sale of public land to private citizens. These legislations represented a discourse of revenue seeking and debt repayment, espoused by the federal government during this early period of American nation-building. In order to efficiently and rapidly create revenue, the federal government implemented the public land sale system to dispose of land within the public domain. Through the examination of land patents and field surveys of cultural landscapes, a case study of Perry County, Ohio, one of the earliest regions disposed of under this system, was utilized to determine the settlement processes that occurred during the Early American Republic. The results of this study show that the federal controls on size, shape, and locations of purchases created a characteristic settlement landscape represented by tangible landscape elements, like roads and property lines, which have persisted into the present-day landscape. As such, the federal government can be considered the “author” of past and present landscapes through the construction of discourses materialized.
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Chapter One: Introduction

Background

Starting with the signing of the Declaration of Independence in 1776, the ratification of the Articles of Confederation in 1777-1781, and culminating in the ratification of the Constitution in 1789, the newly formed government of the United States began to lay the foundations for what would become one of the largest, wealthiest, and most powerful nations in history. This period of nation-building, known as the Early Republican Era or the Federalist Era (specifically 1789-1801), was one of the most important eras in American history, not only because of the political narratives developed during this time, but also because of the everyday actions of ordinary citizens living and working in cities, towns, and the countryside (Wood 1988; Wood 2009). After gaining political independence from Great Britain, Americans were eager to institute new social, political, and economic norms representing the ordinary residents of the new country. The democratic republic established by the “Founding Fathers” allowed the American populace to express their free will, including the desire for land ownership, enabled by the removal, sometimes by force, of Native Americans from lands west of the Appalachian Mountains (Hurt 1996).

The Ohio country was one of the earliest trans-Appalachian regions to be settled, preceded only by Kentucky and Tennessee south of the Ohio River. Before Anglo-Americans crossed the mountains to the east, many Native American tribes, including the Wyandot, Shawnee, and Delaware, used lands in Ohio for hunting and subsistence agriculture. Beginning in the 1760s, but especially after the American Revolution ended in 1783, American settlers moved to Ohio to take over land once used communally by the
Native Americans, leading to strained relations between the former and present inhabitants. Several skirmishes, including the Battle of Point Pleasant in 1774, part of Lord Dunmore’s War to quell resistance to Anglo settlement in the Ohio country, broke out between settlers and Native Americans; this fighting did not effectively end until the Battle of Fallen Timbers forced the remaining tribes in the territory to sign the Treaty of Greenville in 1795, which removed all Native American claims to Ohio lands (Hurt 1996). With the threat of Native American attacks eliminated, the progressive agendas laid forth by the new democratic government encouraged the settlement of these resource-rich lands, especially through the implementation of the rectangular survey system (the township-and-range system) in 1785, which allowed for the rapid and easy transfer of land from the federal government to private citizens (Johnson 1976; Hurt 1996).

In 1803 Ohio officially joined the Union as the 17th state when conditions set forth by the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 were met (specifically, having a population within its borders of more than 60,000) (Hurt 1996). The state’s population expanded rapidly after this point, as evidenced by national censuses taken in 1800 and 1810, which showed Ohio’s population at 51,006 and 269,407 respectively, a fivefold increase over a span of only 10 years (Hurt 1996, p.178). With the expanding population came new institutions, including local governments through the division of the Ohio country into counties and civil townships. One such division, Perry County, located in east-central Ohio, was formed on March 1, 1818 with Somerset as its original county seat, which was later moved to New Lexington in 1853, the current seat of local government (Graham 1883). Settled around Zane’s Trace, a wagon trail proposed and developed by Ebenezer
Zane that connected the towns of Wheeling, West Virginia, and Maysville (formerly Limestone), Kentucky, Perry County offered many passing settlers a place to live and prosper with its bountiful forests, cropland, and mineral resources (Ray 1970; Hurt 1996). Many of these settlers were Pennsylvanian in origin due to the Trace beginning in Wheeling, a town known as a gateway to the western frontier for the Midland hearth (Hudson 1988; Hurt 1996; Anderson 2001). Because of the course Zane’s Trace takes through the county, as well as its proximity to lands settled by other ethnic groups, such as the Virginia Military District to the west, the Ohio Company lands to the south, and the United States Military District to the north, the population of early Perry County had a varied ancestry with different customs, economic traditions, and material cultures (Sherman 1925; Hurt 1996). These different populations interacted in the neutral area of Perry County to form a distinctive cultural landscape unseen before in Ohio or elsewhere in early America. The same landscape was also influenced by national trends and ideals that emerged with the expanding republic, a republic which was experimenting with progressive, democratic solutions to problems of building a nation from scratch. The solutions offered by the federal government led to legislation that created tangible elements in the landscape of lands being settled during this period, elements which influenced the actions of American settlers and created the landscape seen today.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this study is to determine how land was alienated from the public domain to private individuals, and how this system influenced the settlement process of lands settled during the Early American Republic. Knowing how the federal land sale system influenced settlement is important for understanding the creation of the landscape
of early America, as well as the present-day landscape as landscape elements constructed
during settlement persisted over time. To do so, this research will focus on a five-
township region of northern Perry County, Ohio, consisting of some of the earliest lands
disposed of under the federal land sale system, and characteristic of similar regions
elsewhere in the United States. Determining the settlement process and the influence of
the government on the creation of landscape will require answering three research
questions, listed below:

1. How were land patents distributed by the federal government in Perry
   County, Ohio, and thereby how was land alienated from the public
domain?

2. What national discourses emerged at the time of Perry County’s
   settlement, and how are they “materialized” in the settlement landscape of
   the county?

3. Are national discourses still present in the current landscape of Perry
   County? If so, how?

**Rationale**

The historical geography of Perry County is important to study because this
research may provide insights into a number of different perspectives on Ohio’s past
geographies. For one, Perry County itself has been relatively understudied, especially in
recent years. Several rather antiquated histories of the county exist, including Graham’s
(1883) and Martzolff’s (1902), but these date to the late nineteenth century and are highly
romanticized in content. Searches of literary resources uncovered no other recent
academic works relating specifically to the county, making the area very poorly
understood in regards to recent geographic thought. This thesis seeks to fill this void by focusing on Perry County through the lens of recent geographic theories, especially that of Schein (1997); the results of this study may provide evidence for the situation in surrounding counties, which experienced similar conditions in their founding periods. Another reason the work done by this study is critical is through the understanding of the emergence of national discourses, ideas, and trends that have impacts with regard to the way humans interact with cultural and natural landscapes. Through the examination of past and present landscapes of Perry County, the results of this thesis will analyze national discourses that were present at the time of the founding of the early republic, as well as how these discourses influenced the settlement of the Ohio frontier. The discourses presented in the results of this work can be found elsewhere in the United States in areas settled at the approximate time of Perry County, providing evidence for a national thought or a unity that prevailed in denizens of the era. This study provides evidence for the existence and influence of national discourses, which may be present in many, if not all, cultures. If these discourses and their cultural impacts are found, the research here could be expanded to other areas of the world settled by cultures different than Americans.

Study Area

This study will utilize Perry County, Ohio, located in east-central Ohio (Figure 1.1), as a case study for lands surveyed and sold under the federal land sale system during the Early American Republic. Formed in 1818 from Congress lands gained after the signing of the 1795 Treaty of Greenville (Sherman 1925), this area of Ohio was once the western frontier of the United States, a status which gives the cultural landscape of early
Perry County specific characteristics that need to be studied to add to the understanding of the formation of frontier landscapes. This fact, along with the county’s placement astride the important route of Zane’s Trace (Figure 1.2), makes the county a perfect case to study concerning the settlement of the early frontier within the context of recent geographic thought (i.e. Schein 1997). To the south of Perry County lies land once owned by the Ohio Company, formed in Massachusetts in the late 1790s. Some of this land was settled by New Englanders, brought by the Company, but much of it was sold (or pre-empted) to Virginians or Kentuckians, members of the Upland South culture group (Wilhelm 1982; Hurt 1996). To the county’s west lies land of the Virginia Military District, settled mainly by Virginians who claimed war bonds given for service during the American Revolution (Sherman 1925). Zane’s Trace facilitated the easy migration of Pennsylvanians, who settled in regions to the north and south, as well as northern Perry County (Wilhelm 1982). These individuals who settled on the frontier would have brought the culture and traditions of their associated ancestries, elements that would manifest on the landscape. Zane’s Trace also presented a connection to the eastern portion of the United States, where many national trends began. With its proximity to this avenue of ingress for national discourses, Perry County could have also experienced the introduction of discourses materialized not seen until later in other areas of Ohio or even the nation. The timing of Perry County’s settlement, beginning in the early 1800s, also makes this specific county conducive for this brand of research.
As Perry County is comprised of 14 civil townships, the amount of time needed to comb through the land records for the entire county would be too long for the time allotted for this study. For this reason, only the five northern townships (Figure 1.3), Thorn, Hopewell, Madison, Reading, and Clayton, were chosen for study. These five townships were chosen mainly for their location astride Zane’s Trace, as this route would be the path of least resistance into the frontier, meaning that settlers would naturally be
attracted to these townships first over other more isolated regions of the frontier due to the ease of access. Graham’s (1883) and Martzolff’s (1902) histories also explain that these townships were the earliest to be settled, a key factor as this study is looking specifically at the period of the Early American Republic. The southern townships, more isolated and rugged in topography, were not settled primarily until the 1820s, well after the first introduction of the public land sale system that controlled land sales in this region of the country. Therefore, to obtain an accurate portrayal of the settlement process of the Early Republic era, the northern five townships, settled mainly during this period, were chosen specifically for this study. These five townships then are representative of other areas of the United States settled at this time and under the same circumstances, making the results of this study applicable for other regions of the country.
A couple of small items are of note concerning the study area for this thesis. The first involves the difference between civil and congressional townships. The five townships comprising the study area are all civil townships, which are a part of the local government’s hierarchy, one step below the county. The boundaries are all arbitrary and
were drawn up by the county government at the time of each township’s founding. Congressional townships, on the other hand, have set boundaries drawn by the surveyors hired by the federal government to plat the land. Each congressional township is six-by-six miles square and is numbered by a system that denotes how far north or south the township is above a known baseline and how far east or west the township is of a known meridian. Two of the civil townships in the study area, Thorn and Hopewell, consist wholly of one entire congressional township (Table 1.1). Reading Township, the largest in the study area and the county, is comprised of one whole congressional township (township 16, range 16) plus two extra columns of sections located in another congressional township (township 17, range 17), taken from Richland Township in Fairfield County at the time of Reading’s founding. Because of the fact that Reading Township actually contains sections from two different congressional townships (Table 1.1), whenever a section of Reading Township is mentioned in this study the township it is located in is given as well for purposes of clarity. Madison Township, in the northeast corner of the study area, is the smallest civil township examined for this research, as it only contains four columns of sections, instead of the standard six. The missing two columns were given to Muskingum County when Perry County was created from parts of that county, Fairfield County, and Washington County in 1818. The last civil township studied, Clayton Township, is not a whole congressional township as well. When this subdivision was created, four sections of the easternmost column of sections were given to a neighboring township in Perry, Harrison Township, leaving Clayton Township with only 32 one-by-one mile sections. By the way the civil townships of the study area are laid out above, the study region contains 176 sections between the five civil townships.
All subdivisions mentioned above, the township and their sections, as well as the smaller division of aliquots, were used to define patterns within the study area to develop a holistic view of how settlement occurred in northern Perry County.

Figure 1.3. Location of townships chosen for the study. Map by author.
Table 1.1

*Congressional Townships Contained Within Civil Townships*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Township</th>
<th>Congressional Township</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thorn</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopewell</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another item that must be considered in the interest of full disclosure is the exclusion of the small strip of land above the northwest corner of Thorn Township, shown in blue in Figure 1.3, from the study area. This narrow strip of land consists of portions of sections 16, 17, and 18 of township 19, range 17, a fractional congressional township cut off by the survey of the United States Military District, discussed later in this study. These sections, plus the sections of the six other fractional townships cut off by the above survey, were set aside in 1801 as land for the settlement of Canadian refugees who assisted the United States during the American Revolution and thus could not return to their homesteads. However, only 67 claimants were entered by the government as eligible for assistance (claiming only 58,080 acres of the 80,640 acres set aside), so the lands were opened for public sale in 1816 (Sherman 1925, p.119). Due to the extreme difference in settlement pattern between these three sections and the rest of the study area (all sold under the federal land sale system), as well as the fact that the General Land Office recognizes these patents as existing in Licking County, to Perry County’s north, these three sections were excluded from the study. With these aspects of the study area explained, the full spatial scope of this research has been described.
Methods

To answer the research questions proposed for this thesis, qualitative methods including document analysis and fieldwork were utilized. First, land patents granted to the original purchasers of land from the public domain were examined for a variety of data points, including location, date of issuance, type of aliquot purchased, and origin of purchaser if it was listed. Other items of note were recorded, including if a patent was tenanted or assigned, as well as general notes including misspellings of names or other notations on the patents. Figure 1.4 shows a typical land patent granted in Perry County, Ohio, displaying where all the information regarding the patents was available for this study. The patents issued for the land in Perry County were accessed from the database available online at the General Land Office’s website, now a part of the Bureau of Land Management (General Land Office 2016). Because of its organizational prowess and computational capabilities, the records were entered into Microsoft Excel spreadsheets, where the information was divided by civil township for analytical purposes.

Other documents, found through a variety of sources, were utilized to develop a fuller understanding of the land sale and settlement processes in the study area. Survey plats from years after the end of public sales were examined to show how plots were divided in the county in the later decades of settlement. Seeing how the land of the study area was bought and sold after control of the land was given to individuals was necessary for the determination of the national discourse’s influence on settlement patterns after the conclusion of land sales. The original plats are available for viewing in the State Auditor’s office (Sherman 1925), but copies may be found elsewhere for use, including the website of Tim E. Fisher (2009). Another document type analyzed, county histories,
were a popular literary device in their day, mostly written in the late 1800s and early 1900s. These books recorded the local history of one or two counties, usually through biographical accounts of early settlers (Johnson 1976; Hudson 1988). However, histories of these types were heavily romanticized and are usually biased towards wealthier members of society, as they were the audience these books were oriented towards. Though so biased, county histories provide data like ethnic backgrounds of county settlers and possible dates of settlement, as well as accounts of economic activities that may not be found elsewhere, making them useful repositories of information. County histories used for this thesis included those of Graham (1883) and Martzolff (1902), both of which were available in Ohio University’s library. Other supporting documents, such as tax records for the county and individual townships and agricultural censuses, were utilized to provide more evidence concerning settlement patterns and land allocation before and after public land sales ended. Documents of this nature were available at the Perry County District Library, located in New Lexington, Ohio, in the MacGahan Genealogy & Local History Room (Perry County District Library 2016), the library of Ohio University, and Tim Fisher’s (2009) website of Perry County history.
Know ye, That Peter Kirtman, assign of Jacob Fees, having deposited in the Treasury a certificate of the Register of the Land-office at Chilicothe, whereby it appears that full payment had been made for the South East quarter of lot in section number Twenty five, of Township number Eighteen, in Range number Seventeen, of the lands directed to be sold at Chilicothe, by the act of Congress, entitled "An act providing for the sale of the lands of the United States in the territory north-west of the Ohio, and above the mouth of Kentucky river," and of the acts amendatory of the same. There is granted, by the United States, unto the said Peter Kirtman, the quarter lot or section of land above described: To have and to hold the said quarter lot or section of land, with the appurtenances, unto the said Peter Kirtman, his heirs and assigns forever.

In testimony whereof, I have caused these letters to be made Patent, and the seal of the United States to be hereunto affixed.

Given under my hand at the city of Washington, the Seventeenth day of February, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and forty and of the Independence of the United States of America, the Thirty third,

BY THE PRESIDENT, TH. Jefferson.

James Madison Secretary of State.
Finally, fieldwork was conducted on the ground in Perry County to observe the current natural and cultural landscapes. This work was done by traveling to the study region and recording aspects of the landscape that reveal the legacies of past discourses (patterns of rectangular survey, orientation of roads, etc.). Extensive note taking and photographing of the landscape characterized this fieldwork. The photographs taken during the field survey were then georeferenced using their latitudinal and longitudinal coordinates, allowing them to be uploaded into Google (2016) Earth, where the photos could be used to show how the landscape changed or was preserved over the 200 years since land sales commenced. Satellite imagery from Google (2016) Earth was also utilized for this study in the analysis of landscape elements expressing certain discourses materialized on the landscape. The combination of fieldwork and historical document analysis described above provided enough data for the determination of the settlement processes in the study region and the discovery of what discourses contributed to the production of Perry County’s cultural landscape.
Chapter Two: Literature Review

Culture Areas, Hearths, and Diffusion

As a part of the concepts underlying this research stem from the idea of culture areas and hearths, it is important to understand the influential literature regarding this subject. The Berkeley School of cultural geography, founded by Carl O. Sauer in the early 20th century, developed the theory of American culture regions or areas, defined as a continuous area of distribution of identifiable cultural elements or cultural groups (Zelinsky 1973; Mitchell 1978; Anderson 2001). These culture regions can act as hearths, areas in which a new, distinctive subculture develops, as migrants from the culture areas leave and spread their cultural elements to places they travel to and settle in (Mitchell 1978). In the early United States, these hearths developed from the major centers of European colonialization, specifically Massachusetts Bay (New England hearth), southeastern Pennsylvania (Midland hearth), and the Chesapeake Bay area (Tidewater hearth), as the social institutions of the European source countries became “simplified” and adapted to the new environments in which they were deposited (Zelinsky 1973; Harris 1977; Mitchell 1978).

Besides a basic overview provided by Zelinsky (1973), research on culture regions mainly focuses on American regions west of the Mississippi River in the middle of the 20th century, examples being Meinig’s (1965) work on the Mormon culture region and Texas (Meinig 1969). Robert Mitchell (1978) addressed this issue by analyzing the culture regions of the eastern half of the United States, specifically the three aforementioned hearths along the eastern seaboard. Mitchell (1978) also discusses secondary and tertiary cultural areas, such as the Shenandoah Valley and piedmont North
Carolina, where migrants from the source hearths interacted to form new cultural groups, different from yet sharing characteristics of the original cultures. Other geographers have suggested this pattern of dispersion and culture formation, especially in relation to the development of the Upland Southern culture group (Spencer and Horvath 1963; Newton 1974; Jordan-Bychkov 2003). In fact, Terry Jordan-Bychkov (2003) suggests that the final form of the Upland Southern culture developed only after the formation of a quaternary region in mid-Tennessee, the Nashville Basin, suggesting that the process of culture formation is protracted and complex.

More recently, research has focused on smaller culture regions, like the secondary and tertiary intermediate areas described above (Anderson 2001; Jordan-Bychkov 2003), or has taken a more ethnic approach to characterizing a region, discussing the idea of ethnic homelands in the United States (Conzen 1993). Anderson (2001) has blended the two streams of thought together in his study of the Pennsylvania Dutch influence in southeastern Ohio, coining the term “ethnic culture complex region.” He explains that these regions are different from hearths/secondary areas and ethnic islands due to the timing and geographic placement on the American continent, as well as the “moderating and diluting effects of other population groups and national culture trends and processes” (Anderson 2001, p.155). These trends in geographic research and discussions of new divisions of culture areas reflect the complexity of the American cultural landscape, a complexity which needs to be studied further to understand how American cultures formed and influenced the founding of settlements and societies. It is within this context that this thesis research takes place. The culture area being explored in east-central Ohio can be considered as one of these smaller culture regions, possibly tertiary or quaternary,
and is part of the ethnic culture complex region described by Anderson (2001). The work done in this thesis will build off of Anderson’s (2001) research by looking deeper into settlement patterns of the ethnic culture complex region, examining the influence of the Upland Southern culture group, not much discussed in his work, as well as the Pennsylvania-Germans and other migrant groups.

As the concept of culture areas and their associated secondary regions involves the movement of peoples and cultures, it is necessary to discuss the idea of cultural diffusion and migration. When humans move from one location to another, they bring with them their ideas and material belongings, both of which are influenced by the culture in which they developed and lived in. Folk housing has been long studied as an example of material culture being transferred from one region to another through migration as housing is one of the most basic necessities for frontier survival (Kniffen 1965). Other examples of cultural characteristics diffused from one area to another include language patterns, burial practices, and town layout (Zelinsky 1977; Jordan - Bychkov 2003). During transitions from the source region to the destination, cultural characteristics can undergo several processes, including duplication, deviation, and fusion (Mitchell 1978). Mitchell (1978) argues that fusion is the most important of these three processes in the formation of early trans-Appalachian cultures, whereas earlier geographers emphasized deviation and duplication due to the simplification and isolation of frontier cultures.

However, these frontier societies were not as isolated or simple as first thought due to commercial and social connections with the hearths on the eastern seaboard (Mitchell 1978; Hurt 1996). The fusion process allows for an amount of connectivity as
immigrants from several sources enter a new region, bringing the culture they are still attached to from their source areas. As time passes, the new environment and social relations the settlers find themselves in cause the cultures to merge, adapting elements of both as well as modifying certain aspects of each to produce a new culture, born of that region. An example of this process is given by Mitchell (1978), describing the Shenandoah Valley as an area of fusion due to the co-occurrence of Tidewater planters and Middle Colony yeoman farmers. Jordan-Bychkov (2003) also proposes fusion as the main propellant of the formation of the Upland Southern culture, what he describes as one of “the most thoroughly American regions” (p. 85). The research proposed for this thesis will examine these processes of cultural diffusion, specifically fusion, to determine what cultures were present during the formation of Perry County and the surrounding culture region, a relatively overlooked area, and how they contributed to the cultural landscape of the study region. Understanding who settled the region of Perry County will lend insight into the discourses that were expressed and materialized on the landscape, both by individuals and larger agencies.

**Ohio Frontier Settlement**

As the land that would become Ohio was not settled directly during the initial colonization of America, its first Anglo settlers must have originated in the hearths of the eastern seaboard or come directly to Ohio through international immigration. The origins of these settlers have been studied before, but only on a large scale and not specifically for the area being studied for this thesis, Perry County. John C. Hudson (1988) used a mixture of quantitative and qualitative methods to show that migrants from eastern hearths usually moved along a north-south zonation correlating to the location of the
seaboard hearths. The final figure (Figure 14, p. 411) of his paper displays this pattern, with southeastern Ohio represented as an area of mixture between settlers originating from the Midland hearth and the Tidewater hearth plus its associated secondary areas (Hudson 1988). Another geographer, H.G.H. Wilhelm (1982), used the 1850 census to compile tables of each county in Ohio listing the reported state of origin for each respondent in each civil township for the state. His work shows that many southeastern Ohio immigrants traveled from the same sources previously described (Wilhelm 1982). David Stephens and Alexander Bobersky (1990b) utilized land patents issued within the land district administered by the Steubenville office to show the origins of settlers in their study area, finding many of the same results mentioned above, though with a noticeable slant towards the Midland hearth due to the proximity of their study region to Pennsylvania. The role of Pennsylvania-German immigrants in the settlement of the study area is also demonstrated by the work of Anderson (2001), who describes several diagnostic landscape elements, including the forebay bank barn, the federal style I-house, and rural protestant churches, as indicators of the influence this migrant group has had on the cultural landscape.

These landscape elements can be used to read the cultural landscape, a method of using the material and physical characteristics of a landscape to discover its past. Each culture has elements that are unique to it or associated with its presence, and can be used to identify influential immigrant groups that settled in a new region. For example, the Pennsylvania Town, a settlement form consisting of a number of specific characteristics, evidences the influence of the southeastern Pennsylvania culture group (Zelinsky 1977). The Pennsylvania Culture Area and specifically the Pennsylvania-German cultural group
have been extensively studied by geographers, including Lemon’s (2002) comprehensive work on the history and culture of southeastern Pennsylvania. Through the work of previous geographers, the tell-tale signs of Pennsylvanian influence can be identified in areas later settled by migrants from this source region, as shown by the work of Anderson (2001) in southeastern Ohio. The Upland Southern culture likewise has been heavily studied, most thoroughly summarized by Jordan-Bychkov’s (2003) book *The Upland South*. Both of the previous cultural groups have been identified as the main source of settlers in east-central Ohio by Wilhelm (1982) and Hurt (1996), but these authors only looked at broad areas of Ohio, while this research will focus on a much smaller region, providing a more thorough understanding of the complex migration patterns and cultural influences that characterized this region of Ohio. Using the cultural elements described by these previous geographers, this present study will identify the cultural influences of Perry County and determine how they interacted to form the past and present cultural landscapes of the study area.

The process of settlement in Ohio is also a heavily studied area of history, though many of these studies focus on large-scale regions to make general assertions concerning the state’s settlement. Sherman (1925) describes the general origins of the different subdivisions of Ohio, focusing mostly on the surveying aspects of their founding. He does not detail specifically how the land was alienated, leaving that question for future research, answered in part by geographers and historians like Lee Soltow (1983), Robert Wheeler (1988), and Brian Harte (1992). Soltow’s (1979) work describes landholdings in 19th century Ohio, stating that the average land owner controlled “relatively large parcels” (p.146) and that land was not held equally as many individuals were considered
landless while others controlled thousands of acres at one time. While providing a general overview of the settlement process, in terms of early land ownership, Soltow (1979) focuses on a large-scale area and generally glosses over the process of government land alienation. In a later article, Soltow (1983) explores land fragmentation in the Virginia Military District by using economic theory to explain why landholdings decreased in size during the 19th century, citing inheritance and land sales as two main reasons for fragmentation.

Like much of the research conducted on settlement processes of Ohio, Soltow’s (1983) article focuses on regions not alienated from the public domain by the federal government. Many authors have chosen to examine regions of Ohio settled under different circumstances, such as the aforementioned Virginia Military District and the Connecticut Western Reserve in northeast Ohio. The historian Robert A. Wheeler (1988) investigated the settlement of Claridon Township in the Connecticut Reserve, and how the migrants who came from different areas of New England created social relations and cultural landscapes that prevailed in separate sections of the civil township. Later, Brian Harte (1992) researched land sales in the Western Reserve, delving into the history of the Connecticut Land Company and the land speculators it spawned after its dissolution. Both of these articles describe how the settlement landscape of their respective study areas were constructed, but not from the critical standpoint of recent geographic thought. Likewise, both Wheeler (1988) and Harte (1992) chose to focus on the Connecticut Western Reserve, the “unusual” case as this land was controlled by the federal government, but was instead distributed to individual settlers through private land sales.
This is not to say that government land sales in Ohio have gone unstudied by academics. In fact, one of the first works regarding settlement patterns and land sales in Ohio compared areas surveyed systematically by the federal government with areas only surveyed by unaffiliated individuals. The author, Norman Thrower (1966), showed that property boundaries, administrative boundaries, roads, and fields were overwhelmingly oriented to cadastral borders and cardinal directions in the region of the systematic survey. He also demonstrated that these patterns persisted over eight decades (from 1875 to 1955) in the same region, a small area of northwest Ohio. In comparison, the landscape of the unsystematic survey, in the Virginia Military District, showed no adherence to cardinal directions and survey boundaries, especially in regards to roads and administrative boundaries. Another noticeable difference between the two regions was seen in the size of the landholdings: Northwest Ohio was shown to have smaller plots of land than the unsystematically surveyed land (Thrower 1966). The results of this influential study laid the foundation for many of the works regarding cadastral landscapes that were written in the following years, as well as providing inspiration for the present thesis. While being an important work, Thrower (1966) did not examine his study areas critically, and the time period examined was over 75 years later than used for this study, which seeks to interpret the settlement landscape of the Early American Republic, during the era of public land sales.

Other studies which examine the public land sale system and their associated landscapes in Ohio have built off of Thrower’s (1966) seminal study. A dissertation by Edward Rastatter (1965) that explored the impact of speculators on settlement patterns, which employed an economics approach to answer that question, reports that absentee
owners of large amounts of land did not have a detrimental impact, as in pushing settlers towards low-quality land or delaying the time of settlement, on the settlement of frontier Ohio. This work, however, looked at a later time period, 1820-1840, and a much larger scale, the entire state of Ohio, than used for this thesis. A more fitting study was conducted by Alan Schroder (1980), who researched the effect of the federal credit system on land sales in early Ohio. His dissertation was one of the earliest to focus on the public land sale system itself and the only one to analyze the credit system devised by the Land Act of 1800. While providing a great overview of how settlers of Ohio bought land from the federal government between 1801 and 1832, his comprehensive results are pretty generalized as he used study townships from all areas of Ohio alienated from the public domain under the credit system.

More recently, an article by David Stephens and Alexander Bobersky (1990a) also focused on the public land sale system in Ohio, using a study area comprised of the land district administered by the Steubenville land office from 1800-1820. This article (1990a) analyzes land sales administered from this office, examining the dates of sale and their respective locations. The results of this study show that sales were influenced by the section’s proximity to transportation routes and early population centers, as well as the suitability of the land for farming. In their study area, Stephens and Bobersky (1990a) found that more isolated and rugged sections were the last to be bought, creating a predictable settlement pattern that may be found elsewhere in Ohio. This study, like Schroder’s (1980) previous work, examines the public land sale process and the resulting landscape that developed from it during the Early American Republic. Stephens and Bobersky’s (1990a) piece, however, looks at a smaller area than Schroder (1980), an area
still larger than Thrower’s (1966) systematically surveyed landscape. The work of this present thesis seeks to build off of the foundation laid by the previously mentioned research, especially that of Thrower (1966) and Schroder (1980). By looking at a smaller study area than utilized previously, in this case a five-township area of one county, local-scale patterns can be seen more easily and will not become greatly generalized, like several results from Schroder’s (1980) dissertation concerning the Congress Lands east of the Scioto River (including the land of future Perry County), which were lumped in with results from all over Ohio. By examining the public land sale system and its resultant landscape through the lens of critical geographic theories, especially that of Richard Schein (1997), discussed below, this thesis will add to the literature concerning the settlement and creation of survey landscapes, a void in the literature which has not yet been covered, especially for lands in eastern Ohio, one of the earliest regions settled under the public land sale system.

**National/Regional Discourses**

Culture groups may not only interact with each other and the physical environment, but national and regional trends, ideas, or discourses may also influence how the cultural landscape is produced. Mitchell (1978) states that “the appearance of symbols of national unity” aids the fusion process to help form the frontier cultures of the early trans-Appalachian west (p. 67). He provides the examples of legislation passed by the federal government and socio-religious upheavals (the Great Awakening) that influenced the thinking of the entire nation as examples of these symbols of national unity. One piece of legislation mentioned, the Northwest Ordinance of 1789, markedly impacted the landscape of frontier areas by outlawing slavery north of the Ohio River,
precluding the ownership of large plots of land which required the work of slaves to cultivate (Mitchell 1978). Such national discourses can influence the landscape to much larger and more conspicuous degrees, as evidenced by the enacting of laws related to the survey and alienation of land within the public domain. The United States rectangular survey, first implemented by the Ordinance of 1785, had perhaps one of the most extensive influences of any national discourse by creating the square patterns seen in many of the lands east of the Appalachian Mountains. Many towns, farms, and roads have been built according to the arbitrary lines established by this cadastral system, instead of being aligned with the topography of the land (Johnson 1976). The form in which these structures are laid out can have major impacts on how people utilize the land and create a landscape, especially in an economic manner. State, county, and township boundaries are also determined using the survey lines, influencing the political discourses that affect areas, possibly leading to more differences between similar physical and cultural landscapes (Sherman 1925; Johnson 1976; Hurt 1996).

Besides acts that impose a national unity by force of law across the United States, prevailing thoughts of the common people can also influence cultural landscapes. Religion at a regional and national scale “eroded traditional allegiances” and created national identities that transcended cultural groups (Mitchell 1978, p. 88). In Ohio specifically, the rise of Methodism and Baptism created a more uniform religious landscape, influencing the direct use of the settled landscape and larger decisions made about regional discourses, as well as through local politics influenced by religious beliefs (Hurt 1996; Wigger 2005). This last concept is especially crucial, as the different cultural groups that settled southeastern Ohio usually were part of different religions, and
whoever was in power was able to impose their will upon the landscape. For instance, Methodists in Ohio were predominately Jeffersonian-Republicans, who tended to favor the yeoman farmer instead of elite farmers; when in control of local and state governments, the Methodists were able to pass legislation which benefited the lower and middle classes of frontier society (Ratcliff 2005; Wigger 2005).

Along with religious morals that affected thinking of the time, national trends in ideology also influenced the workings of frontier societies and the formation of cultural landscapes, specifically the democratization of America brought about by the American Revolution. With this change in thought came the commercialization of land, especially pertaining to the lower classes of society. As the alienation of land laid out by the Ordinance of 1785 and following land legislation made the transfer of land cheap and effortless, many immigrants traveled west from the eastern hearths to settle on the frontier (Hurt 1996). As Mitchell (1978) states, “Once occupied, it was those who owned the land who exerted the most formative cultural influences on the structure of the new society,” the new settlers, both poor and wealthy, were able to create a cultural landscape because of the national trend of commercialization of land (p. 70). The varied economic activities introduced and developed on the frontier by these settlers had an influential impact on the creation of landscape, as they controlled land use, the distribution of wealth (and thus power), and relations among groups and individual settlers. The economic activities and structures of Ohio have been studied before, but usually on a large scale and not in a framework of discourses materialized, as proposed by Schein (1997), or the production of space, as per Henri Lefebvre (1991). Ray (1970) gave a brief explanation of commercial activities along Zane’s Trace, which runs through the study area of this
research project. However, this work is greatly generalized and does not explain the social relations of the economic activities of the Trace. In his comprehensive history of the Ohio frontier, Hurt (1996) gives a general overview of the commercial enterprises that characterized the actions of Early Republic-era Ohio, but focuses on the broad scale. However, he does make connections at a national scale and explains some aspects of social relations involved in production of commodities. Clark (2005) provides a description of early Ohio’s economy within the context of the national economy, but once again only focuses on the large scale. This study examines the economic activities of one locality, Perry County, which could be used to characterize other regions of east-central Ohio during the frontier settlement period and beyond. The tangible landscape elements that resulted from these economic activities, the discourses materialized, are discussed in detail, developing an understanding of how the landscape of the early frontier was created.

The results of the fieldwork and document analysis proposed for this study will be placed within the context of recent geographic thought that pertains to the aforementioned national discourses, namely that of Schein (1997) and other geographers of discourse. This influential article, “The Place of Landscape,” describes the cultural landscape as a series of “discourses materialized,” where an “individual decision…results in a tangible landscape element, or total ensemble” (p. 663). These decisions can take the shape of wholesale activities like national legislation, such as the survey system introduced in 1785, or through individual action, like those determined by economic systems and their social relations, and can thoroughly embed themselves within the cultural landscape. Discourses materialized can affect how humans use the landscape, as
well as be affected by human action, rendering new spaces and landscapes in result (Schein 1997). It is within this conceptual framework that the analytical portion of this thesis will occur. The past and present landscapes of Perry County will be inspected through document analysis and fieldwork to reveal the discourses materialized in the cultural and natural landscapes, especially those of regional and national proportions. The federal land sale system and the settlement process will be the central focus of the analysis, as these concepts are what most influence the discourses embedded in the landscape.

Geographers have eagerly applied Schein’s framework of discourses materialized to many types of landscapes. Steven Hoelscher (2003) interpreted the cultural landscape of Natchez, Mississippi, specifically the Natchez Pilgrimage, a pageant that depicts life during the ante-bellum South using live actors, as the discourse of racial relationships materialized. Through the exclusive use of white actors in roles of authority and the traditional casting of African-Americans in subservient roles, the town of Natchez materialized (made tangible through the physical existence of the pageant) the discourse of racial relationships (specifically white superiority), which persists to this day (Hoelscher 2003). Other landscapes have been analyzed thusly as well, especially for the discourse of violence. James Tyner et al. (2014) have written about the discourse of violence as materialized on the landscape of Greensboro, North Carolina, or more appropriately not materialized (though this in turn is a discourse materialized, that of the rejection of violence commemoration), extending the discourse materialized narrative to more theoretical realms. The work of Christopher Post (2009) reinforces this idea, as he shows that the town of Lawrence, Kansas refuses to embrace its violent past through the
neglect and obfuscation of memorials to past events, namely the brutal guerilla raid by William Quantrill in 1863. It is apparent from this past research that discourses are actively shaping the landscapes of everyday life; thereby past landscapes were shaped by discourses as well, creating discourses materialized that may persist to the present-day landscape.

Several works have used these concepts to interpret settlement landscapes of the past, including Schein (1989), who investigated the New Military District of Upstate New York, and Hunter (1998), who explored the historical geography of the whole length of Zane’s Trace. Both of these works utilized the idea of discourses materialized, but do not specifically look at national discourses that may have influenced large swaths of the nation. William Wyckoff’s (1986) research concerning the Holland Purchase in western New York also contributes to this theory as well by describing how a larger agency, in this case the Holland Land Company, divided and sold the land it was in control of, creating the settlement landscape through the construction of towns and controlled alienation of its land. Although Wyckoff’s (1986) work greatly improved the understanding of land sales and settlement during the Early American Republic, his article does not analyze the landscape through the framework of discourses materialized and is only concerned with land sold through a private company, not the federal government. This thesis hopes to fill this gap in the literature by analyzing a landscape and culture formation within the theories of Schein (1997) in a region not yet extensively studied, the results of which can be applied to other frontier societies in the history of early America.
Therefore, using the framework presented above of Schein’s (1997) theories concerning discourses materialized, this thesis analyzes the federal public land sale system as a discourse (and a discourse materialized itself), that of the desire for revenue and the hope of creating a class of commercial farmers (Appleby 1982). Simultaneously, aspects of the public land sale system, especially at an ultra-local level, which have gone previously unstudied, will be analyzed and described in hopes of determining how and why settlers purchased and developed their farmsteads. The interplay between different agencies, such as the federal government and individual settlers, is examined as well to see how the landscape during and after the public land sale era was created and modified. Finally, the present-day landscape of Perry County is investigated to show how discourses materialized may persist in the landscape and modify, influence, or control current discourses and their expressions.
Chapter Three: Settlement Processes in Early Perry County

Ohio Settlement Prior to the Habitation of Perry County

The Ohio country, though only officially opened to settlement by Anglo-Americans with the passage of the Land Ordinance of 1785, had been occupied for decades before by adventurous squatters on lands still controlled by Native Americans. The tribes who populated the areas northwest of the Ohio Valley, including the Wyandot, Shawnee, and Delaware, reacted hostilely towards the settlers slowly streaming in to their lands, attacking farmsteads and killing or kidnapping settlers. These attacks were not one-sided however, with the massacre of 96 inhabitants of the peaceful Delaware village of Gnadenhutten in 1782 serving as a prime example of the atrocities Anglo settlers committed against the Native Americans defending their homelands (Hixson 2013). To curb these attacks and prevent an all-out war with the indigenous tribes, the British government enacted the Proclamation of 1763, which prohibited migration to and settlement of lands west of the Appalachian Mountains (Hurt 1996). Although not the main reason for contention between the American colonists and the British government, this edict contributed to rising tensions as American settlers did not want to be kept off of land they thought was theirs under the guise of “Manifest Destiny,” the ideology that western lands were granted by God to be improved by Anglo-American settlers. Despite the ban on settlement west of the Appalachians, immigrants from the eastern colonies began to stream across the mountains into Tennessee, Kentucky, and the Ohio River Valley in the late 1750s and early 1760s, forging small homesteads in the forested wilderness.
With the end of the American Revolution in 1783, the western lands previously claimed by Great Britain came under the control of the United States and the prohibition on settlement of these lands was overturned. However, the federal government needed a way to efficiently and profitably release the land to settlers wanting to move westward. To do so, Congress enacted a series of land alienation laws that created systematic processes for the distribution of the “public domain” (also known as “Congress Lands”) into private hands. Beginning with the Land Ordinance of 1785, officially known as “An Ordinance for Ascertaining the Mode of Disposing of Lands in The Western Territory” (Sherman 1925), a survey system, outlined in Figure 3.1, consisting of townships 36 square miles in size divided into one-square-mile sections, each consisting of 640 acres, introduced a geometric order in the Northwest Territory (lands making up the future states of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota) and areas subsequently brought under American control through purchases and treaties with a variety of Native American tribes. Immediately following the passage of this ordinance, surveying began in eastern Ohio, an area later known as the “Seven Ranges” as only seven survey ranges were supposed to be completed and platted before being put up for sale (Figure 3.2). By 1787, only four of the seven ranges had been surveyed, a pace too slow for the federal government looking to pay off war debts through the sale of public lands (Rohrbough 1968). At this time, the four completed ranges were put on auction in New York City with slow sales characterizing this three-week auction period: Only 72,934 acres were sold for a sum total of $117,108, all in 640-acre sections in close proximity to the Ohio River bought by speculators with no intent to personally settle the lands they purchased (Stephens and Bobersky 1990a, p.2).
Realizing they would never be able to quickly pay off debts incurred from the American Revolution, the federal government opted for another strategy of land disposal, through large land companies acting as middlemen between the government and individual settlers. In 1787 Congress passed an ordinance granting 1.5 million acres in southeastern Ohio (Figure 3.2) to the Ohio Company of Associates for one dollar per acre, though only 964,225 acres were ultimately payed for (Hurt 1996, p.156-157). This company, based out of Massachusetts, quickly platted several towns, such as Marietta, the first permanent settlement in the Northwest Territory, and encouraged settlement of the lands in the surrounding region. Another large purchase similar to the Ohio Company was made by John Cleves Symmes in 1787 for 1,000,000 acres of land between the Little Miami River and the Great Miami River in southwestern Ohio (Figure 3.2), though he, like the Ohio Company, was only able to ultimately purchase 311,682 acres (Hurt 1996, p.161). Unfortunately for the federal government, these companies usually offered lower...
prices for land per acre than what was provisioned for in the Land Ordinance of 1785, which attracted settlers to these lands instead of the lands offered by way of auction in the Seven Ranges. However, once settlers reached the lands owned by the land speculation companies, they encountered issues not seen in lands still under control of the federal government. The Symmes purchase, while known as productive fertile ground, was marred by property disputes as surveying irregularities caused Symmes to sell land that he did not personally own, creating legal troubles that would not be resolved for years. The lands of the Ohio Company, unlike the Symmes purchase, were surveyed accurately; yet the lay of the land here was the issue. Being in the foothills of the Appalachians, the area of the Ohio Company grant is very hilly with many steep grades, a region largely unsuitable for the farming techniques of the late 18th and early 19th centuries. The slow sale of the speculative lands caused both the Ohio Company and Symmes to default on payments due to the federal government, forcing Congress to develop a new system for the disposal of public lands.
In other parts of the Northwest Territory, other agents were working to alienate land not held by the federal government. Lands reserved by the states of Virginia and Connecticut, claimed through their colonial charters and retained through the cessions of their western lands to the federal government after the American Revolution, were distributed by their respective state governments through various means. Land reserved by Virginia (Figure 3.2) between the Scioto River and the Little Miami River, known as the Virginia Military District since the land was meant to be given as bounty for serving in the military during the American Revolution, was distributed using methods characteristic of settlements east of the Appalachian Mountains. This system of
headrights utilized primarily in the Southern and Middle Atlantic colonies, employed the metes and bounds surveying technique on land that was not surveyed prior to initial settlement, as was the case with the township-range system; headright claims were made based on acreage and were then platted out employing sometimes vague descriptions using landmarks such as trees or river banks (metes) connected by straight lines (bounds) (Anderson 2014). While settlement in this area proceeded rather quickly, especially after the establishment of Chillicothe, Ohio’s first capital, deeds were oftentimes overlapping or poorly described, leading to a slew of property disputes that sometimes still exist in modern times. An example of the complexity and vagueness of the land parcels in this area can be seen in Figure 3.3. Claims could also only be made by those who held military warrants issued by the government of Virginia, given to soldiers as payment-in-kind for military service. Many of these soldiers did not want to move to the untamed wilderness of Ohio, so they sold their warrants to individuals looking to settle westward or to speculators hoping for profits from gambling on frontier real estate (Hurt 1996). Because of these circumstances, as well as the main route of ingress northward from the Ohio River up the Scioto Valley, settlement in the Virginia Military District was limited mainly to migrants from the South and the Upland South, especially Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee (Wilhelm 1982), those familiar with the land sales and real estate practices conducted in this region of Ohio.
Figure 3.3. A sketch of land surveys from the Virginia Military District (Sherman 1925).
Simultaneously, in the northeastern portion of Ohio 5000 square miles of land south of Lake Erie (Figure 3.2) reserved by Connecticut for the same reason as Virginia, known as the Connecticut Western Reserve (or Western Reserve), was being sold to private individuals. However, with few parcels being claimed after the American Revolution, the government of Connecticut, desperate to rid itself of the land and reap the profits of land sales, sold 3.2 million acres to the privately owned Connecticut Land Company in 1795 (Hurt 1996, p.165). Surveyors employed by the Connecticut Land Company, as in the lands of the Ohio Company and the government-held Seven Ranges, employed an orderly geometric system to survey and distribute the land. However, the Connecticut Land Company laid out townships that were five miles square, instead of the previously established six miles square townships. Moreover, the subdivision of townships was left to the whims of the purchasers—shareholders in the Connecticut Company—often resulting in lots in adjacent townships that could be much larger or smaller than their counterparts, as seen in Figure 3.4 (Sherman 1925; Harte 1992). Sales of land in the Reserve began in 1796, but demand was low due to the isolation of the area, as there were no rivers or canals connecting to the Ohio Valley at this time, and the high prices speculators were charging for their lots. By 1800, only 1,000 people had settled in the entire 3.2 million acre purchase (Hurt 1996, p.166). Due to the slow rate of sales, the Connecticut Land Company went bankrupt in 1809 and dissolved, with its remaining land holdings distributed among the shareholders. These shareholders also had trouble marketing and selling their lands until the completion of the Erie Canal in 1825, when the settlements of the Western Reserve were finally connected to eastern markets.
Figure 3.4. Differing lot sizes in the Connecticut Western Reserve (Sherman 1925).
via Lake Erie and the Hudson River (Harte 1992). Taken overall, the various methods used to distribute land to private individuals in Ohio prior to 1796 were generally inefficient, unmanageable, and led to sluggish settlement of the Ohio Territory.

To remedy the land situation on the Ohio frontier, Congress passed the Land Act of 1796 on May 18th, which vastly improved the federal system of land distribution and laid the foundation for the next 60 years of federal land policy. This piece of legislation, formally known as “An Act Providing for the Sale of the Lands of the United States, in the Territory Northwest of the River Ohio, and Above the Mouth of Kentucky River,” utilized many of the surveying practices introduced in the Land Ordinance of 1785, such as the 36-square-miles rectilinear township and the subdivision into 640-acre sections one by one mile square (Sherman 1925). The 1796 act also established the “inviolate nature of the American survey” (Johnson 1976, p. 57), a principle declaring that mistakes made during surveying will remain in perpetuity without being corrected. Consequences of this principle can be seen in today’s landscape, including that of northern Perry County. The four central sections (numbered 15, 16, 21, and 22) of each township, the positions of which can be seen in Figure 3.1, would be reserved for use by the federal government under this law, usually to be sold off later after initial settlement of the area in order to increase revenue from land sales. Finally, the Land Act of 1796 introduced the first version of the credit system of payment that dominated the federal land disposal paradigm for the next two decades. The original system developed in this law held that the individual who entered the land claim needed to deposit one-twentieth of the purchase amount at the time of entry, after which he would be given one full year to pay the remainder of the purchase price. If the full amount was paid at the time of entry, a 10%
reduction in price would be granted. As of the passage of this act the minimum price per acre was set at two dollars (Sherman 1925), making the minimum price for a 640 acre section, the smallest amount of land available for purchase, $1,280, an incredible sum for this time period. The aspects of the Land Act of 1796 mentioned above were carried on or modified in later amendments to this legislation and in other land policies implemented by the federal government, and each had profound impacts on the physical and cultural landscapes of frontier Ohio, including early Perry County, which will be discussed further in this thesis.

Land affected by the Land Act of 1796 included areas of the Northwest Territories not yet surveyed and sold by the federal government, and excluding the areas previously reserved by states or given to private companies. The Treaty of Greenville, signed in 1795 by the United States Government and the Western Confederacy of Native American Tribes, extended the legitimacy of federal land claims to areas south and east of a line running south from the mouth of the Cuyahoga River to Fort Laurens (present-day Tuscarawas County, Ohio), west from Fort Laurens to Fort Recovery (present-day Mercer County, Ohio), and southwest from Fort Recovery to the north bank of the Ohio River across from the mouth of the Kentucky River (across from present-day Carroll County, Kentucky), as shown in Figure 3.5 (Sherman 1925). The land south and east of this line contained all lands in Ohio not previously mentioned, except the northwest corner of the state, which would be later ceded to the federal government by treaties in the 1830s and 1840s (Hurt 1996). These lands, including what is now present-day Perry County, came to be known as the U.S. Congress Lands (Figure 3.2). Although the issue of Indian claims to these lands was no longer an issue, providing an end to the brutal
cycle of Native American attacks on settler homesteads and Anglo-American reprisals, sales stemming from the newly passed law of 1796 continued to be stagnant. After the first year, only about 49,000 acres had been sold for a sum of $112,135.45 (Rohrbough 1968, p. 22); this equated to less land and total profits than garnered from the first sale of public lands in 1787. Again, the majority of land sales were centered on areas in close proximity to the navigable Ohio River (Rohrbough 1968). After the poor sales performance of 1796, lands in Ohio were officially closed again for several years as the federal government worked to streamline the system for alienation of public land.

In 1800 Congress passed an amendment to the 1796 law, known as the Land Act of 1800, which modified the existing conventions established by the Land Act of 1796. First, the act created four land offices within the Ohio Territory --in Steubenville, Chillicothe, Cincinnati, and Marietta-- at which sales could be registered by settlers, whereas under previous acts sales had to be entered in eastern cities such as New York and Pittsburgh (Sherman 1925). Changing the location of registration was beneficial for settlers moving to the Ohio frontier, as it was much easier for them to travel the 100 or so miles to one of the land offices close by, instead of traveling hundreds of miles back East to register their claims. This modification also allowed the settlers to view the land they wanted to purchase since they could travel to the local land office to view the plat of open sections, visit the land, and return in several days’ time to enter the claim. With the previous requirement of entering the land in Pittsburgh or New York, migrants advancing to the Ohio frontier, usually from locations far removed from the eastern registration points, may not have been able to make the trek to the city to enter the land they wanted. Research by David Stephens and Alexander Bobersky (1990a) supports this assertion,
stating “it is doubtful that any of the New York buyers had been to the area and they probably had only limited information about [it]” (p. 3). By locating land offices within the territory, the government was in effect making Ohio even more suitable for settlement as migrants could view the land and gain knowledge about the sections they were entering.

Figure 3.5. Map portraying the location of the Greenville Treaty line set in 1795 (Peters 1918).

Another modification implemented by the Land Act of 1800 was the reduction of the minimum purchase area from 640 acres, a whole section, to 320 acres, a half section (Figure 3.1). However, this half section was only divided by a north-south running
meridian, meaning that half sections could only be designated and bought as east halves or west halves at this time (Sherman 1925). Once again, this modification to the 1796 law was a concession by the federal government to the frontier settler as it allowed the people buying the land to purchase amounts that were easier to manage with a one-family wilderness homestead. The total cost of the land sale as well was reduced by this change, as less money was needed to buy less acreage, providing another benefit to the frontier settler. Although the price per acre was still set at two dollars, established originally by the Land Act of 1796, the total cost of the minimum amount allowed for sale, 320 acres, was now set at 640 dollars, instead of the previous minimum of $1,280 (Johnson 1976). However, unlike under the 1796 act, this total was not due within a year after entry; a new system was devised to allow for the frontier settler to establish themselves and earn a profit before laying down money on land payments.

Finally, the Land Act of 1800 reinvented the credit system that had been weakly established in the Land Act of 1796. Like the original system called for, one-twentieth of the full purchase price was due as a down payment at the time of entry. After this initial payment, the system was modified so that the entrant had 40 days to complete the first credit installment, one-quarter of the total purchase price. If no one else had applied for the land at the register’s office, the original entrant then was given three months to complete the first installment. Once the first payment was deposited, the entrant had five years to make the next three installments, two, three, and four years after entry respectively, to complete the purchase of the lot. If payments of the installments were late, a six percent interest charge per year was added to the total purchase price of the entry. On the other hand, early payments were rewarded with an eight percent discount
from the amount due. If all four installments were unpaid after five years from the
original entry date listed in the register’s office, the entered lot would be forfeited to the
federal government and resold at public auction for no less than the remaining amount
owed on that piece of land (Schroder 1980). This system of credit gave settlers moving
to the frontier time to build financial security through the production of agricultural
commodities and goods. The five-year period for full payment allowed the settlers to
build capital where it was needed, usually in the form of farm tools, seeds, or livestock,
instead of spending that money on immediately paying back the federal government. In
fact, the period of time given for full payment was usually more than needed by frontier
farmers to realize a profit from their land. Clarence Danhof (1969) estimated that during
the Early Republic, a working farmer could save for two to three years and collect
enough to pay off the purchase price for 100 to 200 hundred acres of land. As such, 320
acres, the minimum amount of land available for sale under the 1800 act, would not be
out of the question, though possibly requiring the full five years’ grace to complete
payment. For the first time since land from the public domain was made available for
sale, the federal government seemed to meet the demands of the citizens desiring to move
westward.

Support for the beneficial effects of the alterations implemented by the Land Act
of 1800 can be seen through the land sales in the immediate year after passage of the law.
Through November 1, 1801, roughly seven months after land controlled by the 1800 act
was put on public sale, 398,646 acres were sold from the four land offices in the
Northwest Territory, fetching a sum of $834,877.11 (Rohrbough 1968, p. 44). Compared
to the sales under the preceding 1796 act, in five months less time eight times more land
was sold for a sum seven and a half times higher than previously collected. Out of the Chillicothe land office alone, where the western portions of Perry County were administered, 99,058 acres were purchased for more than $220,000 within the first three weeks the land was made available for sale (Rohrbough 1968, p.44). After nine weeks, the amount collected from land sales at the same office rose to $400,000 (Rohrbough 1968, p. 44). Obviously, the modifications made to the credit system and the minimum available acreage, as well as the placement of the land offices in the western territories, combined to create conditions favorable for the purchase of federal lands. However, this legal framework would not remain unchanged for long, as the needs and wants of the settlers would soon revise federal land policy once again.

In 1804, the minimum acreage for sale was again lowered, this time to 160 acres, which came to be known as a quarter section (Figure 3.1). The act that mandated this modification, entitled “An Act Making Provision for the Disposal of Public Lands in the Indiana Territory, and for Other Purposes” (Sherman 1925), popularly known as the Indiana Act, stated that half-quarters would be split with an east-to-west running line, forming 160 acre squares that would become designated by their corner positions: Northeast, southeast, southwest, and northwest (Johnson 1976). Four quarters were contained within each section, and with 36 sections per township, 144 quarter sections were available for sale within each congressional township. The Indiana Act also established three new land offices west of Ohio and made most of the previously reserved sections (15, 21, and 22) available for public sale at a higher minimum price (originally eight dollars per acre), but the most lasting impact of the legislation was the establishment of the quarter section as a unit of sale. The quarter section was more
manageable for the frontier farmer, as he had half as much land to clear and maintain than if a half section had been bought. This change also reduced the minimum total purchase price again, now down to 320 dollars (with two dollars per acre still the set minimum price per acre). The effect of this modification “was to allow a wider range of persons to participate in land purchases” (Stephens and Bobersky 1990a, p. 4), a collection of frontier settlers who moved westward with no financial capital except for possible funds gathered from the sale of lands back east and hopes of attaining an economic status greater than they left behind. Stephens and Bobersky (1990a) rightly assert that with the Indiana Act, “a new age dawned [where] purchasers were dominated by the buyer of the single parcel who would live on his purchase” (p. 5). Evidence for this trend is available in federal land records from early Perry County, data which will be discussed later in the chapter.

Although federal land policy had finally caught up to the needs of the frontier settler in terms of acreage available and the addition of a credit line, completion of the total payment was still hard to come by for groups of settlers. In 1806, five years after the passage of the 1800 act that introduced the five year credit period, it appeared that many frontiersman might default on their payments and have their land reverted back to federal control. To combat this impression, Congress passed a credit extension act that same year, giving settlers several months to gather funds needed to pay their debt owed to the land office. Similar laws were passed in 1809 and 1810, but modified so that land entrants were granted two extra years to pay the government what it was owed. During the decade from 1811-1820, seven total relief acts were enacted by the federal government to ease the perceived burden of the frontier farmer, granting anywhere from
one to three years of grace added to the payback period (Schroder 1980). Evidence suggests, however, that this burden, utilized by the federal government as reasoning for the implementation of the credit extension acts, was almost nonexistent. During the period land could be entered under the five year credit system (1801-1819) the mean rate of reversion of land back to government control was 6.9%, meaning that a vast majority of credit entries, 93.1%, were successfully completed (Schroder 1980). In fact, in his study of representative townships of Ohio, Schroder (1980) found that 71.3% of all credit entries were completed within the five year period with no extensions needed. Almost half of the credit entries, 44.6%, were completed within four years of entry, with a majority of completed transactions (21.7%) occurring between the third and fourth year after entry (Schroder 1980). Clearly there was not a pressing need for credit extensions for the majority of Ohio settlers during the Early Republic; however, 31.6% of credit entries did require extra time to complete payment (Schroder 1980). Of this 31.6%, 34.7%, more than one-third, was able to complete their payments within the fifth year after entry, and 14.7% able to do so during the sixth year after entry, a cumulative total of 86.9% of credit entries completed within six years of registration (Schroder 1980).

Contemporary critics of the credit system claimed that allowing settlers to buy land on credit would create a class of citizens beholden to a government debt that could not be paid off for decades. The evidence cited above, however, suggests that these claims are largely unsupported; a vast majority of the settlers buying land on the Ohio frontier were successful in making their payments to the government, and even doing so earlier than required (Schroder 1980). Understanding that the credit system implemented by the government through the Land Act of 1800 and the Indiana Act of 1804 was
successful in its goal of facilitating the sale of land to the common settler is important because the face of the frontier was forever changed by the rush of settlers that took advantage of the liberal terms offered under the established credit regime. People of modest means could own large swaths of land and turn it into productive farmland, commercializing and commodifying it, and turn a profit from their toils. The opportunity for economic gain offered by the federal land policy described above was of central importance in the creation of the frontier landscape that characterized the Northwest Territory at this time. Spurred by the available land and hopes of financial success in the West, thousands of settlers streamed to the Ohio frontier, including the area that would become Perry County. The impacts of the land policy on the settlers that came as a result can be seen in the historical landscape of Perry County, stemming from the settlement process that occurred as the region of Perry County developed. This process and its patterns will be discussed shortly.

Although land policy was essentially stable for 15 years after the passage of the 1804 Indiana Act, with the exception of the series of credit relief acts starting in 1806, several small modifications were made that offered settlers even more access to public lands. And even though the settlement of Perry County occurred primarily in this era of policy stability, the several later modifications impacted the settlement process of the study area, and therefore will be described here. In 1820, Congress amended the federal land policy to allow entries of 80 acres, a half-quarter section (Figure 3.1). Like the original half sections of 320 acres, the half-quarters could only be divided by a north–south running line, though with the implementation of the quarter section in 1804, half sections could then be sold with east-west running lines as their boundaries (Johnson
The previously reserved sections (sections 15, 21, and 22) that were released from federal reservation in 1804 had their minimum price per acre gradually lowered from eight dollars to four dollars to the federal minimum of two dollars a decade after the passage of the Indiana Act (Schroder 1980). The fourth reserved section, section 16, was also eventually released from federal reservation in 1804, though it was not immediately opened for sale like the three previous sections. With the passage of the original Land Ordinance of 1785, section 16 in each township had been reserved for lands to provide for public education through the construction of a school. The Indiana Act of 1804 released the reserved sections to the public domain, with the caveat that section 16 would remain set aside for school lands. While sections 15, 21, and 22 were eventually sold off to individual settlers, section 16 continued to be reserved for 20 years, until the state of Ohio put the issue to public vote: Keep section 16 reserved for school lands or open the land up to public sale. In 1827 Ohioans resoundingly voted to sell off the school lands, as many schools had been erected on land donated by private individuals, instead of on the land actually set aside for school construction. Money from the sale of the school lands went to the states, while a small percentage was given to the county that each section 16 was a part of (Martzolff 1902). While both of these alterations to public land policy may seem rather insignificant, each nevertheless had impacts on settlement processes and patterns on the Ohio frontier, including Perry County.

The final shift in federal land policy that affected settlement on the Ohio frontier and Perry County, while small in scale in terms of its influence on the landscape of Perry County, Ohio, constituted the largest reversal of policy in the short history of the Early American Republic. In 1820, embedded in the same legislation that reduced the
minimum acreage of sale to 80, the credit system that had allowed many Anglo-American settlers to establish farms in the previously sparsely settled Northwest Territory was abolished. As a response to the need to increase revenue from land sales due to the economic depression brought on by the Panic of 1819, the federal government ended all credit entries and required that all land purchases be paid for upfront in cash. At this time, the federal government was owed almost 23 million dollars from land sales that had not been paid in full (Hone 1997). In order to relieve the settlers of the burden of an upfront cash payment, the minimum acreage was lowered to 80 and the minimum price per acre was slashed to $1.25 (Sherman 1925). Thus, the minimum total purchase amount that could be paid for the smallest available parcel of land would be $100, a far cry from the previous minimum payment of $320 (160 acres at two dollars per acre). Although $100 was still a relatively large sum in the days of the Early Republic, it appears that this was a sum that most settlers could manage to pay in one fell swoop.

The end of the credit system, however, did not result in disaster for those who still owed money on credit entries made before the passage of the 1820 law. With credit already extended to 1821, the Relief Act of 1821 established favorable terms for those still paying back the government. This law gave entrants the ability to settle their debts by relinquishing part of their claim that had not yet been paid for, but allowing the settlers to keep what part of the land they had already paid off. According to Schroder (1980), 70% of land relinquished within his study area was forfeited by settlers within the three months immediately following the passage of the Relief Act. Most of the forfeited land constituted half-quarter parcels, as the entries had been made on a full quarter section of land. Another Relief Act was passed in 1825, extending the terms of the
original Relief Act of 1821 (Schroder 1980). With these liberal terms, many settlers indebted to the government were able to divest themselves of the money owed and retain ownership of an amount of land that was possible to commercialize and realize a profit from. Between the credit extension acts and the credit relief acts, the U.S. government was able to gradually decrease the amount owed by settlers, until the last credit entries were completed in the mid-1840s. Although Perry County had been mostly settled by the time these series of acts had been passed, evidence of their effects on settlement patterns can be seen in the landscape of historical Perry County.

Settlement of Perry County, Ohio

The first settlers. According to county histories, before the arrival of Anglo-American settlers, there were no permanent Native American villages within the borders of what is today Perry County. It is suggested by at least one author, A.A. Graham (1883), that the lands between the Scioto and Muskingum Rivers, containing Perry County, were utilized as a communal hunting ground for several Native American groups, including the Shawnee, Wyandot, and Delaware tribes. What is known concerning Native American occupancy of Perry County is that the area was heavily traveled, evidenced by the existence of several Indian trails throughout the region, such as the Moxahala Trail which led from the Muskingum River to the Hocking River Valley directly across what is now northern Perry County (Graham 1883; Hurt 1996). Because of the ease of access to the region provided by the existing Native American trails, it was only natural that this area would be visited by Anglo-Americans in the early days of western expansion. According the Graham’s (1883) history of Fairfield and Perry Counties, the first known Anglo visitor to Perry County was Christopher Gist, a surveyor.
and explorer employed by the Virginia colonial government who was sent to learn more about the interior country west of the Appalachians. In 1751, Gist and his party camped on the edge of the “Great Swamp,” what eventually became Buckeye Lake, located in northwestern Thorn Township (Graham 1883; Bailey 1976). Between Gist’s expedition and the opening of the country to public land sales in 1801, it is clear that many other Anglo-Americans passed through this region, including missionaries attempting to convert the indigenous tribes of the Scioto and Muskingum valleys, hunters tracking game through the Ohio wilderness, and government-hired surveyors tasked with organizing the frontier for distribution to private citizens (Graham 1883).

Exactly who the first permanent Anglo settler in Perry County is disputed and difficult to ascertain. As land records before the establishment of public land sales are few and far between, and because actual physical settlement was technically illegal before the opening of sales in 1801, there is no clear evidence as to who established the first homestead in what is now Perry County. A.A. Graham (1883) writes that settlers who became dissatisfied with land west of Perry County, in the Scioto Valley and Pickaway Plains areas of the Virginia Military District, were some of the first to settle in the county. Two such were Robert McClellan, who purportedly settled in the vicinity of New Lexington (not included in the study area), and Robert Colburn. Colburn emigrated from Somerset County, Pennsylvania, around 1800 to Lancaster in Fairfield County, and, reputedly, quickly became displeased with the area. He apparently picked up and headed eastward on Zane’s Trace, a route he traveled earlier to come to Lancaster, and found a favorable spot one mile east of the present location of Somerset, in northern Perry County, where “he came upon a good spring [and] liked the appearance of the country”
(Graham 1883, p. 15). It is unknown how accurate the dates and details of this tale are, as other histories of the county list other settlers as the first permanent inhabitants; a Robert Colburn was discovered in the search through the land patents granted within the study area, however, the patent was issued in 1819, located in eastern Clayton Township, over five miles east of Somerset, and was bought with another settler, Samuel Ream, as “tenants in common,” whose place of residence before entering the patent was listed as Muskingum County. The Robert Colburn listed on the patent could indeed be the same as described above by Graham (1883), though his assertion that Colburn was the first permanent settler of Perry County seems to be unsupported by the available evidence.

In a separate chapter that details the history of Madison Township, Graham (1883) mentions another man that could have been the first Anglo settler of Perry County, William Dusenberry. The history states that in 1800, three men, one of them being Dusenberry, emigrated from Sussex County, New Jersey, to Perry County and settled in the northeastern township at the junction of two streams, Jonathan’s Creek and Turkey Run. Little else is written about William Dusenberry in the history, but the 1800 date provided by Graham (1883) would put Dusenberry as one of the first named settlers in northern Perry County, even before the aforementioned Robert Colburn. A William Dusinberry, spelled differently from Graham’s (1883) history, was found in the land patent search of the study area, having a patent granted on July 31, 1805 for the east half of section 29, township 17, range 15, located in Madison Township (Figure 3.6). The spelling difference does not preclude the Dusinberry listed on the patent from being the Dusenberry mentioned in the history as spelling errors were a common occurrence on the frontier due to the mixing of people from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds.
The location mentioned by Graham (1883) matches with the patent granted when compared to the location of streams in Perry County; the half section granted to Dusinberry in 1805 lies one mile southwest of the junction of Jonathan’s Creek and Turkey Run, while the half section itself lies on the banks of Turkey Run (Figure 3.7). Finally, the date of patent issuance aligns pretty well with Graham’s (1883) description: Seeing as it was not possible to legally enter land in Perry County until 1801, the 1805 issuance date would lie four years after the first legal date of entry, within the time limit granted by the federal government. It is entirely possible that Dusinberry settled the land earlier, perhaps the 1800 date mentioned in the history, as many settlers did pre-empt the legal dates by settling on sections not yet surveyed and platted by the land office, waiting until the land was opened for sale to legally enter their claim to the land they had already improved (Johnson 1976). The use of the entire four-year payment window also fits, as Schroder (1980) explains that many of the entries that took longer than three years to complete were entered in 1801 or 1802, like Dusinberry’s entry would have been if he entered it soon after the land opened for sale. One other explanation for the long period of payment could be the simple fact that Dusinberry entered a large piece of land, 320 acres (at this time the minimum acreage available), which would likely require a longer period to pay off. Given the above evidence, it is entirely plausible that William Dusinberry/Dusenberry was one of, if not the first, permanent Anglo-American settler in Perry County.
Figure 3.6. Location of William Dusinberry’s patent issued in 1805. Map by author.

Figure 3.7. William Dusinberry’s 1805 purchase in reference to local streams. Map by author.
A later history of Perry County, written by Clement Martzolff (1902), maintains that it is impossible to know who the earliest settler was, but argues that one likely candidate was Christian Binckley. Through genealogical research, much is known about this man: Born in 1738 in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, Christian was the son of Alsatian-German immigrants who moved throughout Pennsylvania during the late 1700s (Miller 2008). In 1801, Christian moved to Perry County, Ohio, where he settled in Reading Township and entered a whole section (section 2 of township 17, range 17 and shown in Figure 3.8) at the land office in Chillicothe on November 4, 1801. The land patents support this assertion, as Binckley’s patent was issued on the earliest date found in the study area search and in the location described by Martzolff (1902).

Figure 3.8. Location of the Binckley and Arnold purchases of 1801. Map by author.
One other patent, for the entirety of section 11, township 17, range 17, was issued on November 4, 1801, to a George Arnold, who is also mentioned in Martzolff’s (1902) history (Figure 3.8). The author writes that Arnold entered the land, but did not settle on it himself, and instead sold it to Christian Binckley, who had bought the section directly north of Arnold’s entry. Because Arnold did not settle on his land, Martzolff (1902) argues that Christian Binckley was the first permanent settler of Perry County. George Arnold is not mentioned again throughout this text, and in Graham’s (1883) history Arnold is found only once, in a section detailing the biography of the Binckley family.

No new information is given about George Arnold in this history. A cursory search of land patent records reveals that a George Arnold entered and purchased four other tracts of land in Fairfield County, two congressional townships west of his 1801 purchase, in the seven years after his initial entry. From these records, it appears that Arnold may have found better land elsewhere than that which he originally bought and decided to sell his holdings and move westward. With Christian Binckley being his closest neighbor and one of the earliest settlers, it was only natural that Arnold sold his lands to the adjacent Binckley farmstead. Because of these facts, George Arnold cannot be considered one of the first settlers of Perry County. Although it will likely remain impossible to know for sure who the first permanent Anglo-American settler was, the cases listed by Martzolff (1902) and Graham (1883) seem likely and are supported with available evidence from land patents. Knowing who the first permanent settlers in Perry County were is important, as it establishes a reference point from which a chronology of settlement patterns in the study area can be developed. Establishing the identity of the first permanent settlers of an area also allows for the determination of the time and location of
the first effective settlement, a term introduced by geographer Wilbur Zelinsky (1973),
places that may have influenced the landscape and culture of the developing region. Both
of these reasons will be discussed in following sections.

**Public land sales.** Land in the ranges west of the Muskingum River, including
Perry County, were surveyed under the Land Act of 1800 and opened for public auction
in the spring of 1801. From 1801 to 1803, sections were entered at the land office in
Chillicothe. In 1803, Albert Gallatin, the Secretary of the Treasury under Presidents
Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, opened another land office in Zanesville,
northeast of Chillicothe (Figure 3.9). The district administered by the Zanesville office
was carved out of the pre-existing Chillicothe and Steubenville districts, and
supplemented with land newly opened by government surveyors (Rohrbough 1968).
Perry County lay on the dividing line between the two offices: Of the five townships
contained within the study area, two, Madison and Clayton, were administered out of
Zanesville, and the remaining three, Reading, Hopewell, and Thorn, were sold out of
Chillicothe. No difference exists between the selling policies of the two land offices, as
all offices were administered by the same agency (at the time of settlement, the U.S.
Department of the Treasury and the General Land Office (GLO), presently, the Bureau of
Land Management), so minimum land prices and available acreage were the same
between the two districts, making the two districts comparable in terms of data gleaned
from the land patents issued respectively.
Figure 3.9. Location of land districts covered by federal land offices, including Chillicothe and Zanesville (Rohrbough 1968).

**Dates of issuances.** Overall, within the five-township study area, 593 patents were issued by the federal government to individual landholders through public land sales between 1801 and 1842, the locations of which are illustrated in Figure 3.10. The date of issuance is the date that the person of entry completed full payment of the purchase price, thus transferring the land from the public domain into private hands. Though the sales occurred over 41 years (Figure 3.11), the sales did not take place evenly over this period of time. In fact, there were several years in which no entries were recorded, though these years are concentrated at the beginning and end of the period, as would be expected under a credit system where several years were allowed for completion of payment. The years 1802-1804, the second through fourth years after the opening of the study area to public
sale, saw no completed entries, as the land registered during this time was being paid off under the credit system. The fifth year after opening, 1805, saw four entries completed, and in 1806, 15 entries were fully paid. These two years, 1805 and 1806, would mark the fourth and fifth years after entry, the average period of time, as shown by Danhof (1969) and Schroder (1980), that it would take for frontier farmers to pay off their government debt under the credit system created by the Land Act of 1800. Because of the lack of completed payments between 1802 and 1804, it can be assumed that the majority of entries completed in 1805 and 1806, a total of 19, were paid off under the credit system, and not in a lump sum of cash at time of entry. The two earliest entries in the study area, mentioned in the preceding section, completed in 1801 by George Arnold and Christian Binckley were most likely completed in this way, as the patents were issued just seven months after the opening of the study area to public sales. Although these transactions were likely completed as full cash payments, they are still listed as “credit volume patents,” meaning they were completed under the domain of the federal credit system.
Towards the end of the public sale era, intermittent years without sales were found in 1822 and 1829, as well as an extended period of years with no issuances at all between 1835 and 1840. These lapses in issued patents represent the slowdown of land sales, as most of the land in the study area had already been claimed and fully purchased by these dates. Between 1822 and 1829 and between 1829 and 1835 patents were indeed issued, but at much slower rates than seen previously, which will be discussed in detail shortly. The last two years of the issuance range, 1841 and 1842, both saw only one patent completed. Both of the entries were listed as credit volume patents, meaning that
Figure 3.11. Dates of patent issuance for total study area. Figure by author.
even though they were completed over 20 years after the official end of the federal credit system, these settlers were able to extend their line of credit through the series of credit extension and relief acts of the 1810s and 1820s to the era where land could only be bought by full down payments of cash. One of these patents, the one issued in 1841 for the southeast quarter of section 4, township 18, range 17 to a William W. Tolbott, had an assigner listed, one George Hosher. It is possible that this transaction was drawn out so long because the assigner, Hosher, was covered under the credit extension acts, but then at a later date assigned his entry to the person who finished payment, Tolbott, who paid the rest of the claim in cash at the time of assignment. The other possibility is that Hosher assigned his claim to Tolbott very early into the transaction, and Tolbott was then able to extend his credit under the extension and relief acts. Knowing whether, in this case, it was William Tolbott or George Hosher who extended the transaction for over 20 years is not possible, however, as that information was unavailable for the present study. Either way, the credit extension and relief acts were able to help some settlers purchase their own land, even if these payments were not completed until well after the end of the credit system.

Despite these two slow periods of patent issuance, land was sold rather rapidly in northern Perry County. As can be seen in Figure 3.11, showing the number of patents issued per year in the study area, there was a gradual increase in issued patents from 1806 to 1810 (15 patents to 34, respectively), followed by a rapid spike in the number of issued patents in 1811 (66) and 1812 (83). After 1812, patent issuance fell quickly again, to 29 in 1813, after which the rate of issuance remained relatively stable until 1820, when it quickly decreased. From 1820 until the end of the public sale era in 1842, patent
issuance remained low, except for a spike in 1825, when 23 patents were issued, a number similar to the period from 1814 to 1819. 1825 remains the only year after 1820 in which more than 10 patents were issued in one specific year. Obviously, some external factor must have influenced land sales at this point in time, a factor which will be discussed in the following sections. From the dates of patent issuance gathered during the search of land patents in the study area and the data presented above, a distinct peak in issued patents can be seen, in 1811 and 1812. When averaged, the year of issue for the entire study area is 1815, three years after the peak period described above. When the two latest years, 1841 and 1842, are removed from the calculation, the average remains 1815, meaning that although the land sales peaked in the early 1810s, the gradual decline in issued patents was still significant in the later years of the public sale era.

It is not surprising that the peak period of patent issuance was in 1811-1812, especially for this area of Ohio. For one, the district administered by Chillicothe and later Zanesville, including Perry County, was one of the first four districts opened to public sale through regional land offices in the United States. The legal opening of this land would create a rush of settlers coming in to settle and claim their own piece of the public domain, especially after they heard how fertile and unspoiled the new ground was from friends and family who first moved west to find prosperity, a mentality described by Hurt (1996, p.178) as “Ohio fever.” After this initial phase of settlement, the founding of the first effective settlements, by the first pioneers like Christian Binckley and William Dusinberry, knowledge of their exploits made its way eastward through letters and visits home, pulling more settlers westward. This wave of new settlers arrived several years after the initial settlements, but claims made in the earliest years (e.g. 1805 and 1806)
were formally registered sometimes years later. Given the five-year credit period allowed under federal law during this time, claims made in these years were completed in 1810, 1811, or 1812, forming the peak of issued patents seen in the data. Evidence supporting this conclusion can be found in the population of Ohio during this period, which rose drastically from 51,006 in 1800 to 269,407 in 1810 (Hurt 1996, p.178), many of whom bought land from the government and were issued patents for their claims entered in this period.

Another factor contributing to the spike of issued patents around 1811-1812 is the War of 1812 and the movement of soldiers associated with this conflict. With British troops still stationed in several forts in the Northwest Territory at this time and continued British support of Indian raids on American farmsteads that culminated in several Indian wars in the decade before, the two nations went to war from 1812 to 1815, including campaigns on the Ohio frontier. Here, American troops sent to secure the area passed through land that had been recently opened for sale. After being released from the army, many who took note of the land’s potential for profit while marching through migrated westward and bought land from the government. Those who served in the Indian wars before the start of the War of 1812 would have travelled through areas such as Perry County in the mid-1800s, putting their time of migration around 1806-1807, five years before the spike in issued patents. Soldiers who served at the beginning of the War of 1812 could be included in the patent peak as well, especially if they paid in full with cash or finished paying off their credit line quickly after entry. Either way, the conflicts that surrounded the Ohio frontier in the early 1800s had some influence on land sales in the area of Perry County, and not only from the soldier’s side. The increase of troops in the
Northwest Territory in response to Native American raids and the British presence necessitated a need for provisions, especially for the men and the draught animals used to move the military’s equipment. Farmers responded to this need wholeheartedly, as a chance for the profits they desired eagerly presented itself. Hundreds or thousands of people in the East moved westward to Ohio to answer the army’s call for supplies given that it was a guaranteed source of income. As such, the increase in the number of patents issued in the early 1810s could have been a result of settlers taking advantage of the opportunities for economic gain provided by the military’s involvement in the security of the Ohio frontier, either directly, through selling crops to the army, or indirectly, by introducing settlers to land they would later inhabit.

In addition to possibly contributing to the spike in patents, the War of 1812 may have also influenced the decline in sales after 1812. As mentioned previously, Indian raids and British incursions into the Ohio frontier were taking place during the course of the war. The conflicts occurring in northwestern Ohio, Michigan, and Illinois may have deterred settlers, who would fear for their safety in uncertain territory. Although no raids by Native Americans or battles from the War of 1812 have been recorded in the histories of Perry County, fear born from previous eras of settlement where attacks on frontier homesteads were common might have kept settlers from immigrating to Ohio during this period of questionable security. This is not to say that the war was the only reason for the downturn in issued patents, as a good portion of land had already been sold by 1812 (46% of the study area) so only so much more could be sold after this point, but the fear created by the perceived insecurities of the territory did draw out land sales for a period of time longer than would have if the War of 1812 not occurred.
After 1819, almost five years after the end of the War of 1812, patent issuances dropped drastically, as was the case between 1812 and 1813; however, this drop in issuances can be attributed to the decline in the availability of land, as by the end of 1819 85.5% of the patents issued in the overall study area had been distributed by the federal government. By this time, the most desirable land had been already taken, leaving the most rugged, boggy, and isolated areas unsold. Credit entries extended by the relief acts of the 1810s and 1820s could have been issued after this point as well, but as Schroder’s (1980) evidence shows, many Ohio land entries did not utilize these acts, leaving undesirable land as the major component of the patents issued after 1819. The year 1825, as previously mentioned, did see a small spike in issued patents in a period of overall declining issuances. This rise in patents can most likely be attributed to the Relief Act of 1825, which allowed settlers to relinquish back to the government parts of their land claims that had been unpaid for, while still retaining the land they had already put money down on. Evidence for this explanation lies in the fact that of the 34 half-quarter sections patents that were issued within the study area, 13, or 38%, were issued in 1825 alone. Half-quarters were available for sale beginning in 1820, meaning that within the issuance range, half-quarters could be sold for 22 years; one-third of them were issued within the same year, 1825, while no other year after 1820 had even half as many half-quarter patents issued. Schroder (1980) also confirms that half-quarter sections were the most relinquished sections of land, providing credence to the notion that the spike in the number of half-quarter patents issued occurred as a result of the relief act passed in that year. Some external factor must have influenced land sales at this period of stagnant transactions, and the fact that 13 of the 23 issued patents, over 56%, in 1825 were for
half-quarters leads to the conclusion that the credit relief act passed by Congress that year led to the increase in completed sales.

Overall the pattern of the dates of issuance within the study area seems to follow the national trend, as described by Rohrbough (1968), as well as trends in other areas of Ohio (Schroder 1980). Land sales in the Early Republic peaked on the eve of the War of 1812, as many settlers moved westward to find prosperity. The sharp decline in sales after 1812 is also consistent with data at the national level. One difference between the national trends and the study area data, however, is the absence of a decline in sales during the economic recession of the mid-1800s in Perry County. From 1805 to 1810, patents were granted at an increasing rate, a trend not seen in data collected by Rohrbough (1968). Nationally, from 1806 to 1810, land sales declined 25% to 50% of what they had been in 1804 (398,156 acres) and 1805 (581,972 acres) (Rohrbough 1968, p. 48). In fact, they reached a record low in 1808 at 209,167 acres, less than what had been sold in every year of the decade except for 1800 and 1803, years at the beginning of the public land sale era (Rohrbough 1968, p. 48). As shown in Figure 3.11, sales, represented by patents issued, rose drastically during the same period that national sales were decreasing.

There may be many reasons for this difference, though a likely explanation is that northern Perry County represented an outlier due to its agricultural significance and location along a major trade route. Although agricultural data are only available after 1840, the numbers do show that the northern half of the county, the overall study area, accounted for the majority of agricultural production in the county (Table 3.1). Of the 13 crops recorded in Perry County in the Agricultural and Industrial Census of 1840, more
than 60% of the entire production of 10 crops was concentrated in the five townships of
the study area, including the majority of wheat (72%) and corn (64%) produced, the cash
crops of the early frontier farmer. Livestock was also a major component of the study
area’s agricultural system, with the majority of the county’s neat cattle (70.6%), sheep
(70.7%), swine (70%), and poultry (67%) produced in the five northern townships. As
the agricultural data suggest, northern Perry County was rich in the production of
commodities in comparison to the rest of the county in 1840. These data, scaled-back,
can also be used to assess the study area during the period discussed above, 1805-1810,
as this was the core of settlement in the county during the Early Republican era. As such,
land sales could have risen, instead of decreasing as the national trend would suggest, due
to the intense agricultural production the land of northern Perry County supported. With
the exception of this one episode, the land sales in Perry County after 1810 essentially
mirror what was happening nationally, with a decrease of sales after the War of 1812,
partly because of the war and partly due to the economic circumstances of the late 1810s,
such as the Panic of 1819 (Opie 1994), which may have contributed to the sharp decrease
in land sales and issued patents in Perry County after 1819.
When the patent issuance dates of the five townships comprising the study area are examined individually, patterns consistent with those seen in the study area overall are observed, with only isolated variations, as would be expected at smaller scales. The average dates for each township are listed in Table 3.2, and show results both similar and different from the study area average of 1815. Noticeably, three of the townships (Thorn, Hopewell, and Reading) have average dates of patent issuance earlier than the overall average. Thorn Township, in the far northwestern corner of the county, has an average date of issuance of 1812, three years earlier than the overall average of 1815. The range of patent issuances for this township runs from 1805 to 1841; when the outlier of 1841 is removed from the township average, the calculation falls to 1811, even earlier than the study area average. When the dates are graphed, the tight clustering of issue dates can be seen that led to the low township issuance average, as a tight peak exists from 1809 to 1814. During this period, 68% (71 of 104 total in Thorn Township) of the patents were
issued, an overwhelming majority occurring within a six year period. Besides the tight clustering around this period, the dates of sale for Thorn Township align with the study area’s as well, with the peak happening at approximately the same time (1811 in Thorn, 1812 overall), and the increase and decrease of issued patents occurring simultaneously.

Table 3.2

*Average Date of Issuance and Range of Issuances for Study Area Townships*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Average Date of Issuance</th>
<th>Range of Issuance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thorn</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>1805-1841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopewell</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>1806-1834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1814</td>
<td>1801-1834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>1815</td>
<td>1805-1842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>1819</td>
<td>1808-1831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Area</td>
<td>1815</td>
<td>1801-1842</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One noticeable difference between Thorn and the entire study area was the number of patents issued in 1813: In Thorn Township, only two patents were issued, while in the overall study area, 29 were (27 if the two from Thorn are excluded). When considering the entire study area (Figure 3.11), the drop in patents in 1813 in comparison to the three years afterwards does not seem overly significant. However, when examining the patents issued in Thorn Township (Figure 3.12), the decline from 1812 to 1813 seems substantial, and the two years following have a much higher rate of issuance in comparison to 1813 in Thorn than in the entire study area. This dip in land sales could be attributed to the insecurity born out of the War of 1812, as this period aligns with the course of the conflict, though the rise in completed patents immediately afterwards seems to discredit this theory. Another possibility is that this decrease was influenced by the
economic recession of the mid-1800s mentioned earlier in this section. The year 1813 lies five years after 1808, the year Rohrbough (1968) gives as the year of the smallest number of land sales from the public domain during the recession. Settlers who entered claims on land during 1808 or the subsequent year may have faced appreciably lower prices for their crops at market, precisely when they most needed financial capital to pay off their government debt. Thomas Berry (1943) suggests that the price of wheat, the most widely-grown crop in northern Perry County at the time of the 1840 Agricultural Census, reached its lowest price in any year before the recession (50 cents per bushel) in 1808. If settlers were unable to collect enough money from the crops they grew, they were most likely unable to pay off their debts in a timely manner, risking the possibility of having their land revert back to the government without being issued a patent.

Although Schroder’s (1980) research on the credit system in Ohio shows that reversions overall were rare, they were unusually common for land entered between 1805 and 1808. For these reasons --the exact timing of the decrease, the low price of wheat in the Ohio Valley, and the relative abundance of reversions for claims entered in 1808-- it is most likely that the dip in issued patents in Thorn and the entire study area occurred because of the recession, which did not seem to have an effect on other years before or after in northern Perry County.
Figure 3.12. Dates of patent issuance for Thorn Township. Figure by author.
One other slight difference in the data for issued patents between Thorn Township and the entire study area is the lack of a spike in this township in 1825 (Figure 3.12). As previously discussed, the increase in the number of patents issued in 1825 can be attributed to the Relief Act of 1825, which allowed settlers to relinquish part of their land to keep the portion they had already paid off under the federal credit system. In Thorn Township only four patents were issued from 1820 to 1841, with three of them issued before 1825 (the last was issued in 1841). The reason for the exceptional decrease in issued patents after 1820 can only be credited to the availability of quality agricultural land in Thorn, or rather the lack thereof. As Thorn Township, that is the civil township, consists of one full congressional township, it is composed of 36 sections and 144 quarter sections, if it is so divided. Within Thorn Township, composed entirely of township 18, range 17 of the first Ohio survey, 130 of the quarters were deeded to individual citizens through patents, either through quarter sections or other types of aliquots (whole sections, half sections, etc.). Fourteen of the quarters were not granted by the federal government: Eight from sections 15 and 16, both reserved for school lands, three from section 1, and one each from sections 5, 14, and 30. By 1820, 126 of the total 144 quarters had been patented by the federal government, leaving only 18 quarters remaining in Thorn Township. Therefore, with only 18 possible quarters available for sale (actually only 10 as the eight of sections 15 and 16 were still reserved), land was essentially a scarce commodity, and most of what was left was most likely very undesirable, leading to slow land sales during the 1820s in this township.

Like Thorn Township, the adjacent Hopewell Township, in north-central Perry County, had an average patent issuance date, 1813, earlier than the overall study area.
Likewise, Hopewell’s pattern of patent issuance (Figure 3.13) follows the trend set by the entire study area (Figure 3.11). In Hopewell Township, patents, 114 total, were issued from 1806 to 1834, a range of 28 years, and at a steady rate for 13 of those years, from 1806-1819. The peak year for issued patents was 1812, in line with Thorn and the overall study area. No major discrepancies were found in the analysis of the patent issuance dates for Hopewell Township, as the troughs and peaks align with previous conclusions. The one outlying patent, issued in 1834, for the southwest quarter of section 22, township 17, range 16 to a Jacob Hinebaugh can most likely be explained as a rare relic of the credit extension acts. This one patent, however, is not unusual as most of the townships studied have at least one patent that was extended beyond the normal range, as, for example, already explained above for Thorn Township. Taken overall, Hopewell Township rather exemplifies the trends found in the analysis of issuance dates for the entire study area.

The last township of the five to have an average date of issuance earlier than the overall average was Reading Township, physically the largest township, as well as its most populous. For this township, the average year patents were issued was 1814, only one year later than the average for the study area. When the 153 patent dates are plotted out (Figure 3.14), a trend similar to those already analyzed appears, with some variations. For Reading Township, the range of patent issue dates extends from 1801, the earliest in the study area overall, to 1834. The peak year for issuance was 1812, with 23 patents
Figure 3.13. Dates of patent issuance for Hopewell Township. Figure by author.
issued, in line with the county average for top issuing years. Between 1801 and 1804 no new patents were issued, as it is presumed that most settlers were entering the area at the time and making credit entries, taking several years to pay off the debt owed to the government. In 1805, two new patents were issued in Reading Township, most likely to settlers who entered claims two-to-three years prior. Beginning in 1806, patent issuances increased in number for three years: this follows the trend over the entire study area. However, in 1809, the number of patents issued began to decrease, from 11 in 1808 to seven in 1809 and finally down to five in 1810 (Figure 3.14). This decline in issuance does not follow the previously established trend, but may likely be attributed to the recession of the mid-1800s. Although this township seemed to be affected by economic circumstances, it rebounded strongly in 1811 as the spike in land patents seen in previously discussed trends appears as resiliently as ever. The dip in 1813 is also recorded in Reading Township, though it does not appear to be as drastic as seen in Thorn Township; the availability of land may have influenced this difference. Thorn, as mentioned before, showed an extremely tight clustering of issued land patents around 1809-1812, when more than half of the township’s land was claimed and paid for. By 1813, 75% of the total number of patents had already been granted in the township. Reading, a larger township in size than Thorn as it contains 12 more sections, shows a more temporally dispersed pattern of sales. As land was more plentiful in Reading, more people would have been able to settle in the township, even though a recession was affecting the ability of farmers to pay off their debts. This available land, as well, was most likely better in quality than the sections still available in Thorn, as the northern
Figure 3.14. Dates of patent issuance for Reading Township. Figure by author.
township was mostly picked over and claimed by this point in time. Reading, with its more plentiful and available land, would allow settlers to still produce, hopefully enough to pay their government debts, as by 1813 only 56.9% of the total number of patents had been granted, giving many of the settlers who came to the area during the recession a choice of where they wanted to build a farmstead. This choice would have created a cushion for the settlers, possibly softening the effects of the recession in Reading Township and forming the trend seen in the patent issuance dates of the township.

Reading Township also witnessed a larger number of patents issued after 1820, the end of the federal credit system, than the two previously discussed townships. Eight of the 13 patents issued after 1820 in Reading were credit volume patents, relics of the credit extension acts. One of these credit entries, issued to Edward McFadien (most likely McFadden) for the west half of the northwest quarter of section 36 in township 16, range 16, is quite possibly a result of the credit relief acts of the 1820s that allowed settlers to relinquish land to the government, but allowed them to keep what they had already paid for, as it was a credit entry resulting in a half-quarter section. The five other patents issued after 1820 were state volume patents, which indicates that they were entered after the end of the credit system and were paid for immediately with full cash payments. Although Reading Township shows an extended period of patent issuance and an overall more protracted trend, only 8.5% of the township’s patents were issued after 1820, a rather insignificant number. Of these, more than half were assisted by the credit relief and extension acts, though this percentage accounts for only 5.2% of the total number of patents in the township. When viewed holistically, the influence of the credit extensions were almost negligible, a view supported by Schroder’s (1980) research.
Overall, Reading Township’s issuance dates did not much differ from the study area’s trends, and are similar to the patterns seen in Thorn and Hopewell Townships.

The other two townships in the study area, Madison and Clayton, however, exhibit different trends than the three previous townships, and the study area overall, in terms of patent issuance dates. Madison Township, in the northeast corner of the county, has an average patent issuance date of 1815, consistent with the overall study area’s average. The range of dates for the 92 patents issued in the township began in 1805 and ended in 1842, the longest range of all five townships examined. When the dates are plotted out (Figure 3.15), deviances from the overall trend are immediately seen. For one, the peak issuance year was not found in 1811-1812 as shown before, but in 1817, about five years after the peak dates for the other townships. There is a spike in issued patents at the same time as seen in the other townships, with the year in which the second most number of patents were issued included (1811), but the second later spike is unique to this township. After having no patents issued in 1814, Madison Township saw a quick rise in issued patents from 1815 to 1817, after which the rate of issuance fell again to zero patents issued in 1820, as seen in the other townships discussed.

Another noticeable difference discovered in the Madison Township data is the later starting date of issued patents. One patent was issued in 1805 (to William Dusinberry, discussed in the previous section); no other patent was issued in Madison Township until 1809, when the first spike in patent issuance begins. If the maximum credit line of five years is assumed to have been utilized by settlers, then 1805 would
Figure 3.15. Dates of patent issuance for Madison Township. Figure by author.
mark the year that settlers began to enter claims in Madison Township, a later date than seen before. However, as Danhof (1969) and Schroder (1980) explain, many settlers only needed two or three years to pay off their government land debt, suggesting that major settlement in this township did not begin until possibly 1806 or 1807, much later than in Reading, Thorn, and Hopewell Townships. The disparity in dates of settlement may be explained by Madison Township’s location within Perry County and its topographical configuration. Madison’s position in the northeast corner of the study area was rather isolated in terms of early population centers. Reading and Thorn Townships both border Fairfield County to the west, and Hopewell Township lies to the east of Thorn Township, the western portion of this township located only six miles away from the Fairfield border. Madison Township, though, sits east of Hopewell: At its closest, the western edge of Madison is 12 miles from Fairfield County, being closer instead to Muskingum County and its population center of Zanesville.

Located in the eastern part of Fairfield County, Lancaster, was an important town platted and organized by Ebenezer Zane on his wagon road, Zane’s Trace. This road stretched from Wheeling, West Virginia, to Maysville (formerly Limestone), Kentucky, and as of 1797, the year in which the route was blazed and made fit for travel by Zane and his party, became “the only major overland route into Ohio away from the [Ohio River]” (Hurt 1996, p. 255). In 1800, Ebenezer Zane began selling plots in Lancaster to settlers, most of whom came from the area of Pennsylvania dominated by people of German ancestry. As these Pennsylvania-German settlers most likely moved together in large family units, so as to keep their cultural heritage and language intact, many settled in concentrated areas, such as in and around Lancaster. Since settlement in Lancaster
began in 1800, areas surrounding this town would have been settled simultaneously or quickly afterwards, probably by people of similar cultural traditions (though this will be discussed in following sections). Because western Reading Township and Thorn Township are directly adjacent to Fairfield County, it is not surprising that the earliest dates of patent issuance in the study area occurred here. In fact, the two earliest patents issued in the study area, those of George Arnold and Christian Binckley, are located on the extreme western edge of Reading Township, directly bordering Fairfield County (Figure 3.8); it is also known that Binckley, an established Pennsylvania-German immigrant, also bought land in Fairfield County, just east of Lancaster (Miller 2008). This evidence supports the notion that areas close to early population centers, such as Reading Township, would have an earlier average settlement date, with patent issue dates serving as a proxy, than areas more isolated.

Hopewell Township, though slightly more distant to Lancaster than Thorn Township and the western areas of Reading Township, also displays an earlier average date of issuance than the overall study area. A variety of factors in this county subdivision combine to create this trend. For one, it is within a relatively close distance to Lancaster and Fairfield County, only a six mile distance from the westernmost sections of the township. When the average date of issuance is calculated for each of the 36 sections that comprise the congressional and civil township of Hopewell (as they are one in the same), the eight earliest averages (Table 3.3) are found in the western third of the township (Figure 3.16), closest to the population center of Lancaster. Because of this pattern, it seems that proximity to previously settled areas definitely influenced the first settlers of Hopewell Township. Another reason that may explain why Hopewell has
earlier dates of issuance is the topography of the area and its relation to farmland suitability. By looking at a map of the elevations in the study area with Hopewell Township outlined (Figure 3.17), it can clearly be seen that a fluvial lowland extends throughout the north-central portion of the township: This is the valley formed by Jonathan Creek, one of the larger streams that runs through the study area. Because well-drained land is necessary for productive farming, settlers would have favored this land over other areas, farther away from drainage systems and usually at slightly higher elevations. When the average date of issuance is examined for the areas forming the largest section of the Jonathan Creek Valley (Figure 3.18), sections 5, 6, 8, 14, 15, 16, and 17, the average date of patent issuance is found to be 1811, two years earlier than the township average. When the fractional section 14 (it was divided into quarters instead of being sold whole) is removed from the average, the mean issuance date falls to 1808, five years earlier than the township average. One caveat to these averages is the fact that the sections reserved for schools, 15 and 16, are included: These sections have no sale date (at least from the government) as they were never issued to private citizens under federal land policy. The actual dates of sale for these sections are known, but, however, are not included in the average mentioned above as these sections were settled much later than the surrounding sections due to the government reservation. Despite the presence of the two reserved sections, it can clearly be shown that land in the Jonathan Creek Valley was sold much earlier than aliquots in higher, more poorly-drained ground in Hopewell Township, contributing to the early average date of issuance for the entire township.
Table 3.3

_Eight Average Earliest Sections Issued in Hopewell Township_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Average Year Issued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1809</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One final factor that could have contributed to the earlier settlement of Hopewell Township, as well as Reading, is its location on Zane’s Trace, the important transportation route servicing interior Ohio. Clement Martzolff (1902) writes that the exact location of the road through Perry County is controversial, even stating that there is “more uncertainty about the actual route, than in any same distance between Wheeling and Maysville” (p. 74). Although the exact route is in doubt (Figure 3.19 shows Martzolff’s (1904) estimate of its path), it is certain that Zane’s Trace passed through southeastern Hopewell Township as it trended southwest towards Somerset, in Reading Township. Though it may have passed through only the southeast corner, the position of the road through Hopewell would have allowed settlers traveling down the trace the opportunity to see available land along the way, possibly leading to these areas being settled earlier than areas more distant. Assuming Martzolff’s (1902) position of the trace is accurate, when the average issuance date for the four most southeastern sections (numbered 25, 26, 35, and 36) of Hopewell Township is calculated, however, the mean is shown to be 1813, the same as the overall township average issued date. According to
this measurement, it does not seem that proximity to Zane’s Trace had a significant influence on the time of settlement. The Trace would have definitely had an impact on the pattern of settlement, as people would have traveled up and down the route to get to land that they wanted to claim, like the optimal Jonathan Creek Valley previously mentioned. It seems, though, that the land the Trace itself was built on was not entirely suitable for farming; Martzolff (1902) writes that “the trace followed the high ridges mostly and in many places went down precipitous bluffs” (p.76). These high ridges, most likely poorly-drained, and bluffs the road traveled over would not have been ideal sites for situating a farmstead, and would have likely been passed over for more suitable land elsewhere. When compared with the topography of the township and proximity to early centers of population, the proximity to Zane’s Trace does not seem to have had a larger impact than the two previous factors described.
Figure 3.16. Location of eight earliest townships by average issuance date for Hopewell Township. Map by author.

Figure 3.17. Topographic relief in Hopewell Township. Map by author.
This trend is seen in Madison Township as well, where Zane’s Trace passed through more extensively than in neighboring Hopewell Township (Figure 3.19). According to Martzolff (1904), the trace entered Perry County in section 22 of Madison Township; the average date of issuance for this section was found to be 1816, one year later than both the township average and the overall study area average, supporting the conclusion that physical position astride Zane’s Trace did not correlate with earliest settlement. However, when the eight southern sections (numbered 27-34) of Madison Township are considered, the average issuance date decreases to 1813. This suggests that proximity to the trace was favorable, as would be expected due to the ease of access to markets and towns. As mentioned before, the actual location of Zane’s Trace was deliberately blazed into high ridges along the route, which are generally less suitable for farming than lower elevations. It therefore stands to reason that the sections close to the trace, but not physically overlapping it, would show earlier settlement than those farther away. For comparison and to show supporting evidence for this theory, the next row of sections north of the southern eight sections (numbered 19, 20, 21, and 22) in Madison Township had an average date of issuance of 1818, three years later than the township average and five years later than the southern eight sections. However, the outlier of the 1842 patent lies within this row; when removed, the average for sections 19-22 decreases to 1817, still significantly later than the study area, township, and southern section averages mentioned before.
What contributed to the later date of issuance in areas of Madison Township away from Zane’s Trace then? Isolation from early population centers does not seem to answer the question, as central Madison Township (near the unincorporated town of Mount Perry) lies less than 20 miles southwest of Zanesville. Like Lancaster, Zanesville was organized and platted by members of Ebenezer Zane’s party, and sales of town plots began about the same time as those in Lancaster. In fact, by 1812 Zanesville’s population was almost three times as large as Lancaster’s, making the northeastern town a larger population center during the same time period (Hurt 1996). In comparison to the southern two rows of sections comprising Madison Township, the average date of issuance for the northern two rows of sections (sections 3-10) in the same township is 1816, three years later than the southern sections. Even though these northern sections
are geographically closer to Zanesville, patents here were, on average, issued later than
those farthest away from the city, meaning that for Madison Township, some other factor
influenced the settlement dates.

Figure 3.19. Route of Zane’s Trace through interior Ohio (Martzolf 1905).

The most fitting answer to the above question seems to be, as hinted at earlier, the
topographical vagaries of the township. As can be seen in Figure 3.20 showing the
topography of Madison Township, several ridges (in brown) are present in the township
with lower-lying lands (yellow) in between. The path of a creek, the headwaters of
Jonathan Creek that runs westward into Hopewell Township, can also be seen in green,
but this “valley” is not as deep or flat as it is farther downstream, as can be seen in Figure
3.18. Between the ridges and the creek path, significant topographical variation occurs within Madison Township, more so than other parts of the study area (though the elevation differences between the green and brown lands in Figure 3.20 may only be as low 50 meters, or 164 feet). Sloping land does not hold water, necessary for productive crops, as well as flatter land and soil erosion can become a real issue as water runs downhill, creating gullies and rills that harm crops and remove fertile soil from the farmstead. For those reasons, flatter, or at least less sloping land, is deemed more suitable for farming and more likely to be entered and purchased first.

*Figure 3.20. Topographic relief in Madison Township. Map by author.*
Evidence for this trend can be shown using Thorn Township as an example, counter to Madison Township and its ridges. Thorn Township, as already established, had the earliest average date of patent issuance for any township within the study area. It, however, lies nowhere on Zane’s Trace, which runs to its southeast through Reading Township. Thorn does sit in close proximity to Fairfield County and its seat of Lancaster, though Reading Township is closer. With Reading Township closer in distance to both Zane’s Trace and the population center of Lancaster, why was the land in Thorn Township purchased, on average, two years earlier than Reading (and three years earlier than Madison Township)? Topography appears to answer this question. Figure 3.21 shows the topography of Thorn Township, which is mainly comprised of a gradual northward downhill slope. When compared to Madison Township (Figure 3.20) and Reading Township (Figure 3.22), the ground in Thorn is relatively flatter as no ridges appear in this township. The topography is certainly sloping, as the elevation changes from the plateau (in white and pink) in the south-central portion of the township to the shores of Buckeye Lake in the north (green), but there are no steep slopes or ravines as found in both Madison and Reading Townships. This continuity of the land would have been heavily favored by settlers looking to build a farmstead in the wilderness as they would not have to contend with clearing trees from ravines and steep slopes. Therefore, as the average dates of patent issuance show in Table 3.2, the flatter land of Thorn Township was favored over more broken and rugged land available in Madison Township and the eastern edge of Reading Township. Once the more suitable land was claimed and purchased in the early stages of Perry County’s settlement, more marginal land, such as that located in Madison Township, would still be available for purchase at
later dates (i.e. 1815 and later). However, the quality of the more marginal land is not to be discredited entirely, as Graham (1883) writes that in Madison Township “the land is all arable…and is very fertile” (p. 208). The above conclusions explain the disparity in the average date that patents were issued for the townships mentioned, and would account for the later spike in issued patents seen in Madison Township between 1815 and 1818 (Figure 3.15).

Figure 3.21. Topographic relief in Thorn Township. Map by author.
One final aspect of note in the data concerning Madison Township’s issue dates for patents is the relatively high number of patents issued in 1825. Six patents were issued in this year, the second highest amount issued in this year for any of the townships. Four of these six patents are issued for half-quarter sections, the only four purchased in Madison Township. As mentioned for previous townships, the most likely explanation for this spike in 1825-issued patents is the Relief Act of 1825, which allowed the relinquishment of debt and land to the government in return for the purchase of the proportion of land already paid for. Schroder (1980) states that half-quarter sections were the most relinquished portions; the data from Madison Township supports his assertion. Only two other land patents were issued after the 1825 spike, in 1827 and 1842, relics of the credit system as both were issued as credit volume patents. Overall however, land
sales in Madison Township were mostly clustered in a 10 year period running from 1809-1819, a period skewed slightly later than the other townships of the study area.

The last township examined, Clayton Township, is located in the southeast corner of the study area, away from the path of Zane’s Trace and distant from the population centers of Lancaster and Zanesville. The average date of patent issuance for this township was 1819, later than the study area’s average and the next closest township average by five years. By graphing the dates of issuance for Clayton Township (Figure 3.23), the reasoning for this late average can be deduced. The first of the 130 patents granted in Clayton Township was issued on October 5, 1808 to a John Forsyth for the northwest quarter of section 17, township 16, range 15, and the issuance period lasted until 1831, a period of 23 years, the shortest range found in the study area. The peak year for issuance was 1812, when 16 patents were granted, a date consistent with the peak dates of the other townships. However, unlike the other townships, there was no gradual buildup to the peak issuance year, like shown in the date graph for Hopewell (Figure 3.13) and Thorn (Figure 3.12). In 1811 for Clayton Township, only three patents were issued, following three straight years (1808-1810) where only two patents were given; the 16 patents issued in 1812 constitute a huge spike that comes from nowhere in the previous years’ data. Like the other townships though, 1813 was a lean year for patents: Only six were issued, representing the insecurity born from the War of 1812 and the possible effects of the recession four to five years earlier. However, it is after this point
Figure 3.23. Dates of patent issuance for Clayton Township. Figure by author.
in time that Clayton Township deviates so wildly from the other townships’ patent issuance data.

After another low issuance year in 1814 (only three were granted), the number of patents rises again in 1815, reaching a second peak in 1819, when 14 patents were issued. This is unusual, as the year 1819 was a scarce year for patents in every other township in the study (Reading was second for patents issued in 1819 with eight), though the rise seen after 1814 was mirrored in Madison Township (Figure 3.15) as well, except that in Madison the late increase was met with an equally rapid decrease after 1817; no other township than Clayton saw a rise in patents moving towards 1819. Patents issued in Clayton then decreased in 1820 to five, after which no land patents were granted in the township during the years of 1821 and 1822. In 1823, an unexpected trend appears in the township data: Another rise in patents issued is seen from 1823-1828, including a peak year of 14 patents in 1825, tied for the second most patents issued during one year in Clayton Township. This third rise in patent issuance for the township is very unique to Clayton as no other township in the study area had a significant number of patents issued (33%, one-third of the township’s total) after the end of the credit system in 1820. The increased number of patents issued in 1825 is also present, as it is in Madison and Hopewell Townships.

It is possible to explain the patterns described above in Clayton Township using the same conclusions as drawn for the other four townships. First settlement of the township began, according to Graham’s (1883) history, around 1806-1807, much later than the other townships, which already had patents issued at this point in time. Although patents were issued in Clayton beginning in 1808, a major push in land sales
did not happen until 1812; however, this spike was seen in all townships. It is the increase and peak of sales after 1812 that can be used to describe differences between Clayton’s settlement and the settlement of the remainder of the study area. As established using the average dates of issuance for each township, three of the townships had been heavily settled before the midpoint of decade of the 1810s and Madison Township was mostly sold off by the middle of the same decade. All four townships showed drastically reduced sales by 1819 and almost no sales in the decades afterwards. Therefore, it can be argued that Clayton Township was passed over in favor of areas north and westward, areas such as Thorn and Reading Townships. Once the most favorable lands in these townships were claimed and purchased, settlers migrating to Perry County had to look elsewhere, where migrants had not settled: Clayton Township.

But why was the land of Clayton Township passed over for Thorn, Hopewell, and Reading Townships? For one, most of the township lies well away from Zane’s Trace, the main point of ingress for settlers streaming to the farmland of interior Ohio. Only the northern row of sections in Clayton, sections 1-6, could be considered to be in close proximity to the trace, as the route passed through Madison, Hopewell, and Reading Townships, never entering Clayton. The six northern sections do have an earlier average date of issuance than the rest of the township, calculated to be 1815, showing the influence that Zane’s Trace may have had on the location of settlement in this township. However, this date is still later than much of the study area to the north and west, the seemingly more favorable territory in the county. Clayton Township’s location is also isolated from early population centers, like Lancaster and Zanesville, with Rehoboth, an unincorporated town within the township, being over 20 miles from each of these cities.
Therefore, the relative isolation of this township compared to the other four townships would have made this land less favorable as transportation costs and shipping times would be increased for the township’s farmers sending their produce to markets.

Another reason for the early avoidance of Clayton Township by frontier settlers could have been the topography of the land, as was demonstrated for Madison and Thorn Townships. The map showing the topography of Clayton Township, Figure 3.24, clearly shows the multitude of ridges (pinks and browns) and valleys (yellow) that dissect the land of this area. Such sharply sloping land, described by Graham (1883, p.178) as “some of it [is] extremely rough” (p. 178), would not have been ideal for raising crops or even livestock since certain ravines are rather rugged. Flatter land, characteristic of the townships to the north and west, would likely have been searched for and claimed instead of rougher terrain in Clayton Township. Once this flatter land had been purchased from the government and made productive, settlers coming west in later years would find the most favorable land already taken, leaving the marginal land in regions of Madison and Clayton Townships as the next best thing. Because these lands, even though comparatively rough and rugged, are still relatively close to Zane’s Trace and the National Road to the north, they would have been claimed before lands in more isolated counties, like Hocking and Vinton counties to the southwest. The work of Stephens and Bobersky (1990a) supports this hypothesis; in their study area encompassing the district administered by the Steubenville land office the authors discovered that more rugged areas were bypassed for more level areas. Once the best land was bought, the areas of rougher terrain were infilled afterwards in a period running from 1810-1820. The authors also claim that land sales in their study area in the earliest period of settlement, from
1800-1803, were most influenced by proximity to previously settled areas and transportation routes, in this case streams that drained into the Ohio River (Stephens and Bobersky 1990a). These conclusions are supported by the research conducted in the study area of northern Perry County as well. Several of the townships under analysis showed that proximity to Zane’s Trace led to earlier average dates of patent issuance than for areas more isolated from transportation routes. Taken overall, the data from the land patents suggest that proximity to routes of transportation, distance to early population centers, and topography all influenced the date of patent issuance, and therefore the date of settlement.

*Figure 3.24.* Topographic relief in Clayton Township. Map by author.
When the settlement of the townships in the study area is viewed holistically, the trends described above can be shown to have taken place within four stages. The first, an “initial settlement” phase, lasted from 1801-1805 and was characterized by minimal sales and patent issuances. These purchases, shown in Figure 3.25, were most likely influenced by proximity to routes of ingress (i.e., Zane’s Trace) and the early population center of Lancaster. The second phase, “the Perry land boom” began in 1806 and lasted until 1812, the peak year of sales in the study area. Land sales were plentiful during this seven-year period, when over 45.5% of the patents issued in the study area were granted alone. The sections issued in this span are illustrated in Figure 3.26, and were most also likely influenced by proximity to transportation routes and early population centers, proximity to family members or other neighbors at this point in time, and level topography. No significant pattern is apparent on the map of land sales during this era, though a general trend towards the more favorable grounds in the northern and western sections of the study area can be seen.
Figure 3.25. Patents issued in “Initial Settlement” phase, 1801-1805. Map by author.

Figure 3.26. Patents issued in “Perry Land Boom” phase, 1806-1812. Map by author.
The third phase of settlement, from 1813-1819, can be aptly named “the gradual decline,” as patents were issued at a steady rate during this time, though in generally fewer numbers than seen during the “Perry land boom” stage. This seven-year period saw patents issued in areas that had been passed over by the earlier settlers, and sales were most likely influenced by the availability of unclaimed sections, proximity to transportation routes, and the burgeoning towns of the study area, and topography, as the roughest areas continued to be avoided. These trends can be seen in the map of issued patents during this era, Figure 3.27. The final stage of settlement in Perry County lasted from 1820 to 1842, when the last patent was issued by the federal government within the study area. This ultimate stage, “infilling,” was characterized by stagnant land sales in the earliest settled parts of the study area, but also an increase in patents issued for areas passed over in the previous stages of settlement. The availability of land, determined by settlement patterns in the first three stages of settlement, largely influenced the location of sales during this period. During this “infilling” phase, sales were concentrated in southeastern Clayton Township (seen in Figure 3.28), on some of the most rugged terrain found in the study area. Other sections are placed into this period as they are relics of the credit system and must have been extended several times under the relief acts of the 1810s and ‘20s. This model describing the timing and locations of the issuance of patents, and therefore settlement, dovetails well with Stephens and Bobersky’s (1990a) findings, and can likely be applicable to other areas of frontier Ohio, especially those regions featuring a mix of terrain, like the counties surrounding Perry. However, the dates may not match exactly as Perry County was settled and founded earlier than others due to its location on Zane’s Trace and near the early population
centers of Lancaster and Zanesville. With an understanding of the timing of settlement through the dates of issuance listed on the land patents, other aspects of land sales in Perry County can be analyzed for further settlement patterns.

Figure 3.27. Patents issued in “Gradual Decline” stage, 1813-1819. Map by author.
Another set of data that is able to be compiled from land patent searches is the type of aliquot purchased from the government by the migrating settlers. The minimum available aliquot, the section or fractional section purchased, changed throughout the period northern Perry County was settled, decreasing from an entire section in 1800 to a half-quarter in 1820. This shrinking trend, controlled by federal land policy, can be seen in the data gleaned from the patent search of the study area, as well as other trends in the type of aliquot purchased.

As listed in Table 3.4, 501 of the 593 total patents issued within the study area, an overwhelming 84.5%, were issued for quarter sections, consisting of 160 acres. The next highest aliquot type, the half section, was purchased by only 43 settlers, or 7.25% of the issued patents. Half-quarter sections were only issued to the purchasers of 34 patents,
5.7% of the total. The last type of aliquot offered for sale in the study area, the whole 640 acre section, was purchased for only 15 patents, 2.5% of the study area patents. These data show a clear trend skewed towards the purchase of the quarter section, the most popular aliquot issued in northern Perry County.

Table 3.4

*Types of Aliquots Present in Overall Study Area*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aliquot Type</th>
<th>Number of Patents Issued</th>
<th>% by Aliquot Type</th>
<th>Average Year Issued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Half-Quarter</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>1827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarter</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>84.49</td>
<td>1814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>1810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1808</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4 also details the average date of issuance for each type of aliquot granted in the overall study area. Whole sections had the earliest average issuance date, 1808, well before the entire study area’s average date of issuance of 1815. The 34 half sections issued also had an earlier average date than the entire study area, 1810. The aliquot comprising the majority of issued patents, the quarter section, had a calculated average date of issuance of 1814, only one year earlier than the study area average. The close proximity of the quarter section’s average issuance date to the study area average is to be expected though, as more than three quarters of the patents issued were for the 160-acre quarters. The final aliquot, the 80-acre half-quarter section, had an average patent issue date of 1827, 12 years later than the study area average, a significant amount of time in comparison to the other three aliquot average patent issuance dates. Overall, a close
correlation developed between aliquot size and date of issuance within the study area:
The smaller the acreage of an aliquot, the later that aliquot would be purchased.

Similar patterns are seen when the townships’ patents are examined individually, listed in Table 3.5. Thorn and Hopewell Townships, the townships with the earliest average issuance dates (Table 3.2), both solidly show this trend, as both townships do not contain any half-quarter sections. Thorn Township, out of 104 total patents, had 80 quarter sections (76.9%), 23 half sections (22.1%), and one whole section (1%) granted during the public sale era. Hopewell Township’s data are fairly comparable to Thorn’s, with some variations of course. This second township saw, out of 114 total patents, 105 quarter sections (92.1%), four half sections (3.5%), and five whole sections (4.4%) purchased while its land was available for sale. Both townships had an overwhelming majority of quarter sections entered; however, sales in Hopewell Township recorded more than 15% more quarter sections than Thorn Township, the first noticeable difference between the two townships. The proportion of quarter sections sold in Hopewell (92.1%) also happens to be one the largest percentage of this type of aliquot sold in any of the townships, with only Madison Township besting it with 93.5%. Thorn Township, on the other hand, contains more half sections than Hopewell (almost 19% more), and in fact has more half sections than any other township within the study area. A discrepancy between the numbers of whole sections issued is also present, with Hopewell containing four more section aliquots than Thorn, which only saw one whole section purchased during public land sales.
### Table 3.5

**Types of Aliquots Present in Each Township**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Aliquot Type</th>
<th>Number of Patents Issued</th>
<th>% by Aliquot Type</th>
<th>Average Year Issued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thorn</td>
<td>Half-Quarter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorn</td>
<td>Quarter</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>76.92</td>
<td>1812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorn</td>
<td>Half</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22.12</td>
<td>1810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorn</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopewell</td>
<td>Half-Quarter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopewell</td>
<td>Quarter</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>92.11</td>
<td>1814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopewell</td>
<td>Half</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopewell</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>1808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Half-Quarter</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Quarter</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>82.35</td>
<td>1814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Half</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>1808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>1806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Half-Quarter</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Quarter</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>93.48</td>
<td>1815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Half</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>Half-Quarter</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.46</td>
<td>1826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>Quarter</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>1817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>Half</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1819</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The timing of settlement and purchase in these townships may be used to explain the difference in the type of acreage bought by frontier settlers. As shown in the previous section, Thorn Township had an earlier average date of issuance than Hopewell Township by one year. Simultaneously, Thorn’s issuance dates (Figure 3.12) were much more clustered around the peak year, 1811, than Hopewell’s patents (Figure 3.13), whose dates were more spread out during the “land boom” and “gradual decline” phases of northern Perry County’s settlement. Because of the relative early settlement of Thorn...
Township, the claims entered in this township may have been affected by federal land policy at the time of entry. For example, claims registered at the Chillicothe land office before 1804, the time of the passage of the Indiana Act that enabled the purchase of a 160-acre quarter section, would have been restricted by the minimum available acreage, the 320-acre half section. Of the 23 half sections issued in Thorn Township, 11 (48%) have an issuance date that lies within the five-year credit window offered to claims entered before the implementation of the lowered minimum acreage. The large number of half sections seen in Thorn Township, the highest amount of half sections seen in the study area by far (Table 3.5), could have resulted from the fact that this was one of the earliest settled regions of the county, limiting the acreage available for sale to either 320 or 640, if the land was entered before mid-1804. As 320 acres would be immensely cheaper than purchasing a whole 640-acre section, the half section became the aliquot of choice during the early settlement of Thorn Township.

However, 12 of Thorn’s half sections (52%) were issued after the original five-year credit period offered by the federal government. In fact, the average date of issuance, when all 23 half sections are factored together, was 1810, one year after the credit period would be completed. The latest date of issuance for a half section patent in Thorn Township was 1818, a date almost at the end of all land sales in this township and after most of the quarter sections issued in Thorn were purchased. Because of this later average date of issuance than would be expected if the only controlling factor was the federal policy the land was purchased under, and as Schroder (1980) states that most credit entries were paid off after only three to four years after registration (meaning that the 12 half sections issued after the five-year credit period were most likely not relics of
the credit extension acts), another factor must have influenced the amount of land purchased in Thorn Township.

When the topography of the township is compared with the location of half sections, a slight trend is noticed (Figure 3.29). The half sections, shown in blue, seem to avoid the high plateau in the south-central portion of Thorn Township, as all but one (the east half of section 29, issued in 1814) are concentrated around the edges of the township. Twelve of the half sections, approximately 50% of these aliquots, lie in the northern 2 rows of sections in Thorn, a high concentration as the other 11 half sections were issued in the remaining southern four rows of the township. The main difference between the northern two rows of sections and the other four in Thorn Township is the large amount of low-lying land in the northern end of the township (shown in green). Presently, the northern end of the township lies on the banks of Buckeye Lake, a reservoir created from what used to be described as “a great swamp,” consisting of a series of small lakes during the time of Perry’s settlement (Graham 1883, p. 14). Being in such proximity to a source of water, as several creeks drain this area as they flow into Buckeye Lake, this northern land would appear very appealing to settlers looking to start a farmstead in the frontier wilderness.
The land in this region is also relatively flat (Figure 3.29), in comparison to other parts of the study area like southeastern Clayton Township (Figure 3.24); in fact, Graham (1883) writes that “the level land in the northern part of the township is also extremely fertile” (p. 307). Although the author may be romanticizing the point a little bit, the northern end of Thorn Township is the flattest region of the study area, and because of this, some of the most appealing land. A photograph, Figure 3.30, taken during field work in the present location of the patent issued for the north half of section 8 in Thorn Township demonstrates the relative flatness of this region. Farmers would have wanted to take advantage of the richness of the land, especially by owning as much of it as they could; this thinking could have led to the purchasing of the larger aliquots in later years,
instead of the available minimum after 1804, the 160-acre quarter section. The presence of the unusual north/south half section, divided by an east-to-west running line, also lends support for this above hypothesis. Of seven north half sections issued in the study area, five (71%) are in the northern two rows of sections in Thorn Township, a disproportionate amount not seen elsewhere. As this land lies against the banks of “the great swamp” and its lakes, the settlers would want to take advantage of the fertility of the riparian habitats provided by the shorelines; the most efficient way to do so would be to purchase a north/south half section abutting the shorelines, as seen in Figure 3.29.

Figure 3.30. Present location of the north half of section 8, township 18, range 17, in Thorn Township. Photograph by author.
The persistence of the large size of land holdings is another piece of supporting evidence for the conclusion that half sections are predominant in this area because settlers wanted to take advantage of the land as much as they could. From a map surveyed and drawn by H.F. Walling (1859), the size of property holdings in Thorn Township can be extracted. In 1859, the sections in the northern 2 rows of Thorn Township that were sold by the federal government through the issuance of half sections (numbered 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, and pictured in Figure 3.29) had an average acreage of 120.4. The township overall had an average acreage of 106.7, while the sections of Thorn Township in the southern 4 rows of sections had an average land holding size of 103.6 acres in 1859. The farmsteads in northern Thorn Township had larger acreages on average than the township overall and the southern two-thirds of Thorn’s sections, evidencing that farms were potentially more productive in this region, as settlers were not forced to sell off as much of their acreage as others in Thorn Township had to. Settlers of northern Thorn Township were apparently able to keep much of their land in production, most likely due to the situation of the land in reference to topography and riparian areas, allowing them to raise more profits than other farmers in the same township and giving the farmers the ability to pay the increased taxes and operating costs of owning a larger farmstead. Therefore, because of the continued persistence of larger land holdings into the era after the Early Republic and the location of the land itself in regards to the progenitors of Buckeye Lake, the disproportionate rate of half sections entered in Thorn Township appears to be a significant pattern noticed in the aliquot data taken from federal land patents.
In contrast to the patterns seen in Thorn Township, Hopewell Township, directly to the east, is mostly dominated by the issuance of quarter sections, with 92.1% of patents in the township being over the 160-acre variety. Half sections and whole sections are also present in the township, but not at the same quantities seen in Thorn (Table 3.5). During public land sales, Hopewell Township had five of its sections, 4.4%, bought whole outright (sections 5, 6, 8, 17, and 31), a high proportion not seen elsewhere except Reading Township, which has 12 more sections than Hopewell. Both Thorn and Clayton Townships only had one section bought whole, while Madison had zero patents issued for entire sections (Table 3.5). Like the argument for the high number of half sections in Thorn Township, the same logic can be applied for the higher number of whole sections in Hopewell Township. Figure 3.31 shows the position of the sections bought whole in Hopewell Township. All five whole sections are located in the western portion one-third of the township, the closest region of the township to early centers of population in frontier Ohio (Lancaster). As well, four of the five sections are located in the lowest lying area of the township, the Jonathan Creek Valley (previously discussed, see Figure 3.18). Like the half sections of Thorn Township, most of the whole sections are clustered on the low lying ground (shown in green in Figure 3.31) of Jonathan’s Creek, especially the wider portions of the valley that show less changes in relief. Adding to these factors, the average date of issuance for the whole sections of Hopewell Township was calculated to be 1808 one of the earliest dates of issuance for aliquots in the study area (Table 3.5).
Combining the factors of proximity, topography, and date of issuance, a hypothesis can be developed to explain the concentration of whole sections in Hopewell Township. Settlers migrated to this area of Ohio, attracted by the early population centers of the region, including Lancaster in adjacent Fairfield County. Looking for land close to this bustling frontier town, settlers moved through Thorn, Hopewell, and Reading Townships searching for good-lying land to build their farmsteads upon. In Hopewell Township, the Jonathan Creek Valley, with its flat, low, well-drained land, would appear as some of the most appealing land around, prompting the quick claiming and settlement of the land within its boundaries. The four whole sections entered in this area had issuance dates of 1806, 1808, 1808, and 1809, all with the beginning of their
five-year credit lines before the passage of the Indiana Act. If these patents were entered before the 1804 passage of the act, then the only two aliquots available for purchase would have been the whole section and the half section. Like the north/south half sections in Thorn Township, the most efficient method to utilize the land for farming in this region of Hopewell would have been the whole section, as the purchase would then contain all the fertile riparian land the settler needed. An entire section would not be out of the question financially for a frontier settler as well. Given the entire five year credit period, it is very possible that a settler could turn the land productive enough to pay off his federal debt within this time according to Danhof (1969) and Schroder (1980). The sale of land back east would facilitate this transaction even more by providing the settler with financial capital before the sale of his crops began. Therefore, the half sections of Thorn and the whole sections of Hopewell represent the resourcefulness of the frontier settler, as they show how they utilized federal land policy and the land itself to develop their farmsteads out of the Ohio wilderness. The exceptions to this process would be sections 15 and 16 of Hopewell Township, both of which were reserved for school lands by the federal/state government, and which will be discussed in detail later.

This same trend can be seen in the whole sections entered and issued in Reading Township (Figure 3.32), to the south of Thorn and Hopewell. In this township, eight patents were issued for whole sections, out of a total 153, making 5.2% of Reading’s patents 640-acre sections, the highest percentage seen in the study area. All of the sections issued in Reading Township are clustered in the western portion of the subdivision, especially the extreme western column of sections, with five of the six sections being purchased in their entirety; the other three whole sections issued are in the
next column of sections over, as seen in Figure 3.32. The average date of issuance for the eight Reading sections was 1806, the earliest average date of issuance calculated for any aliquot in the five study townships. Two of the whole sections in Reading Township also represent the two oldest patents granted in the study area, in 1801 to George Arnold and Christian Binckley (Figure 3.8). Like in Hopewell Township, the whole sections were issued in a low-lying level region, shown in yellow and orange in Figure 3.32. This land would appear appealing to early settlers, prompting the early purchase of these aliquots.

Figure 3.32. Map of the locations of whole sections issued in Reading Township in comparison with the topography of the township. Map by author.

Another factor to consider in the trend of whole sections in this area of Reading Township is the fact that this region is the closest of any part of Perry County to the town of Lancaster, most likely attracting many settlers to this area and its surroundings.
Support for the influence of this factor in the timing of settlement, and thus aliquot selection, comes from the ancestry of the settlers who purchased the patents for the whole sections in this area. Christian Binckley, of section 2 fame, has already been established as the son of German immigrants who lived in southeastern Pennsylvania. A Philip Senft purchased section 26 (township 17, range 17) in 1806; he is also to be known of German descent, particularly Alsatian (Geni.com 2014). Others who bought sections, such as Henry Hootle of section 14 and Adam Ansbaugh/Onsbaugh of sections 1 and 12, are thought to be of German ancestry as well, primarily on the basis of the etymology of their last names. Lancaster was settled by Pennsylvania-German settlers migrating westward from southeastern Pennsylvania. Therefore, the preponderance of German descendants who purchased patents in Perry County near the vicinity of Lancaster is not surprising. As Pennsylvania-Dutch migrants usually traveled in large family groups, the fact that they closely followed their kinsman in the timing of their settlement (as Lancaster was settled in 1800) is not surprising. The purchase of Hootle’s section was completed in 1807; Ansbaugh/Onsbaugh’s sections were completed in 1805 and 1806 respectively; Senft’s section was issued in 1806. These all constitute some of the earliest purchases in the township and study area overall. Because these settlers followed families in packs, they would have arrived early in the 1800s, most likely before 1804, when the only available aliquots were the whole section and the half section. The choice of a whole section instead of a half section was possibly a consequence of the settler’s attempt to maximize the production they could extract from the land: by purchasing a large amount of land, the farmer could have choice and plenty of space to efficiently build his farmstead and plant crops.
Another possibility is that these early pioneers bought so much land so that they could sell or will it to family members as they moved westward. This practice is seen especially in the transactions of Christian Binckley: In the 1820s, Christian sold several large parcels of the whole sections he owned in Reading Township (sections 2 and 11, the latter which he bought from George Arnold) to his sons Henry, Adam, and George Binckley (Miller 2008). This practice guaranteed the availability of land in an area where land soon became scarce, especially after 1815, when most of the productive farmland in northern Perry County had been claimed. It also kept the family unit close together for a culture that valued the traditions of their society. With the motivation of either reason, the purchase of a whole section by the Pennsylvania-German settlers was greatly facilitated by the sale of their lands back east, as land prices in southeastern Pennsylvania increased over the 18th century, especially towards the end, when in 1790 an acre was worth anywhere from three to 10 pounds (Lemon 2002). With the financial capital the sale of improved Pennsylvania farmland provided, the purchase of a 640-acre section was not out of the question for these migrants moving to the Ohio frontier. As seen in Thorn and Hopewell Townships, aliquot selection in Reading was influenced by a variety of factors, including the topography of the land, proximity to existing settlements, and the availability of land and financial capital.

Though half sections were purchased in the two townships not discussed so far, Madison and Clayton (two and one respectively), whole sections were found in only one of these two townships, Clayton, where only one 640-acre section was purchased. The timing and circumstances of the whole section patent in Clayton Township are unusual from the patterns seen in the previous townships. The whole section bought in Clayton,
section 35 (shown in Figure 3.33), was issued in 1819, the last year possible for registering new credit entries, to Robert Law and Thomas McKeever as “tenants in common, and not as joint tenants.” This was the only whole section in the entire study area to be issued to more than one person. Clayton’s whole section is also the latest entire section issued, by seven years (section 23 of Reading was issued in 1812). The lateness of the patent issuance, plus the fact that two people were involved with the purchase of the section, make section 35 an outlier in the data regarding whole sections. When topography is considered as well, as it is in Figure 3.33, differences from the expected trend appear as well. Clayton’s section 35 is located on a rather uneven piece of land, which slopes downward from the north of the section, in white and brown, to creek valleys in the south, in yellow. Most of the other whole sections purchased within the study area were issued for land relatively much more level than this section (see Figure 3.32 for Reading Township and Figure 3.31 for Hopewell Township). The exact reasons for such a departure from the pattern followed by previous whole sections remains unclear, though the fact that the patent was issued to two people may provide some motivation for the purchase. Though it will be discussed more completely in a later section, the phrase “as tenants in common, and not as joint tenants,” written on the patent granted to Law and McKeever, must be defined for purposes of an explanation for the appearance of section 35.
From what can be established, the phrase “as tenants in common, and not as joint tenants” means that the two or more people the patent is issued to will live on the land, but not have joint ownership of the land together. In other words, each owner may own a different proportion of the land than the other, possibly having one owner with a much larger parcel than the other. This is what is thought to have occurred with Robert Law and Thomas McKeever in section 35 of Clayton Township. The advantage of buying a section of land under these terms was that two people would be able to pool their money together to buy a much larger piece of land than the two would have been able to if they entered land by themselves. By working together, the two could maximize the amount of land they owned and choose a location that they saw fit for commercial agricultural
production. It is not known who received the larger share of the section between Law and McKeever, though it seems typical that the first person named on the patent (in this case Robert Law) would be the main financier in the transaction, and thus receiving a larger proportion of the section. This conclusion is also supported by the 1828 tax duplicate for Perry County. In 1828, section 35 had been divided into four parts: The southeast quarter, owned by Thomas Law, the southwest quarter, owned by Robert Law, the northwest quarter, owned by John Law, and the northeast quarter, owned by Thomas McKeever. As three of the quarters of the section were owned by relatives of the original buyer Robert Law, it certainly appears that Robert received three-quarters of the whole section upon purchase, after which he either sold or gifted two quarters to relatives (most likely brothers), and Thomas McKeever received the last quarter, which he kept undivided for himself for at least nine years after purchase. From these data, it appears that McKeever teamed up with Robert Law to purchase a piece of land that he would have been otherwise unable to purchase, possibly because of the price of the land or the availability of remaining land in northern Perry County.

Why section 35 of Clayton Township though? This question can most likely be answered by the date of issuance. The patent for section 35 was issued on June 3rd, 1819, a time towards the end of northern Perry County’s settlement, but at the peak of Clayton’s. Most likely, the two men entered the land between 1814 and 1819 (between the five-year credit window allowed by federal law), after much of the western portion of the study area had already been claimed and purchased. Not many whole sections would have been left for choosing, with Clayton Township being the last of the townships in the study area to be settled, on average. If Law and McKeever were then looking for only a
whole section, their choice would have been limited by the availability of 640 acres of land, most likely hard to come by. Section 35, maybe being one of the last whole sections left unclaimed due to its topographical profile (Figure 3.33), could have been the only choice for the settlers looking for a large piece of land in northern Perry County, relatively close to Zane’s Trace and the population centers of Lancaster and Zanesville. Another motivation for choosing this section could have been that it was suited for the type of agriculture that the two men wanted to practice, though this hypothesis is uncertain as the data necessary for corroboration is unavailable. Whatever the influence, Law and McKeever chose to purchase a whole section in a contrasting style from the other 14 whole sections purchased in the study area.

A more popular deviation from the quarter section than the half or whole section in Madison and Clayton Townships seems to have been the half-quarter section, consisting of only 80 acres. Of the 34 issued half-quarter sections in the entire study area, four were in Madison Township (4.35% of that township’s total) while 24 were located in Clayton Township (18.5% of Clayton’s total, 70.6% of the study area’s total). The location of the half-quarters in Clayton Township can be seen in Figure 3.34, in comparison with the topography of the region. The remaining six half-quarters were issued in Reading Township (comprising 3.9% of that township’s total patents). The average date of issuance for half-quarters in the entire study area was 1827, a date much later than the average issuance date for the study area (1815). In the specific townships, the average dates of issuance for half-quarters do not differ much from the overall average: 1826 in Clayton, 1831 in Reading, and 1825 in Madison Township. Several factors combined to make the dates of sale for half-quarters much later than the average
issuance date for the study area, a trend consistent in the three townships that contain half-quarter sections.

Figure 3.34. Map of the locations of half-quarter sections issued in Clayton Township in comparison with the topography of the township. Map by author.

For one, 80-acre half-quarters were not available for sale until 1820, when Congress passed new land legislation that lowered the minimum acreage from 160 to 80. The first half-quarters sold in the study area were issued in 1823, three years after the reduction in minimum acreage. Most of the half-quarters issued in the study area were sold in the 1820s, with only eight of the 34 (24%) sold in the 1830s, the last being in 1833 (Figure 3.34). This federal policy lowering the minimum acreage was the main reason for the late issuance date of half-quarters in northern Perry County. The
concentration of half-quarter patents issued in 1825 is especially noticeable in Figure 3.35, when 13 of the total 34 half-quarters (38%) were issued within one year. As previously alluded to in earlier sections, this spike is most likely due to the passage of the 1825 Credit Relief Act, where the federal government allowed settlers to extinguish their debt by relinquishing the part of their claim yet still unpaid, while keeping the part that they had completed payment on. Schroder (1980), as also mentioned, found that the most common result of these relinquishments was the issuing of a half-quarter section of 80 acres. This conclusion is supported by the rise of half-quarter patents issued in 1825.

When the location of half-quarter sections is examined, a definite pattern is noticed, especially in Clayton Township (Figure 3.34), where most purchases of this specific aliquot are concentrated in the central portion of the township. Looking at the topography of the township, a relatively extreme change in elevation is seen in the vicinity of these patents, where ridges (in whites, browns, and reds) coincide directly with stream valleys (in yellow and orange). The terrain here is not smooth at all, with broken ground extending throughout this area (Perry County Chapter, Ohio Genealogical Society 1993). With the land in such a state, this area would have been passed over for lands more suitable for farming crops westward in Reading, Thorn, and Hopewell Townships. Once western lands had been claimed and purchased, settlers coming to this area who wanted to live in proximity to their neighbors and the establishing towns of the area would have searched for unclaimed land, such as the area of central Clayton Township. The fact that these lands were passed over for more suitable western land also contributed to the late issuance dates of patents, and may have contributed to the issuance of half-quarter section aliquots as well. If the land was highly broken and rocky, the frontier
farmer would have had a hard time producing enough crops to pay off the debt owed to the government. With the passage of the 1825 relief act, settlers had an out: relinquish part of the land still owed upon and be able to keep what they had already paid for. Most likely, farmers would have been able to pay off at least enough money to purchase a half-quarter, either through their meager crop productions or the sale of lands back east. Therefore, it is hypothesized that the high concentration of half-quarter sections in central Clayton Township and their late issuance dates are due to the topography of the land, the choices of early settlers to look for more suitable land westward, and the generous credit terms offered by the federal government to ailing frontier farmers. Other half-quarter sections purchased later than 1825 most likely were the product of settlers taking advantage of the smaller minimum acreage and the lesser price tag attached to this smaller parcel of land. However, like the half sections and the whole sections previously analyzed, the half-quarter section played only a small part in the settlement of northern Perry County.
Although the exceptions of whole, half, and half-quarter sections have been thoroughly discussed above, the rule in Perry County’s settlement was the issuance of quarter sections. Of the 593 total patents granted within the study area through federal public land sales, 501 were sold as 160 acre quarter sections, constituting 84.5% of the total patents issued (Table 3.4). Individually, each township as well showed the same overwhelming trend for the purchase of quarter sections (Table 3.5). Madison Township had the highest proportion of quarter sections issued, at 93.5%, representing 86 out of a total 92 patents. Hopewell followed closely behind, with 92.1% (105 out of 114). The three other townships, Reading, Clayton, and Thorn, all had quarter section percentages higher than three-quarters of their total, with 82.6%, 80.0%, and 76.9% respectively. When the location of quarter sections is examined (Figure 3.36), a slight trend towards areas of the study area settled later, the eastern end of the townships, is seen, though

Figure 3.35. Dates of issuance for half-quarter patents in the study area. Figure by author.
quarter sections exist throughout the study area. Larger aliquots such as the whole and half sections are clustered more in areas of earlier settlement (i.e. the extreme western edge of the study area), but quarter sections do exist in these areas as well, especially in western Thorn Township. A clear relationship between the location of quarter sections and topography does not seem to form, except for where whole, half, and half-quarter sections dominate, as previously explained within this subsection. Overall, it seems that the influencing factor in the placement of quarter sections within the study area was the selection of this specific aliquot by the frontier settler.

Figure 3.36. Map of the locations of quarter sections issued in the study area in comparison with the topography of the region. Map by author.
Given the choice between whole, half, and quarter sections, as federal land policy granted between 1804 and 1820, the main period of settlement for the study area, settlers resoundingly chose the 160-acre quarter section. Obviously, the reduction in minimum available acreage introduced by the 1804 Indiana Act proved beneficial to frontier settlers, as more than 85% of them purchased this aliquot size while available. The quarter section seems to have been a good compromise between settlers and the government; the government received much needed funds from the sale of public land (at least 320 dollars per quarter section, according to the minimum price per acre during this period), while the reduction in size, and thus price, allowed many settlers of lesser means to move westward and purchase their own land they could commercialize and profit from. The completion of many of the majority of the patents before 1813 supports the idea that the 160-acre parcel was a manageable size to purchase for the average settler. Many of the credit extension acts were passed by Congress in the later 1810s, meaning that patents completed in the later years of that decade had a higher chance of being extended for years after their original entry. By completing purchase of patents earlier in the decade, settlers must have been able to collect the necessary funds required to pay off their government debt. As mentioned before, Danhof (1969) and Schroder (1980) maintain this conclusion and state that a frontier farmer only needed two to three years of productive farming to raise enough financial capital to extinguish their debt. The data from land sales in northern Perry County adds support for their conclusions and shows their effects at a small scale (the sub-section scale) not previously demonstrated before.

The data from the land patents show differing trends in the purchase of specific aliquots throughout the time and location of the study area. However, the quarter section
was king, as its presence is seen in every township and stage of the settlement process (Figures 3.25-3.28). For the quarter, the main influence for purchase seems to have been the choice of the settler. The other aliquots present in the study area were influenced by other factors, namely timing of entry, topography, and the financial situation of the claiming settler. Between the date of issuance and the type of aliquot purchased, a strong settlement pattern emerges from the land patent data. First, the western edge of the township was settled in the decade of the early 1800s, and constituted mainly whole and half section purchases. Next, as the main body of settlers migrated to Perry County, areas of suitable farmland were claimed, specifically in the western portion of the study area first, then gradually eastward as land soon became unavailable. This time period was characterized by the high proportion of quarter sections issued, as the average date for quarter section issuance was 1814, right after the peak of land sales in the study area. Finally, areas of extreme topography and isolation, usually in the eastern part of the study region, were infilled and purchased, sometimes taking an extreme amount of time to be completed. Here, the financial situation of the settler had more influence than before, as some took advantage of generous terms offered by the federal government (i.e. the 1825 Credit Relief Act). As time changed, the type of parcel changed too, with the minimum available acreage of aliquots purchased gradually reducing in size in the later years of settlement. However, one constant remained throughout this time, that being the dominance of the quarter section, representing the ability of the frontier farmer to where and how he wanted to settle his land.

**Reserved sections.** Beginning with the Land Ordinance of 1785, the federal government reserved the right to keep several sections of land in each township for its
express purposes. This sentiment was carried over from that document into the federal land policy that controlled the alienation of land in the region of Perry County, specifically the Land Act of 1796, which reserved the four central sections for the government, and the Indiana Act of 1804, which made the four said sections available for public sale at higher than normal acreage prices. The sections of the study area affected by this legislation, numbered 15, 16, 21, and 22, can be seen in Figure 3.37; the centrality of the sections is the main pattern created by the policy of section reservation. As this land was originally reserved only for use by the federal government and only then later opened for sale, it can be expected that the settlement of these reserved sections would have occurred later than their surrounding aliquots.

Figure 3.37. Locations of the sections originally reserved by the federal government. Map by author.
The above hypothesis is supported by data gathered from the land patents and other sources. For the overall study area, the average date of issuance for the four reserved sections was calculated to be 1821 (Table 3.6). This date is six years later than the average date of issuance for all patents within the study area (1815). In all townships, section 16 was not issued by the government, as it was reserved specifically for school lands by the federal and later state government, nor was section 15 in Thorn and Hopewell Townships, which was reserved for school lands as well. As these seven school land sections (five sections 16s and two section 15s, shown in Figure 3.38) were not opened for official settlement until 1827, the average date of settlement should be even higher for reserved sections in northern Perry County. The distribution of the school lands by the state legislature will be discussed further in following paragraphs.
### Table 3.6

**Average Dates of Issuance for Reserved Sections**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Average Date Issued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study Area</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Area</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Not Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Area</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Area</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Area</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorn</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Not Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorn</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Not Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorn</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorn</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorn</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopewell</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Not Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopewell</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Not Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopewell</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopewell</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopewell</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Not Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Not Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Not Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1825</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Individually by township (Table 3.6), the same trend is seen as well, and the earlier described pattern of settlement, with certain townships settled earlier than others, still holds true for the reserved sections of the study area. Thorn Township, like with the average date of issuance for all patents, has the earliest date of issuance for reserved patents, 1818. The next earliest average date, 1819, belongs to Madison Township, followed by Reading (1820), Hopewell (1822), and Clayton Townships (1825). In comparison with the average date of issuance for patents of all sections in each township, these listed dates are six, four, six, nine, and six years later, respectively. The same pattern of settlement holds too, except that Madison and Hopewell Townships have been switched in the order of dates as described two sections previous. This deviation from

*Figure 3.38.* Location of the sections reserved specifically for school lands. Map by author.
the established pattern does not appear to be too significant however, as Thorn, Reading, and Clayton Townships remain aligned with what would be expected. One possible reason for the earlier date in Madison Township could be the positioning of the reserved section 22, which has an average date of issuance, 1816, earlier than the other two reserved sections in the township, 1821 for section 15 and 1820 for section 21. As mentioned earlier, Zane’s Trace enters Perry County through section 22 of Madison Township, offering land extremely close in proximity to a major transportation thoroughfare, a factor shown to be relevant in the date of issuance/settlement. Supporting this argument is the fact that in the other four townships of the study area, the difference between the average dates of issuance for the individual reserved sections is, on average, one or two years (Table 3.6). In Madison Township, the difference is four and five years, as sections 15 and 21 were purchased much later than section 22. Some factor must have influenced the early settlement of section 22 in comparison to the other reserved sections of Madison Township, and proximity to Zane’s Trace appears to be the major force in drawing settlers to that section.

Overall, however, the sale of reserved sections took place five to seven years after the initial wave of issued patents in each township, an expected trend. The reasoning behind this conclusion is twofold. First, the sections were originally reserved for government use only, meaning that settlers were not allowed to claim or enter aliquots in these sections, at least until 1804 when the Indiana Act removed the federal reservation of these sections. However, as the federal government was desperate to receive increased revenue from land sales, the minimum price per acre for these sections was set four times higher than for regular sections, at eight dollars per acre. This was the second factor
leading to the late purchase of previously reserved sections. With plentiful cheaper land surrounding the reserved sections, settlers would have passed over this expensive acreage for land elsewhere, even if these sections contained quality land suitable for farming.

Since the minimum available acreage was still only 160 acres, at eight dollars per acre the reserved sections would cost a minimum of $1,280, more expensive than purchasing a whole section at that period of time. As such, cost would definitely have been a deterrent to settlement in the reserved sections. Congress eventually realized their mistake, decreasing the minimum price per acre of the previously reserved sections to four dollars in 1808. Because the average dates of issuance for reserved sections were all after 1815 (and the five-year credit period that would begin in 1808), it seems that this reduction in price did nothing to attract settlers to these sections. In the mid-1810s, the minimum price per acre was reduced to equal the regular minimum, two dollars per acre, finally allowing settlers to afford the reserved sections which had long since become surrounded by farmsteads and settlements (Schroder 1980).

As alluded to previously, the sections reserved specifically for schools (section 16 in all townships and section 15 of Thorn and Hopewell Townships) were purchased and settled differently than the sections reserved by the government solely for increased revenue. Given to the state government when Ohio achieved statehood in 1803, the land comprising these seven sections were leased by the state to individuals who ran frontier schools, working to educate the growing populace of the frontier. As 640 acres was a large amount of land to maintain and unnecessary for the operation of a school, in 1827 the state legislature let the people decide if the school lands should remain reserved or be opened for public sale. The people responded with resounding approval for the sale of
reserved school lands. Within the study area alone, the vote was counted to be 939 for public sale, 47 against (Perry County Chapter, Ohio Genealogical Society 1997). Such fervor may have been expected, as at this point in time most land in northern Perry County had already been bought, making available land scarce in this region of Ohio. Opening up new lots for sale would have introduced new land into agricultural production, giving new settlers migrating through the area a place to settle or providing sons/daughters/other relatives of previous settlers a chance to strike out on their own search for prosperity.

As the school lands were held in reservation until after 1827, and were not precisely opened for sale until 1828, the dates of their purchase should reflect the late settlement and commercialization of these specific sections. The average year of issuance for the lots located in the seven school land sections of the study area was 1833 (Table 3.7), 12 years later than the other reserved sections and 18 years later than the overall study area average. For each township, the average date of issuance for these sections varies greatly, as seen in Table 3.7. The earliest issued sections, on average, are in Thorn (section 16, 1828) and Hopewell Townships (section 16, 1829), a discovery not surprising as this thesis’s research has shown a trend towards the earlier settlement of these two townships within the study area. However, the average date of issuance for the school land sections in other townships seem to buck the previously established trend, especially that of Clayton Township, whose section 16 had an average date of completed purchase of 1832, the third earliest date of the seven school land sections. Likewise, section 15 of Thorn Township had a much later date of issuance than expected, 1834, especially in comparison to the other reserved school section in the same township. The
date for Clayton Township may be slightly misleading, as, when the individual purchases are examined, a clear dichotomy presents itself: Out of the eight lots section 16 was divided into, three were purchased in 1828 and three were purchased in 1837. The seventh lot was sold in between these dates, in 1831, and the eighth lot did not have a date of sale attached to it. Therefore, the 1832 average calculated for section 16 of Clayton hides the fact that several of the lots were sold immediately after the section was opened for public sale, while the other half of the aliquots went unpurchased until almost 10 years later, possibly an effect of the previously described isolation/unsuitability of the land in central Clayton Township. The later date of sale for section 15 of Thorn Township, however, does not seem to conceal anything about the individual purchases: Six of the eight lots in this section were sold after 1830, an unusual pattern for this township, but not uncharacteristic of the sale of reserved lands.

Table 3.7

*Average Dates of Issuance for Sections Reserved for School Land*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Average Date of Issuance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thorn</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorn</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopewell</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopewell</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Area</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Like section 15 of Thorn Township, the section reserved for school lands in Reading Township had a later than expected date of sale, 1837. This date, though, can be explained through the extremely late issuance of two of its patents. One of these lots was purchased in 1864, the other in 1880; these two patents, though not issued by the federal government, are the two latest sales conducted by a government entity (in this case the Ohio state legislature) within the study area. Without these two dates, the average date of issuance for Reading Township is decreased to 1829, tied for the second earliest date of issuance of the seven sections reserved for schools. This date fits more appropriately with previously established settlement trends, as Reading Township was one of the earliest settled areas of the county. The reason why these two patents were purchased so late is unknown; it may just be that people did not want to purchase these two lots and were passed over as people immigrated ever westward.

Besides these two extremely late patents, another oddity concerning issuance dates appears in section 16 of Reading Township. One lot was listed as purchased in 1819, to a Mary Kulp. It is possible that this may have been an error, and the real issuance date was 1829, after the reservations were officially lifted on this section. Another possibility is that this purchase is an example of pre-emption, the practice where settlers squatted on and claimed lands not yet surveyed or opened for public sale. Pre-empted claims were not made legal by the federal government until 1841, much later than the sale date listed for Kulp’s purchase. However, since this section was officially under the control of the state of Ohio, it is entirely possible that they allowed a pre-emption claim on their school lands, especially if that area was not being used for educational purposes. Clement Martzolff (1902) states that in several cases, “section 16 had been
‘entered’ before the survey was properly made” (p.98). Therefore, it is possible that Mary Kulp settled in section 16 before the survey of the study area had been completed. The later date of sale, 1819, though, makes it seem unlikely that this was this case. As no other date was recorded for the purchase of school lands before 1828, the 1819 date listed for this aliquot is most likely a typo. This is not to say, however, that people did not settle on the land until 1828. Martzolff (1902) is likely accurate in his assertion that people settled in the school lands before they were sold; they just were not officially able to own the land until the reservations were lifted by the state in 1827.

Like the dates of issuance discussed above, the aliquots sold in the school lands were different than those issued in land sold by the federal government, either in unreserved sections or in the previously reserved sections of 15, 21, and 22. Only five of the 53 lots sold in the school lands were issued for 160-acre quarter sections, the largest aliquot seen in the purchases from these sections. The majority of deeds issued in former school lands, as seen in Table 3.8, were for 80-acre half-quarter sections, comprising 34 of the 53 purchases (64.2%). Surprisingly, smaller aliquots than seen in the general study area were present in the school land purchases, including nine 40-acre quarter-quarter sections (17% of purchases) and four 20-acre half-quarter-quarter sections (7.5%). A patent was also issued for an irregular sized lot of eight acres, in Madison’s section 16, to a Nathan Melick, whose section was carved out of one of the five quarter sections purchased (which would actually only be 152 acres, instead of the usual 160). The eight acre purchase was completed in 1828, 15 years before the purchase of the quarter section that it was taken from, possibly delaying the purchase of the quarter section as the aliquot could not have been bought whole like other aliquots in the section.
Table 3.8

_Aliquot Types Purchased in School Land Sections_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aliquot Type</th>
<th># Aliquots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarter</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half-Quarter</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarter-Quarter</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half-Quarter-Quarter</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular Lot Size</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The issuance of smaller aliquots than seen previously is an interesting discovery from the school land reservations. Quarter-quarter sections were not available for sale by the federal government until 1832, when the minimum saleable acreage was reduced to 40 acres (Johnson 1976). However, in the school lands, the average year of sale for quarter-quarter sections was 1831, with several bought as early as 1828, the first year these sections were opened for sale. Several smaller aliquots were also sold, such as the four half-quarter-quarter section, seen only in Reading Township’s section 16, and the irregular eight acre lot previously mentioned. The half-quarter-quarter section, consisting of 20 acres, was never an official acreage available for sale by the federal government in the public sale era; neither were smaller irregular sizes like the eight acre Melick plot. Here in the school lands, it seems that the state legislature was responsible for reducing the minimum available acreage to whatever size the consumer desired. It is known that settlers preferred to buy smaller parcels of land, evidenced by the preference for the quarter section within the study area, and the fact that once it became available for sale in 1832, the quarter-quarter section, or “forty,” rapidly became the most popular aliquot size in American land sales. The overwhelming choice of lots smaller than the standard
quarter section in the school lands, where size was apparently not regulated, indicates this preference for smaller units of land as well. It is possible that the state legislature was not searching for the kind of revenue that the federal government was hoping for from land sales, thereby allowing settlers to purchase any amount of land they chose. Another possibility for the reduced size of aliquots in the state-owned sections is that the state legislature, physically and institutionally closer to the settlers, was able to better understand the needs and desires of its people and responded so by offering smaller parcels of land for sale than the federal government allowed. Federal land policy did catch up to the precedent set by the state of Ohio, but not until 1832, and never provided the degree of freedom of choice that the state did with its school land sections.

Between the later date of settlement and the smaller aliquots, the sections previously reserved for school lands within the study area show a different settlement pattern than the other reserved sections, which followed generally similar patterns to the overall study area. As both types of sections were reserved at some point by the federal government, the primary agent creating the differences seen must have been the state control of the school lands, which followed different land policies than the federal government. As the exact patents or deeds for the lands in the seven school sections were not located, it would be interesting to do so and glean the information from them to understand more about the transactions that alienated the lots from the public domain, a process which has not been studied before for the school reservations. It is also of import to note that for one of the seven school sections, section 15 of Hopewell Township, the patent data could not be located, as it was for the other six sections. The implication could be made that the purchasing of this section may have followed the pattern of
section 16 of Hopewell, which was fully sold within the first three years it was open for sale. However, that assumption must be taken lightly, as the comparison does not hold well between sections 15 and 16 of Thorn Township, which have average dates of issuance six years apart. Locating the data for section 15 of Hopewell Township would provide a more complete picture of reserved section settlement in the study area, and add more knowledge to the process of school land distribution described above.

Assignment. Another piece of information gathered from the analysis of the patents issued within the study area was the amount of assignments executed during the era of public sales. The process of assignment consisted of the original entryman transferring their registered claim to another person, who would subsequently complete payment for the transferred aliquot (Schroder 1980). The assignor, the original claimant of the land, would then have no right to the land once the new holder of the claim, the assignee, finished the transaction. Presumably, the assignor would receive some compensation for relinquishing his claim to the assignee, possibly in land elsewhere or commodities, though most likely in financial capital. It is also important to note that the assignee was not given a new five-year credit window to complete the transaction; he must have it completed in the time left by the assignor (though it is possible, but not likely due to several residency restrictions, that the assignee could have his credit extended by the relief acts). In his study concerning the effect of the credit system on frontier Ohio’s economy, Schroder (1980) examined assignments briefly, stating that this process was beneficial to the economy as it allowed entrants who were unable to fulfill their payment obligations to sell their land interest on an open market, placing the land in production sooner and providing financial capital to farmers who may have been
struggling to prosper. He supports this supposition by explaining that assigned entries had a higher rate of completion, 92% of all assigned entries, than all unassigned entries. Approximately one-fifth of all entries were assigned (18.8%), while 23.1% of all completed entries had assignees listed, according to Schroder’s (1980) study.

In the study area, the percentage of completed patents that were assigned was shown to be higher than in Schroder’s (1980) study, at 32%. Of the 593 patents issued within the study area, 190 had assignees listed (Table 3.9). The reason for the discrepancy between the previous study’s numbers and the figure derived from this research is unclear. It is possible that Schroder (1980), who looked at representative sections from over all areas of Ohio sold under the federal credit system, chose sections from Congress lands east of the Scioto River (including Perry County) that underrepresented the patents typically issued within the region. Another possibility is that assignments occurred at a higher rate within the study area due to reasons specific to this area. Settlers claiming land in northern Perry County may have experienced hardships due to the timing of their entries, possibly coinciding with the recession of the mid-1800s. These people, unable to sell their crops and commodities at high market prices, would have difficulties keeping up with their payments to the government, forcing them to look for alternative avenues of financial stability. Selling their claim to someone else who could complete the transaction, assigning the land to a new person, would have lifted the debt the original settlers were facing, giving them freedom to look elsewhere for economic opportunities. The high rate of assignment seen in the study area could account for the slight effects of the mid-1800s recession as discussed earlier, which were felt more heavily in other areas of Ohio and the United States during this time of
expansion. By handing the land over to someone who had the capability to pay off the
government debt, land reversions (by way of decreased land sales) were not seen to the
degree here as they were in other frontier areas, presenting as the rise in patent issuance
seen between 1805 and 1812 (Figure 3.11).

Table 3.9

*Patents Issued With Listed Assignments*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Number of Patents Assigned</th>
<th>Percentage of Patents Assigned</th>
<th>Average Year of Issuance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thorn</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33.65</td>
<td>1812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopewell</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.82</td>
<td>1814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33.99</td>
<td>1814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33.70</td>
<td>1817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29.23</td>
<td>1820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Area</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>32.04</td>
<td>1815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The trend of higher rates of assignment is seen in the individual township data as
well (Table 3.9). Reading Township had the highest rate of assignment in the study area
at 34%, though Madison and Thorn Townships have similar rates of assignment at 33.7%
and 33.65% respectively. The other two townships, Hopewell and Clayton, had
comparable rates as well, with 29.8% and 29.3% of their patents assigned respectively.
All five townships in the study area had higher rates of assignment than that calculated by
Schroder (1980), an interesting find within the patent data. It is also interesting to see
that all five townships had pretty similar rates of assignment with each other, a sign of
consistency within the study area. This consistency can be seen again through the
locations of the patents assigned (Figure 3.39); a pattern to their location does not appear,
as the assigned patents are pretty evenly spread across the five townships, and even
within each township. It seems that no physical influence affected which patents became assigned, lending support to the hypothesis that financial difficulties were a primary factor in determining if an assignment was necessary.

Figure 3.39. Locations of the patents listed with assignments. Map by author.

The average date of issuance for the assigned patents is consistent with the average date of issuance for the patents of the entire study area, 1815 for both sets of patents. The dates for the individual townships are consistent as well, though the trend appears to be that the average date of issuance for assigned patents is about one year later than for unassigned patents (Table 3.9). Thorn and Reading Townships both show average dates of assigned patents similar to the average date of their unassigned patents.
Hopewell and Clayton Townships have average issuance dates for assigned patents one year later than their unassigned patents (1814 and 1820 respectively), while Madison Township’s date of issuance for assigned patents was two years later than its average for unassigned patents (1817). These dates are consistent with the figure Schroder (1980) developed, who wrote that the time of completed payment for his assigned patents was usually one year later than for unassigned patents. The reasoning behind this pattern is that the assignor would work the land for a year or two, hoping to profit so he could pay back the debt owed to the government. However, if he failed to raise funds, he would eventually miss payments, threatening the farmer with reversion of his property. To escape this result, the assignor transferred his claim to the land for money or some other commodity, relieving his debt. The new holder of the land, the assignee, would absorb the debt accrued by the assignor, and needing time for his production to become profitable, required an extra year or two to raise the necessary capital to complete the payment owed on his aliquot. Though assignments did delay about one-third of the land sales in the county for almost a year, it seems, between the average dates of issuance and the locations of assigned patents, that assignments did not have a major effect on the settlement pattern of northern Perry County. Absolutely determining why more assignments existed in the study area than seen elsewhere would be interesting and important in understanding this process, though it is unfeasible for this study as assignments did not deter or majorly affect the settlement process in Perry County.

Tenanted patents. Another phenomenon that appeared on the patents analyzed in this study was the listing of two people as the buyers of an aliquot, and the words “as
tenants in common, and not as joint tenants” written at the bottom of the patent, as shown in Figure 3.40. As two buyers were listed on the patent, this is an indication that two people contributed money towards the final purchase of the aliquot and that these two settlers shared ownership of the parcel. More complicated though, is the inclusion of the difference between tenants in common and joint tenants at the bottom of the patents. Tenants in common, unlike joint tenants, can transfer, will, or sell their share of the property without any consent from the other owner of the concerned aliquot. Joint tenants must consent before this can occur. Another difference is that tenants in common can own unequal portions of the land; an example would be a quarter section of 160 acres, bought by tenants in common, where one owner owns 100 acres and the second buyer only controls 60 acres. In contrast, joint tenants own an equal share of the aliquot purchased together; therefore, in the example given above, each owner would receive 80 acres apiece (Lehman and Phelps 2005). As clear distinctions were made almost every time two purchasers were present on the patent, it appears that owning the land as tenants in common was the most popular practice of dividing land between two buyers.

Figure 3.40. Part of a patent granted showing the phrase “as tenants in common, and not as joint tenants” (General Land Office 2016).
Of the 593 patents issued within the study area, 34 were listed as being purchased by “tenants in common, not...joint tenants.” The location of these patents, heretofore known as tenanted patents, can be seen in Figure 3.41. From the map, it can be seen that no true pattern emerges from their locations, though the tenanted patents do have a higher concentration in the southern half of the study area than the north. The individual township data shows this assertion as well, in Table 3.10, with Thorn and Hopewell Townships containing only one and four of these types of patents respectively. Madison Township however, also located in the northern half of the study area, has a higher number of tenanted patents with eight; in fact, this township also boasts the highest percentage of tenanted patents, with 8.7% of its patents containing tenancy indications. Reading and Clayton Townships, in the south, had the highest number of tenanted patents, 11 and 10 respectively, but as both also contain the highest number of patents, their percentage of tenanted patents is lower than Madison’s. Overall though, as each township, and the study area as a whole, has a percentage of tenanted patents below 10%, these patents were few and far between during the settlement process of Perry County and likely had little effect on processes in the study area.
Figure 3.41. Locations of tenanted patents within the study area. Map by author.

Table 3.10

Tenanted Patents within the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Number of Tenanted Patents</th>
<th>Percentage of Patents Tenanted</th>
<th>Average Year of Issuance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thorn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopewell</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>1817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>1818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>1821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Area</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>1818</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is interesting to note, however, that the average date of issuance for tenanted patents is higher in every township than the average date of issuance for untenanted
patents (Table 3.10). On average, the dates of issuance for tenanted patents are two to three years later than normal: Thorn, Reading, and Clayton Townships have average dates of issuance two years later than normal, while Hopewell and Madison are three years later than average. For the study area overall, the average date of issuance for tenanted patents (1818) is three years later than average (1815). This data suggests that putting an aliquot under tenancy influenced the date of issuance. Adding a second purchaser could delay the transaction, as one of the tenants could be slow in making his share of the payments due every year. Another factor that could have delayed the purchasing of the tenanted patents is the idea that these aliquots were originally passed over for more suitable land, leaving these parcels unclaimed for several years later than usual. When the locations of tenanted patents are compared with the regions topography, as in Figure 3.42, this hypothesis gains traction. Many of the tenanted sections appear to lie on ridge tops or relatively broken ground, shown in white, brown, and red in Figure 3.42. This seems especially true for Clayton and Madison Townships, the two latest townships settled within the study area. It is possible that these aliquots, passed over for other land westward, were purchased later by groups of settlers (in twos) as they knew this ground would not be as productive. By dividing the aliquot, each farmer would then owe less money to the government than if they had each purchased a full quarter, and because the land might be less suitable for farming, the lessened cost would prove beneficial as the farmer needed to create less capital to relieve their debt. One other possibility for the tenancy of land is the desire for proximity to family. Examples of relatives, either brothers or fathers and sons, purchasing a piece of land together can be found in several of the townships in the study area, such as the patent for
the southwest quarter of section 29 in Hopewell Township, where David and John Ridenour were listed as “tenants in common, and not as joint tenants.” However common this familial practice was, this possibility does not lend to the reason why tenanted patents were issued on average later than others, leaving the topography hypothesis as the primary explanation for that trend.

![Location of tenanted patents within the study area in comparison with the topography of the region. Map by author.](image)

*Figure 3.42.* Location of tenanted patents within the study area in comparison with the topography of the region. Map by author.

How the tenanted patents were divided among the purchasers is another question of interest as well. Only one of the 34 tenanted patents actually details the partitioning of the land shares: The patent for the west half of section 2 of Thorn Township specifically states that Thomas Buchanan, the first listed buyer, receives 215 acres, while the second purchaser, William Fullerton, received only 50 acres (this section must have been platted
with lines drawn in error by the government surveyors, as this half section only contains 265 acres, instead of the usual 320). As other tenanted patents do not explicitly list who received what share of the land, other sources must be used to approximate the distribution of this land. The Perry County tax duplicate from 1828 provides a glimpse into this process, as one can see who held the land about 10 to 20 years after it was first sold. An example of using this resource for this purpose was described earlier in the case of section 35 of Clayton Township, where it appears that the first listed purchaser, Robert Law, received three quarters of that section (approximately 480 acres), while the second purchaser, Thomas McKeever, only received a quarter section of the section he helped purchase.

Both of the above examples show instances where the tenants in common received unequal shares of the land, a trait unique to this type of tenancy. However, it does not appear that this unequal division was the only way land was tenanted. A tenanted patent issued in 1820 in Reading Township, for the southwest quarter of section 24 (township 16, range 16) seems to have been divided equally among the two purchasers. According to the 1828 tax duplicate, Philip Campbell, the second purchaser listed for the patent, owned 80 acres of land in the quarter section he helped purchase; the first listed purchaser, a Jacob Barnshisel, must have sold his share of the land between 1820 and 1828, as the tax duplicate lists a Francis McCambridge as the owner of the other 80 acres of the southwest quarter of section 29. Obviously, this quarter, at the time of issuance, must have been split evenly between the two buyers. From the 1828 tax duplicate records, it appears that both methods of land division were popular, though unequal splitting seems to be the predominant method, even among relatives. One patent,
issued for the southwest quarter of section 34 in Madison Township, purchased by apparent relatives, Joshua and Jorum/Jerome Plummer, appears on the duplicate with Joshua owning 100 acres and Jorum/Jerome receiving 60 acres of the purchase. The splitting of parcels also emphasizes the desire for smaller pieces of land to farm as well as theunnecessity of the large minimum available acreage set by federal land policy. Tenanting patents was one way to circumvent this minimum and allow farmers to thrive as they wanted and needed to.

**Miscellaneous sections.** With the above explanations of the distribution of the reserved sections, assigned patents, and tenantded aliquots, the process of settlement has been almost fully described. No other reservations provided for by the Land Act of 1796, such as salt springs, were recorded within the study area, so these will not be discussed in this work (Sherman 1925). What is left to mention, though, are the sections that went unsold by the federal government during the public land sale era. Along with the 593 patents issued within the study area and the 53 known lots within the school land sections, 14 aliquots were never patented for by the federal government. As can be seen in Figure 3.43, all 14 parcels were 160-acre quarter sections, and most were concentrated in the northern half of the study area. Why these sections remained unpatented is a mystery; topography does not seem to have a relationship with these aliquots, as the topography ranges between low-lying level areas in northern Thorn Township to higher relief ridges in Reading and Hopewell Townships. Proximity to transportation routes and population areas as well does not seem to answer this question, as several are close to the early-settled Fairfield County, and the unsold aliquot in Reading Township is within a mile of the study area’s largest and earliest founded city, Somerset. Zane’s Trace also
passed directly through this area, so that aliquot would have been in close proximity to that important frontier route, yet remained unpurchased from the federal government. One can only postulate as to why these lands were left available, though a likely possibility could have just been the quality of the land. If settlers passing through deemed the land occupying these sections as unsuitable, they would have passed over this land for potentially more productive ground elsewhere, leaving these aliquots unpurchased.

Although unsold by the General Land Office, these aliquots were eventually alienated from the public domain, though this was done by the state government after the unsold lands were transferred from federal to state control. Unfortunately, it is unknown exactly when this transfer occurred, so the exact dates of purchase and settlement are unknown for these 14 quarter sections. It may be assumed that this date had to be after 1833, when the last patent not a relic of the credit system was issued directly by the federal government through a cash sale. Therefore, the eventual settlement of these sections would occur later than the settlement of the rest of the township, especially the unreserved sections.
Figure 3.43. Location of unpatented aliquots within the study area. Map by author.

Two of the aliquots counted with the unsold sections, the southwest quarter of section 2 and the northwest quarter of section 36, both in Hopewell Township, may actually have been sold during the public sale era, but remain uncounted due to errors made by the Chillicothe land office. The reasoning behind this hypothesis is that for the sections adjacent to these two sections, sections 3 and 35 respectively, both have an extra patent listed (making five patents total for each section only containing four aliquots). These extra patents were granted for the missing aliquot (southwest quarter and northwest quarter), but written as granted in the adjacent township. The double granting of the patents in the adjacent townships is certainly a mistake on the part of the land register at the Chillicothe land office, though it has never been corrected in the database of the
General Land Office. Though it appears likely that the two double patents are for the two missing aliquots in sections 2 and 36, the aliquots were counted as unsold for the analysis of the patent data done in this work. For the adjacent sections, 3 and 35, the first patent listed was used as the patent for analysis, both because they seem to fit the general pattern of the surrounding aliquots, both in date and in terms of identity of the purchasers.

The double granting of patents seems to have been a possible issue during the early days of public sales under the federal government. Two other cases were discovered within the study area, both in Reading Township, controlled by the Chillicothe land office. However, both of the later patents (the double patents) are listed as having been issued out of other land offices, districts that did not include Reading Township. One of the double patents (for the southeast quarter of section 2, township 16, range 16) was granted from the Zanesville office, opened after the Chillicothe office and whose district did not include this township. The actual patent for this aliquot was issued four years prior, through the Chillicothe office. The other double patent issued within Reading Township (for the southwest quarter of section 35, township 17, range 17) came from the Canton land office, to Perry’s northeast. In this instance, the real patent for the aliquot was issued by the Chillicothe land office two years earlier. It is unknown what township and range the two double patents were actually issued for, as the writing on them indicates they are for the townships actually covered by the Chillicothe office. For the purposes of analysis, the two double patents (not the actual patents issued by Chillicothe) were not included in the data for this study.

In the interest of full disclosure, another matter concerning the total number of patents within the study should be mentioned. Two patents, in this sense the actual
physical piece of paper granted by the government, were issued for more than one aliquot at the same time. In Hopewell Township, a patent was issued to a Paul Bean in 1806 for both the west half and northeast quarter of section 19. Another was issued in Thorn Township to John Cooperider in 1810 for the northeast and southwest quarters of section 13. It is unknown why these two patents were issued in this manner (having two aliquots on one patent) as the majority of the time when settlers completed payment on two separate aliquots in the same section on the same day, the settler was issued one patent for each aliquot. An example of this situation can be found in Thorn Township, where William Forster completed his purchase of both the northwest and southeast quarters of section 20 on the same day, October 12th, 1812. Here, Forster was issued two separate patents for each aliquot; several more examples of this method of issuing patents can be found in the various townships of the study area. It seems that issuing a single patent for each aliquot was the preferred method the land offices used to transfer land from the public domain to private hands; why the two above patents include two separate aliquots is unknown, but they appear to be the exception and not the rule. For the purpose of analysis, the patents issued for two aliquots were counted as two patents (four total) by separating the aliquots into a single patent, as this was the predominant method of patent issuance. Physically, 591 patents were issued in the study area, but 593 were counted within the study area when the two extra aliquots from the above patents are added.

With these last sections and aliquots explained, the process of public sales in northern Perry County has been thoroughly analyzed. The date graphs show that sales occurred mainly in the late-1800s and early-1810s, peaking in 1812. However, public sale was not limited to this period alone, lasting well into the early-1840s. Throughout
this sale period, minimum aliquot size changed with federal land policy, and the preferred aliquot purchased by settlers reflected these changes, with whole and half sections chosen during the beginning of the sale period and the sale of half-quarter sections rising during the latter end of the period. The quarter section prevailed throughout the sale period, though, as the aliquot of choice for migrating settlers. Different factors concerning the patents, such as the reserved status of some sections and the question of whether a patent was assigned or tenanted, also affected the way in which aliquots were claimed and purchased. The combination of these patent factors and the physical landscape, including proximity to early population centers, nearness to transportation routes, and the suitability of the land for farming, influenced the processes by which land was disposed by the federal government. These processes, and the people who instigated them, created the cultural landscape seen during the Early Republic and seen in today’s present, a landscape heavily influenced by national discourses laid out in federal land policy.
Chapter Four: Federal Discourses Materialized in Perry County

Discourses

Decisions regarding how people utilize and modify the spaces they control occur every day at a wide range of scales, from the small household level to choices that affect an entire nation. These decisions are influenced by how people see and perceive their landscapes, a perspective that changes from viewer to viewer. The perspectives and decisions that are used to modify landscapes are known as “discourses,” a term adopted by James Duncan (1990) to denote the “shared meanings which are socially constituted, ideologies, [and] sets of ‘common sense’ assumptions” (p. 12). Essentially, discourses represent the different ways in which people see the world in which they live, work, and play, and are used to codify these values.

Richard Schein (1997) expands on this idea by stating that “when the action results in a tangible landscape element, or total ensemble, the cultural landscape becomes the discourse materialized” (p. 663). This means that individual decisions, made by a single person, an organization, or even by a governing agency, have definite effects on the landscape, and can ensconce themselves in the cultural landscape of a region by becoming a discourse materialized through the creation of a tangible feature. Once a discourse becomes materialized in the cultural landscape, the discourse materialized acts to both limit and empower “the possibilities inherent for human action upon the landscape” (Schein 1997, p. 664). The discourse materialized, possibly created decades before, can influence how people utilize and modify their landscape, even if they own that landscape in the form of a parcel of land bought from the federal government. The decisions and actions taken after the creation of a discourse materialized may then in fact
destroy, enhance, or mask the discourse materialized, as the landscape constantly evolves through the activities of daily life (Schein 1997).

In his article, Schein (1997) asserts that the cultural landscape of the United States is more challenging to interpret due to its “piecemeal [creation] within a cultural milieu that idealizes liberal individualism, laissez-faire capitalism, and political democracy” (p. 663). The nature of the founding of America, with its emphasis on individual freedom and choice, makes the landscape harder to interpret as there are more choices and actions affecting the same piece of land over long periods of time. These actions and decisions may even be contradictory to each other, as one tenant of the land may create a discourse materialized, but the next may remove evidence of the discourse with his own actions. As the history of the American nation is characterized by this vibrant individualism, this quality “mitigates against powerful, centralized, large-scale landscape authorship” seen elsewhere in the world (Schein 1997, p. 663). Because of the “countless individual, independent, self-interested decisions” made by Americans since the founding of the nation (p. 663), Schein (1997) argues that most American landscapes were created by the actions of private individuals, and supports his argument by interpreting the landscape of a small neighborhood in Lexington, Kentucky.

However, the results of this study, presented in the preceding chapter, would argue that a powerful, centralized, large-scale landscape authorship seems possible in the United States. As the land on the frontier of America, including the study area of Ohio’s northern Perry County, was controlled and disposed of by the federal government, through land policy the central government created, the process by which people purchased and initially settled their land was influenced largely by the American
government. Because the acts instituted by the federal government in the late 1790s and early 1800s affected large swaths of land from Ohio in the northeast to Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana in the South, and even as far west as the Illinois shore of the Mississippi River (Figure 4.1), the actions and decisions influenced by federal land policy had wide-reaching influences on the American landscape. People migrating to the western frontier all over America must have been influenced by the minimum available acreage for sale, what sections were available for sale (i.e., the reserved sections), and other processes allowed by the public sale system, such as assignment and tenanting. Because decisions and actions can have tangible results, any landscape element created through actions influenced by federal land policy can be deemed a discourse materialized, as theorized by Schein (1997). Therefore, it is entirely possible that a large-scale author was able to create discourses materialized throughout an entire section of the United States. This research has focused on northern Perry County, one of the earliest areas of the frontier settled under the newly established federal land policy, as a case study that represents how a centralized, large-scale author can create a landscape through the production of discourses materialized.

This is not to say that Schein (1997) was incorrect in his assertion that most landscapes are created through the actions of individual citizens. It is certain that many cultural landscapes are influenced, modified, or conceived by individuals, especially at small-scale levels like the homestead or neighborhood, and Schein (1997) argues this point most convincingly. Even in the landscape created by federal land policy, individual actions modified and influenced the landscape in ways contradictory or confirming to federal actions, but these decisions and activities were undoubtedly constrained by the
landscape originally created by the centralized author of the American government.

These personal actions are present in the early landscape of Perry County, and will be discussed in further detail in the proceeding sections, entrenched within the larger landscape created by the system implemented by the American government to dispose of land within the public domain.

**Discourses Materialized in Perry County**

As established above, discourses represent socially constituted meanings and ideologies that can vary from person to person or even from person to agency. One such discourse that was present in the study area of northern Perry County during the Early American Republic was the federal government’s perception of the land comprising the public domain as a commodity necessary for the repayment of the national debt (Rohrbough 1968). In order to efficiently transform this commodity into revenue, Congress passed legislation outlining how the land was to be partitioned and sold to private citizens, beginning with land in eastern Ohio; the history of this legislation was profiled in the previous chapter. By so doing, the American government created an agent by which tangible landscape elements, in the form of survey lines and the sections they denoted, could be constructed. Their perception of the land as a source of revenue, and thereby its commodification and subsequent survey, is presented as a national discourse, as in it was perceived by the representatives of the whole nation’s interests (i.e. Congress) and in that it affected a large portion of the nation as it existed in this period (Figure 4.1). The resulting tangible elements can be termed as national discourses materialized, since they reflect the ideology of the nation’s interests in its pursuit for land alienation and revenue.
First, the creation of six-by-six mile townships divided the land into large squares, the first hint of the grid pattern that would soon come to dominate the American West. Overall, congressional townships did not add much to the government discourse, as land sales occurred at lower levels of the hierarchy established by Congress, except for serving as an aid for the alienation of government land. In fact, William Wyckoff (1986) states
that townships were utilized by agents of the Holland Land Company, acting in western New York, for several reasons, including the simplicity and efficiency by which land divided into townships could be disposed, as well as the fact that townships could even be used as a unit of sale themselves (consisting of 23,040 acres, though whole townships were not available for sale at the time of Perry County’s opening). These above strengths can be used to help explain the reasoning behind why Congress implemented this basic survey system in its early land legislation. In order to orderly and quickly dispose of its vast holdings, the land first had to be organized into these larger units to facilitate public sale and, thus, discourse materialization. The five townships mentioned throughout this study are actually civil townships laid out by the state and county governments, and while sometimes following exactly the boundaries of congressional townships (like Hopewell and Thorn Townships, Figure 4.2), they ultimately had no bearing on public land sales and did not contribute to the national discourse.
Figure 4.2. The civil township boundaries that comprise and denote the study area. Figure by author.

The next level of the hierarchy established by the Land Act of 1796, the one-by-one mile section, contributed more substantially to the creation of the national discourse materialized. Without looking at the physical landscape itself, the section lines, as drawn on a map, can be clearly seen to portray a grid that could be superimposed onto the ground it was surveyed for (Figure 4.3). Because these lines denoted the boundaries of actual units of sale, as laid out in the series of federal land acts passed in the early 1800s, sections definitively represent the discourse of land commodification generated by the American government. Prior to 1804, the only possible aliquots available for sale were 640-acre whole sections and 320-acre half sections. Settlers claiming land and
registering their entries at local land offices on the frontier during this period were constrained by the legal restrictions placed on aliquot size, an example of a national discourse controlling the actions and decisions of private individuals. The effects of this early discourse were explained in the previous chapter, where whole sections were primarily bought during the first years of public land sales in the study area. Figure 3.8, detailing the Binckley and Arnold purchases, the earliest patents issued within the study area, exhibits the influence exerted by this national discourse. As Christian Binckley would have conformed his farmstead to the area given to him by the government by building fences, clearing trees, and planting crops within the confines of his 640-acre section, this settler would have created a discourse materialized representing the national discourse of land commodification. Within the wilderness of frontier Ohio would have appeared squares of improved land marked off by the purchasers of those claims, developing a settler landscape in the Early Republican period characterized by large, isolated agricultural landholdings carved out of forests, essentially dictated by the order of American federal land policy.

The concentration of whole sections purchased in one of the earliest settled regions of the study area, western Reading Township, seen in Figure 3.10, supports this argument. Since these patents were some of the earliest registered in the land offices, they were constrained by federal policy, which created a discourse materialized through the selection of whole sections. The location of these patents, however, was a function of both the national land system and the actions of individual settlers. On a broad scale, the national government controlled where migrants could purchase and settle land by opening certain areas of the public domain for sale only after they were surveyed and
platted by government hired surveyors. Within these districts opened for sale, settlers could individually choose which pieces of land they wanted to purchase, decisions outlined in the previous chapter which seemed to be influenced by suitability of land for farming, proximity to early centers of population, and proximity to trade routes. Although personal choice created this small-scale landscape within the study area, the overall settlement landscape presented on the frontier of the Early Republic was dictated and created by the federal government.

Figure 4.3. The surveyed section lines that comprise and denote the study area. Figure by author.
Sections also served to create the national discourse materialized during the Early American Republic by controlling, to a certain extent, where settlers could purchase land and establish a homestead within the districts opened for sale. The reserved status of some sections, especially in the early days of the study area’s settlement, influenced the placement of claims and purchases made by individual settlers. Three of the four reserved central sections, as discussed previously, were not opened for sale until 1804, creating an early landscape where certain areas of the domain were passed over and left vacant due to government regulations. When the three reserved sections were finally released to public sale, but at a price per acre four times higher than the non-reserved sections, these sections were systematically passed over for several more years, until the price was finally lowered to equal the standard public price of two dollars per acre. This assertion is supported by evidence presented in the preceding chapter, where reserved sections had a consistently later average date of issuance than non-reserved sections. The reasoning for reserving the sections and selling them for higher than average prices was a nationally-directed effort to increase revenue from land sales in order to pay down the national debt more rapidly. Therefore, as the reservation of sections was an effect of the national discourse on the settlement landscape of Perry County, the persistent vacancy of these sections well into the mid-1810s was a materialization of the federal land policy discourse. These sections, in the physical landscape of the study area during the period of the Early Republic, would remain uncleared, unfenced, and unimproved, unlike surrounding sections bought and settled years earlier. These unimproved reserved sections would then represent the national discourse materialized, as their settlement pattern was heavily controlled by federal policies.
The setting aside of school lands in section 16 (and section 15 of Thorn and Hopewell Townships) also contributed to the national discourse materialized seen in early Perry County. Originally set aside by federal land legislation with the three other reserved sections, the school land sections were given to the state governments once statehood was achieved (1803 for Ohio). The original reservation prevented settlement upon these lands for at least three years, dictated directly by the national government, and the state legislatures kept these lands reserved for non-settlement purposes until 1827. In these seven sections of the study area, settlement was prevented by a combination of federal and state interests for over 25 years after public sales began, once again causing these areas to be passed over for land that could actually be obtained by private hands. The land contained within these sections would remain largely unimproved, save for the construction of a school, as originally intended by national land legislation. In both cases, the outcome was decided by restrictions emplaced by a central authority, creating tangible landscape elements (either unimproved land surrounded by farmsteads or the use of the lands for educational purposes) that added to the physical and cultural landscapes of northern Perry County. Once school lands were opened for public sale in 1828, the government, though this time the state of Ohio, once again influenced the settlement landscape of these sections by offering smaller than normal aliquots for sale, such as the quarter-quarter and the half-quarter quarter sections, seen only in the school lands of the study area. By selling smaller sections, the state government was influencing the cultural landscape by creating smaller farmsteads that would be delineated from the physical environment, creating another discourse materialized.
Although the aliquots mentioned above were sold specifically in the school lands, aliquots size and orientation were the most conspicuous landscape elements created through the national discourse of federal land policy during the Early American Republic. During the public sale era of Perry County, four types of aliquots were offered for sale under federal legislation: The whole section (640 acres), the half section (320 acres), the quarter section (160 acres), and the half-quarter section (80 acres). By directly ordering that land could only be sold in these units, the federal government influenced the decisions of settlers purchasing land in this region, creating a discourse materialized as farmers improved their land by planting crops, clearing trees, and fencing off their aliquots. After the majority of the patents were issued within the study area, the partitioned landscape would have resembled an odd grid (Figure 3.10), as all four types of aliquots were purchased by incoming settlers. As determined through the patent data, the quarter section was the most popular type of aliquot sold in the study area, so these parcels made up most of the grid seen on the landscape. Whole, half, and half-quarter sections also would have been seen, though the two larger aliquots may have been further subdivided by the purchasers, as they had the right to do after payment was completed.

The overwhelming preference for quarter sections illustrates the constraints leveled upon the decisions of the purchasing settlers by the national discourse of revenue seeking. During the majority of the years that land was sold in the study area, the minimum available acreage for sale was the quarter section, as the government wanted to increase revenues by selling larger amounts of land. For the frontier settler, smaller parcels of land were more suited to their style of farming, as farmers were able to clear about 10-15 acres of land per year, according to Clarence Danhof (1969). By purchasing
only as much land as necessary, the frontier farmer could maximize his return on investment by putting his land into production as rapidly as possible. If the average frontier farmer purchased more land than he needed, such as a half or whole section just for himself, then he would require more time and effort to recoup his original investment. But, by buying the minimum available acreage, most likely the quarter section, the farmer was able to pay back his debt and make a profit (usually the goal of the farmer) in a faster amount of time than so otherwise.

This preferential trend for the minimum available acreage, always dictated by federal land policy, is seen throughout the public sale era of the study area, even when the quarter section was not the minimum aliquot. A table located in the last chapter, Table 3.4, lists the different aliquot types and their respective average dates of issuance. From this table, a trend can clearly be seen: As aliquot size decreases, the average date of issuance becomes later. This trend can be explained as a direct result of the federal land policy in place at the respective dates of issuance, which restricted aliquot sizes in certain eras. The aliquot with the earliest date of issuance, the whole section (average date of 1808), was never the minimum size available while the land of Perry County was open for sale, and this would explain why it is also the aliquot that saw the fewest purchases (15 out of 593). As a smaller aliquot, the half section, was possible while whole sections were available, the smaller aliquot was preferred over the larger whole section. The half section was found to have an average date of issuance of 1810 within the study area, the second earliest of the four aliquot types. This result is to be expected if the desire for small farmsteads was being constrained by federal limits on minimum available acreages.
Although the half section was much preferred by settlers over the whole section, the half was still too unmanageable for the average farmer, and when sales lagged under the Land Act of 1800, the federal government responded by lowering the minimum acreage to the 160-acre quarter section. The reaction to this change in federal policy can be seen almost immediately, as land sales increased drastically after 1806 and the average date of issuance for quarter sections was only four years after that of half sections (at 1814). Once credit sales were ceased in 1820 and as Congress tried to alleviate the effect of this decision, the minimum aliquot once again fell, this time to the half-quarter section. With the average date of issuance for half-quarters calculated at 1827, it can certainly be said that once half-quarter sections were available, after quarter sections were no longer the minimum aliquot available, that preference again changed for the smaller of the aliquots. As clearly shown here, the aliquot of choice during the public land sale era changed with federal policy, thereby being dictated by this national discourse. Because settlers would bound and denote their purchases from that of their neighbors, the preference for different aliquots would be materialized onto the landscape of the study area during different time periods: For example, the fencing off of half-quarter sections would not be seen before 1820, as this aliquot was not available for purchase. Through the sale of public land to private citizens and the constraints on minimum acreage, the federal government was able to have its discourse materialized on the settler landscape of northern Perry County.

The spike in half-quarter sections in 1825, discussed in detail throughout the previous chapter, can also be connected to the preference for smaller aliquot sizes, as well as the national discourse concerning commodification of public land. As the rise in half-
quarter sections issued in 1825 was the result of the passage of the 1825 Credit Relief Act, these landscape elements were a direct result of the national discourse concerned with disposing public land as quickly and efficiently as possible. At this time, after the end of the credit system and during a period where relic credit entries were extended longer and longer due to extension acts of the of the previous decades, Congress decided that it would be in its interest to return outstanding patents to public sale, in order to increase profits. So with the passage of the Relief Act, the national discourse was once again materialized on the landscape of early Perry County through the relinquishment of half-quarter sections, aliquots that would be eventually bounded off by fences and agricultural activities. The relinquished half-quarter sections were quickly claimed and bought as well, with the last half-quarter section patent issued in 1833, eight years after the peak. By providing settlers with an opportunity to relinquish land that was previously held and removed from the public domain, the government was also redirecting sales towards these areas, therefore once again manifesting its discourse onto the landscape as new farmsteads would be built on these aliquots.

The terms established by the 1825 Credit Relief Act also aided the settlers through their preference for smaller units of land, a well-established trend seen throughout the study area. By allowing settlers to forgive their debt through the relinquishment of part of their land, the federal government was providing farmers with a method to increase their return on investment and develop a pool of financial capital that would otherwise have been given to the government to pay for land they might not have even been using. The sudden increase in patents issued during this time of stagnant sales demonstrates the willingness of farmers to rid themselves of debt in the hope of quicker
economic gain. Once again, the system implemented by Congress was providing a freedom of choice that would appeal to the settler and allow him to create his own landscape, albeit under the constraints of the federal land policy, which created a landscape representing its own discourse. Essentially, individual landscapes were created by the actions of the purchaser, but these landscapes were built upon the larger landscape established by the government under the discourse of federal land policy. Individual discourses materialized were constructed on the back of a broader discourse materialized in the settler landscape of the Early American Republic.

The orientation of certain aliquots was also controlled by federal legislation, specifically for half sections and half-quarter sections. Congress restricted the directions of aliquots for the purpose of surveying ease: By originally making all half sections divided by a north-south running line, creating east and west half sections, the surveying and platting of land was more uniform and cheaper, as most of the dividing lines in the early days of government surveying were north-south meridians. When half sections were first introduced in the Land Act of 1800, they were specifically dictated to be divided only in a north-south direction; this constraint can be shown in the average date of issuance and the number of patents issued for the different orientations of half sections within the study area. Table 4.1 lists the four different types of half sections issued during the public land sale era, along with the number of patents issued for each type and their respective average dates of issuance. As can be seen, east and west half sections were the most dominant type of half sections issued, with 14 and 20 purchased respectively, and total of 34 of the 43 total half sections issued (79.1%). These two
aliquot types also had earlier average dates of issuance than north and south half sections as well, with east halves issued on average during 1808 and west halves during 1809.

Table 4.1

*Average Date of Patent Issuance for Differing Half Section Orientations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aliquot Type</th>
<th>Number of Issued Aliquots</th>
<th>Average Date of Issuance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Half</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Half</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Half</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Half</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1809</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the two unconventional half section types were examined, they were found to have lower amounts purchased and later average dates of issuance. Only seven north half sections were sold within the study area, and just two south half sections were purchased, a total of nine of the total 43 half sections issued (20.9%). Both also had later average dates of patent issuance than the east and west half sections, with north halves being issued on average during 1812 and south halves on average during 1813. It is not exactly clear when the restriction on dividing half sections only by north-south lines was lifted, but it must have been around 1806, when the first of the north/south halves was sold. Therefore, for a period of time in the early 1800s the government restricted the settlement and bounding patterns of farmers to a strict north-south discourse materialized that would have been apparent on the landscape. Once the restriction was lifted, settlers had a choice in how they wanted to orient their half sections, and clearly did exercise this freedom as several north/south half sections were sold. However, the government-preferred east/west divide was much more popular in the overall picture, even when
individuals were given a choice, possibly resulting from the federal government’s authority over land disposition and its dominant discourse prevalent during the Early American Republic.

The above discussion has focused on how the discourse espoused by the federal government’s land policy acted to constrain and restrict the movements, decisions, and landscape modifications of early frontier settlers through limitations established by federal legislation. Schein (1997) also argues that discourses materialized can “[empower]…the possibilities inherent for human action upon the landscape” (p. 664). From the data gathered from the land patents issued within the study area, it is apparent that this statement is true for the national discourse of land commodification too. Yes, the limitations on minimum available acreage, aliquot orientation, and the actual area that was opened for sale did influence the choices settlers had to make about where to locate their claims. However, settlers were offered a large amount of freedom and individualism in making this choice, being able to choose from any of the available sections within an opened land district. They were also given the choice to select any aliquot they wanted that was available at the time of sale, allowing settlers to freely choose how much land they wanted to pay for and turn productive. The differing orientations of aliquots offered by the federal system also allowed settlers to take advantage of the land in the most efficient ways possible. This fact was demonstrated in the previous chapter when it was shown that many of the north halves that were issued were concentrated on the edge of the Great Swamp, the future Buckeye Lake. Here, the sideways half section, divided by an east-west running line, gave settlers the chance to access the most productive land they could in the quantities they thought would yield the
most return on investment. So it definitely seems that within the rigid structure emplaced by the national discourse of land policy settlers were given an immense amount of freedom to create a landscape by choosing where they wanted to create a farmstead and commercialize the land for their economic gain. The national discourse empowered frontier farmers by providing the opportunity to purchase land and make landscape modifications, discourses materialized, that would prove beneficial for the settler in terms of financial capital and economic stability.

This freedom of choice is echoed in the dates of patent issuance throughout the study area, described in detail in the previous chapter, especially after 1806, when the majority of the patents were issued. As seen in Figure 3.26, the concentration of patents issued between 1806 and 1812 were located in the northern and western portions of the study area, in Thorn, Hopewell, and Reading Townships. The freedom of choice granted to the settlers under the federal land policy enabled them to choose the land they thought best suitable for their actions, which must have been primarily located in the these three townships. After 1812, the best land having been already claimed, land sales gradually declined, but with the opening of reserved sections and their simultaneous decline in price per acre, settlers were still able to select the land most suited for their respective purposes, exhibited by the map of issued patents from 1813-1819 (Figure 3.27). With most of the aliquots already claimed in the study area by 1820, it is no wonder that land sales fell dramatically; however, with some parcels still available and the implementation of the 1825 Credit Relief Act, the government land alienation scheme did allow patents to be issued during this period (Figure 3.28), mainly in rugged land that had been passed over for better land westward, as the freedom of choice given to the settlers allowed for
that to occur. Therefore, the freedom of choice granted to settlers created the date trend seen in the issuance of land patents within the study area; freedom, molded by the constraints of the federal land laws in place, created a patchwork mosaic of family farmsteads that sprang up in a grid-like pattern across northern Perry County throughout the public land sale era. This grid-like pattern of farmsteads, as well as the scattered timing of the purchasing of the patents (and therefore construction of farmsteads) represents the national discourse materialized within the landscape of the study area.

Other aspects of the public land sale system characterize the individual freedom allowed within the context of the authority of the federal land policy, including the processes of assignments and tenanting. Assignment, the act of handing over one’s claim to an entry to another party, was shown previously to have occurred at a higher rate within the study area than other areas of the frontier. Although the assignment process may not have had a lasting impact on the landscape of Perry County, at the time of settlement a discourse materialized could have developed due to this act. Assigned patents were shown to be issued slightly later on average than unassigned patents within the townships of the study area. Because of this, it is entirely possible that land that was assigned did not physically become improved by settlers until at least a year later than surrounding unassigned claims, presenting as patches of uncleared forest encompassed by improved farmland. If this scenario occurred due to the later purchasing of an assigned patent, then this patch of forest would be characterized as a discourse materialized, as it existed through sole fact that assigned patents, allowed by the federal land sale system, usually took extra time to be purchased from the public domain. However, this situation is probably unlikely, as assigned patents could be worked by the original claimant for
several years before assigning the patent to another party, presenting as just another farmstead within a surrounding mosaic of farms.

Although assignments may not have had much of an impact on the physical landscape of the Early American Republic, they did represent the idea of private individualism within the broader context of federal land policy discussed above. If a settler felt he could not complete his payment on time or decided that he would rather migrate elsewhere before he completed purchase, the assignor was completely within his right to sell his claim to some other person, under federal law. However, the new holder of the land’s claim, the assignee, still was constrained by the limits of the federal government’s land policy, specifically the five-year credit window that credit entries were given. If the assignee was unable to complete payment of the purchase within the period of time left by the original claimant, the land would then be reverted to government control and once again opened for sale. The assignment process was conceived by individuals to prevent reversion, and keep the land productive and working towards the settler’s ultimate goal of economic gain. The federal government allowed assignments to occur as they aligned with the national discourse of land commodification and increased revenue, but still regulated this process by maintaining that the assignee must complete payment within the original given credit period. Therefore, assignments could be characterized as a national discourse materialized as they furthered the federal government’s perception of the land as a source of revenue.

Another patenting process that demonstrated individual freedom within the confines of federal policy was the act of tenanting a patent. As discussed in detail in the previous chapter, a tenanted patent was a patent for which two or more buyers were listed
as holders of the land’s title once the patent was issued. By so doing, purchasers were able to pay for only the amount of land that they wanted to cultivate, maximizing their return on investment. This process essentially circumvented the restriction on minimum acreage available, as both tenants were able to purchase less than 160 acres, while together purchasing one of the four aliquot types available from the federal government. An example of this is seen in the only tenanted patent that actually lists how many acres each purchaser received: This patent, issued for the west half of section 2 in Thorn Township, listed the first purchaser, Thomas Buchanan, as receiving 215 acres, while the second purchaser, William Fullerton, received only 50 acres, well below the federal minimum offered at the time of purchase (1814). Obviously, settlers working together to buy a tenanted patent were doing so in order to gain more freedom in their choices concerning land use of the patents they purchased. Tenanted patents could also get around the restriction placed on public sales where land patents were only issued for square and rectangular parcels of land. Once the tenants claimed an aliquot together, they were free to divide up the land in any size or shape they wanted to, as the government had no control on land division once the entry was purchased. If settlers wanted to divide their aliquot using the metes and bounds system seen elsewhere in the United States, they were free to do so, though the task of surveying would fall to the individual level.

Because of these two facets of tenanted patents, it is easy to state that tenanting was the ultimate show of individualism in the face of the authority wielded by the federal land alienation system. This expression of individualism would be manifested upon the landscape in the form of smaller and more differently shaped pieces of land than seen in surrounding aliquots. Fences would bound smaller areas of land, and smaller fields of
crops would be grown on these tenanted farmsteads, representing a discourse materialized, this time however, characterizing the discourse of individualism on the part of the settler, instead of the national discourse. Yes, the national discourse would still be present in the landscapes modified by tenanted patents, but in the underlying context that the land was sold from the public domain to private citizens who would then circumvent government regulations and create their own discourse materialized in the settler landscape. It is surprising then, that only 34 of the 593 patents issued within the study area (5.7%) were issued as tenanted patents. A likely reason for this might be the difficulty present in finding a person who would want to tenant an aliquot with another settler. From the patent data collected within the study area, it seems that the majority of tenanted patents were issued to purchasers who were unrelated to each other, at least by blood (i.e. having the same last name). Only 11 of the 34 tenanted patents (32.4%) were issued to purchasers sharing a last name; two of these patents were issued to the legal representatives of the original purchaser, so they were tenanted only by means of inheritance, instead of through the actual purchasing process. These data suggest that tenanted patents were more likely to occur between unrelated purchasers, a fact that would make it harder to complete this process, as settlers may have been hesitant to enter into a binding legal agreement with unrelated partners.

It is also interesting that so few of the tenanted patents were issued between relatives. This again, may have been a result of the hesitancy to enter into a legal agreement with another person, even if they are related. Another factor influencing the number of related tenanted patents might have been the practice of willing land to children and other relatives. By purchasing a larger amount of land (such as a quarter
section instead of tenanting a patent for only 50 or so acres), the buyer would be able to
divide up more land among relatives upon time of death, or being able to sell more of the
land to relatives as they moved westward to join their kin. Whatever the reasons for
tenanting or not tenanting an aliquot, these types of patents did not make up a significant
proportion of the patents issued within the study area, and therefore did not have a
significant impact in creating a discourse materialized on the settler landscape. Even
still, they do represent a discourse of individualism not paralleled elsewhere within the
patents of Perry County and deserve to be recognized as such.

Between the differing aspects of the public land sale system during the Early
American Republic, a complex cultural landscape developed due to the interplay between
the discourses of individual choice, sought by the settler and granted by the federal
government to a certain extent, and land commodification, invoked by the federal land
policy of the period. The restrictions and constraints implemented by the land acts
passed between 1796 and 1825 created the backdrop that settlers migrated to and
constructed farmsteads upon during the public land sale era in the study area. The
choices of the individual settlers were influenced by the regulations of the land laws,
manifesting themselves as the national discourse materialized masked by the illusion of
individual freedom. For most decisions concerning the purchase of land and the initial
settlement of their plots, their choices were modified and influenced by the national
discourse espoused by the controlling land policy of the federal government. Therefore,
the settler landscape of the Early American Republic in northern Perry County, Ohio can
be characterized as a national discourse materialized, authored by the agency of the
centralized, federal government. This national discourse materialized was subsequently
modified through individual decisions and their resulting actions, creating a complex cultural landscape in terms of authorship. However, as the federal land policy heavily influenced and restricted many of the decisions made by the settlers, the national discourse did more to affect the individual discourses than the individual discourses did to affect the national discourse. Because of these factors, the national discourse materialized on the landscape of the early study area created the context that individual discourses were able to eventually modify and create new landscapes, though still influencing discourses and landscapes in the decades following the public land sale era.

**Persistence of the National Discourse**

Public land sales facilitated by the federal government officially ended within the study area in 1842, when the last patent was issued in Madison Township, though sales had been essentially stagnant since 1820 and the end of the credit system. However, land sales did not stop with closing of public sales; private citizens were free to sell land to other individuals in any shape or size they wanted to, as they officially held title to the parcel. Even before public land sales were stopped in Perry County, land was sold between private individuals, as evidenced by the transactions of Christian Binckley, one of the earliest settlers in the study area. For example, as early as 1806, county records show that Binckley sold a quarter section of his land, the southeast quarter of section 6 (township 16, range 16) in Reading Township, to a William Rutter, after originally purchasing the east half of that same section in 1805 (Miller 2008). In fact, the private sale of land was popular in the study area, especially after the close of the public land market, as this was the only way land could be obtained within the study area. The rise of private sales increased the amount of freedom of choice that settlers had in all aspects
of land sales, as they were no longer constrained by the limitations of federal legislation. The buyer did not have much choice however, as he was restricted to the terms of the seller, though negotiations could allow more freedom for the buyer; the federal land system did not allow for such negotiations, limiting the freedom that settlers could have in the terms of their purchases. Therefore, the cultural landscape of Perry County after the close of public land sales is characterized by an increase in individualism and choice, a discourse that could have profound effects on the previously established landscape, including discourses materialized through the federal land alienation system.

When the size of land holdings after the close of public sales is examined, a clear trend for smaller aliquots is seen in the study region. Through data collected from a map created in 1859 by Walling (1859) listing the acreage of land holdings, it was found that the average parcel size at that time in Thorn Township was 106.7 acres, a little more than 50 acres smaller than the dominant aliquot of the public land sale era, the quarter section. A tax extraction covering Clayton Township from the same time period (albeit an unknown date between 1835 and 1849) shows that the average land holding size was also smaller than any of the aliquots available during public sales, calculated to be 74.3 acres per parcel (Perry County Chapter, Ohio Genealogical Society 1993). Unfortunately, data like the above could not be found for the three other townships in the study area, though from similarities previously discussed in the earlier chapters, these data may be roughly extrapolated to cover these townships as well. Hopewell Township has appeared very similar to Thorn Township in most aspects of settlement, so it may be assumed that the average land holding after the public sale era closely reflected that seen in Thorn. Clayton Township, though an extreme in many ways to the other townships, is most
similar to Madison Township, so the data for the first township may be applied to the
second. The fifth township, Reading, is more complex as different portions of the
township are dissimilar. The western end represents Thorn and Hopewell Townships in
appearance and data trends, while the eastern edge is more similar to Clayton in the same
factors. Therefore, Reading Township may be characterized by the datasets of both
Thorn and Clayton, but only approximately.

From the data listed above, it appears that the average size of land holdings
decreased after the end of public sales. The preferential trend towards smaller parcels of
land found within the patent data continued into the period dominated by private sales.
This result, once again, supports the conclusion that settlers were attempting to maximize
their return on investment, by only paying for the amount of land they considered
necessary to construct a productive farmstead. However, as no legislation affected the
size of the aliquots that were sold during this period, the only factors controlling the size
of parcels was the amount of money a settler wanted to invest in his purchase and the
amount of land the seller was willing to part with. This unregulated discourse of
individualism became materialized upon the landscape through the smaller size of land
holdings in the period after the era of public sales. The size discrepancy between the
parcels of Thorn and Clayton Townships may be an expression of the suitability of the
land in each township, as discussed in detail in the previous chapter. In Clayton
Township, consisting of a more broken landscape, smaller parcels resulted as farmers
could only invest so much money into land that would yield less crops than more suitable
land elsewhere, like seen in Thorn Township. The freedom of choice stemming from the
removal of government restrictions allowed this type of discrepancy to occur as well,
leading to this discourse materialized in the form of differing farmstead sizes in two areas less than 10 miles apart.

Despite the increase in the discourses materialized through acts of unregulated individual choice, the prevailing national discourse materialized established during the earlier period of public land sales was persistent into the era of private sales, and even into present-day Perry County. For one, even though land sellers were given the choice to sell plots of land in any shape they desired to, many of the private sales made within the study area were sold in square or rectangular parcels. Walling’s (1859) map of Perry County exhibits this trend in great detail; however, being too big to reproduce in this work, snapshots of representative sections are pictured for evidence of the persistence of the national discourse materialized in the form of rectangular units of land. Figure 4.4 depicts four sections from Reading Township as they were partitioned in 1859; as can be seen in the picture, almost all aliquots contained in the sections were divided using straight north-south or east-west running lines. In this group of sections, only one boundary line is not oriented to cardinal directions, and can be found in the southeast corner of section 26, where two narrow aliquots are divided using a short diagonal line running southwest-northeast (Figure 4.4). The rectilinear pattern of aliquots can be seen as well in four sections of Madison Township (Figure 4.5), and to an extreme extent in Hopewell Township, where eight sections exist without having any non-cardinally oriented boundary lines (Figure 4.6). This pattern is carried over into the later decades of the private sale era, shown in a portion of a map depicting Clayton Township in the late 1800s (Figure 4.7). This map by Calvin McClintock (n.d.) also portrays the rectangular aliquots that seem to dominate in all areas of northern Perry County, this time seen in a
section from one of the later areas to be settled. So in spite of the increased freedom of choice given to individual land owners after the end of public sales, aspects of federal land policy were carried over from that system to the next. Private individuals did not need to sell land in rectilinear plots, but due to the ease of description and bounding lent to this method of survey, as opposed to the metes and bounds system that could have been implemented, individuals utilized this system in their own private discourses. These private discourses modified the existing cultural landscape, but caused a persistence of the national discourse through the adoption of rectangular aliquot shapes.

*Figure 4.4.* Sections 25, 26, 35 and 36 from township 17, range 17 in Reading Township, as divided in 1859 (Walling 1859).
Figure 4.5. Sections 5, 6, 7, and 8 from Madison Township, as divided in 1859 (Walling 1859).

Figure 4.6. Sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, and 12 from Hopewell Township, as divided in 1859 (Walling 1859).
Even the exact aliquot shapes and sizes purchased under the federal land alienation system persisted into the decades after the end of the public sale era. The sections of Hopewell Township shown in Figure 4.6 best represent this suggestion, as there are several 160-acre quarter sections left undivided within this area. Section 9 in the bottom left hand corner of the figure is still partitioned into the original four quarter sections it was sold as between 1811 and 1813. The section above it, section 4, as well still contained three undivided quarter sections in 1859, displaying most of the original aliquots it was sold as by the federal government. These sections, as well as others within the study area, represent the extreme persistence of the national discourse.
materialized, as the owners of these parcels did not feel the need to divide the land in any way other than how it was originally purchased from the government. At the same time, the same sections represent the discourse materialized of individual choice, as the owners chose not to divide the aliquots after having their patents issued. Therefore, as mentioned before, a complex cultural landscape existed in the study area due to the entwining of the persistent national discourse materialized and the emerging discourse materialized through individual freedom. However, because of the extreme rectilinear pattern that emerged because of the national discourse and persisted through adoption by private land owners, the landscape of this era can still be described as being authored by a centralized authority, the federal government, but modified by further discourses that were influenced, and still possibly controlled, by the original landscape author. So in contrast to Schein’s (1997) statement that authorship by centralized authority is mitigated by individual actions, it seems that the landscape of northern Perry County in the decades after public land sales ended were still controlled and influenced by the original discourse materialized in the landscape.

Even 200 years after the opening of the study area for public sale, the national discourse presented in the first decades of the 1800s is still materialized in the landscape of Perry County. The rectilinear pattern imposed on the landscape by federal land legislation, which persisted into the early decades after the close of public sales, is even a dominant element of the tangible landscape, especially in the case of farmsteads and roads. Plat maps from 1974 demonstrate the continued rectangular pattern seen in many of the land holdings in the study area: For example, Figure 4.8, depicting the land holdings of Madison Township, shows many parcels of land in rectangular forms, though
there are an increasing number of plots that have irregular, non-cardinally oriented lines, such as seen in the western half of section 16. Some original aliquot partitions still persist to this date as well, seen in Figure 4.8 in section 32 where both the 160-acre southeast and northwest quarter sections are still fully intact as they were sold in 1811 and 1817 respectively. The plat maps for the other four townships in the study area are consistent with the one drawn for Madison Township in both of these respects, though they also belie another trend, the decrease in the size of many land holdings, a trend which has been seen through and through in the data from Perry County. The 1974 map for Thorn Township (Figure 4.9) exhibits this trend, as many small rectangular parcels exist within the confines of the sections comprising this township. Several large land holdings do exist, such as A.C. Reed’s 312-acre deed in section 31 of Thorn Township, so it cannot be said that all land holders desired smaller amounts of land; the general trend over the years since the end of the public sale era, however, suggests that on average land owners purchased smaller units of land than their forefathers. This trend can be characterized as the materialization of the discourse of individual choice, constructed on top of and under the influence of the national discourse of land commodification that created the original landscape of early Perry County.
Figure 4.8. Plat map of Madison Township from 1974 (Fisher 2009).
Besides just being manifested as lines drawn on plat maps, the national discourse materialized exists within the present-day physical and cultural landscapes of northern Perry County. Boundaries between different land parcels are made tangible through the cutting of trees, the planting of crops, and the building of fences or roads. These bounding effects can be seen through aerial views of the landscape, such as in Figure 4.10, in which the original government issued aliquots can be clearly made out upon the
current landscape (Though only three patents were issued as the west half was bought as a 320-acre half section and later partitioned privately into two 160-acre quarter sections, which is what is seen on the landscape). Between roads (the southeastern boundary), divisions between fields (the southwestern boundary), and differences in tree cutting (central western boundary), the section itself can be clearly bounded out from the overall landscape. The boundaries of the individual aliquots, as well, can be identified, especially through roads (i.e. the dividing line between the southwest and northwest quarters). Lines of trees, most likely left as markers denoting property lines, also materialize the boundaries originally laid by the government in the early 1800s; a clear example of this in Figure 4.10 can be seen in the northern section of the line dividing the southeast and southwest quarter sections. When the aliquot boundary lines are overlain on the aerial view, it is easy to see that the roads and tree lines align with these divisions (Figure 4.11; the lighter green areas in the southeast quarter, as well as the slightly slanted line dividing the same quarter from the west half, were errors in drawing the map and could not be readily corrected).
Figure 4.10. Section 25 of Thorn Township in 2014 (Google 2016).

Figure 4.11. Section 25 of Thorn Township in 2014, overlain with aliquot divisions (Google 2016).
The discourses materialized representing individual choice are also present, through the smaller land divisions seen within the three original aliquots; the northeast quarter shows this discourse most, through the concentration of houses and small land holdings that can be identified along the two large roads that cut diagonally through the quarter. The placement of the main road diagonally through the quarters without regard to the rectilinear pattern previously established represents another discourse materialized, this time of the state/local government and their desire to provide routes of transportation throughout the region it administers. Most likely, the state/local government used the right of eminent domain to claim the land they deemed best for road construction, therefore materializing this discourse through the direct construction of the road. However, the placement of roads along boundary lines represents a discourse materialized as well on behalf of the state/local government, though this time influenced and possibly controlled by the previously established national discourse materialized of the federal government’s early land policy. Because of the interplay between the federal discourse, the state/local discourse, and the discourse of the individual, the landscape of current Perry County is especially convoluted and possibly challenging to interpret. Even so, vestiges of the national discourse introduced over 200 years ago still remain on the current landscape and still control or influence the expression of other discourses to this day.

This description of the landscape can be seen in other areas of the study region, such as section 33 of Hopewell Township (Figure 4.12, Figure 4.13), where the same landscape elements depicting each of the three discourses mentioned above can be found. In fact, when the entire study area is viewed aerially, the same patterns described above
are seen, especially in the western portion (Figure 4.14). This part of the study area has remained relatively more agricultural than other regions, especially the southeastern township of Clayton. In Figure 4.14, this fact can be easily seen by the sheer amount of trees and vegetative cover in the southeast corner of the photo. When the aliquot divisions are overlain on the aerial image, as in Figure 4.15, the rectangularity of land parcels, and the persistence of the national discourse materialized in the form of aliquots, is more visible in the agricultural western portion, as no trees are covering the divides. This difference between separate ends of the study area represents another interplay between discourses espoused by separate agencies. The large concentration of trees in the southeastern end of the study area comprises the Perry State Forest (Figure 4.16), a unit administered by the Ohio Department of Natural Resources, a state agency. Their mission, the discourse they espouse, of conservation and recreation created this discourse materialized which has essentially obliterated the discourse materialized through the federal land alienation system. Almost no aliquot lines are visible within this area, as trees have overgrown boundary lines long ago established to divide land among buyers. No fences and almost no paved roads run through this area as well, having been set aside for all-purpose vehicle use in 1961 (ODNR Division of Forestry 2016). The creation of this park just adds to the complexity of the landscape in Perry County, working to destroy or hide the landscape elements created in the early days of the county by the federal government. Despite the abolishment of the national discourse materialized in this area of the study region, due to the discourse of another powerful landscape author, the legacy of the federal land sale system is still seen in a large portion of the study area, as previously discussed.
Figure 4.12. Section 33 of Hopewell Township in 2014 (Google 2016).
Figure 4.13. Section 33 of Hopewell Township in 2014, overlain with aliquot divisions (Google 2016).

Figure 4.14. Aerial view of the study area in 2014 (Google 2016).
Figure 4.15. Aerial view of the study area in 2014, overlain with aliquot divisions (Google 2016).

Figure 4.16. Location of Perry State Forest within the study area (Google 2016).
National discourses materialized are not only visible from the air, though they are much easier to see from a broader vantage point. A landscape interpreter with a trained eye can view tangible landscape elements created by the national discourse on the ground as well. Long straight roads have long been considered a part of survey landscapes (Johnson 1976), and can most definitely be considered a discourse materialized stemming from the federal alienation of land as roads were usually built on the boundaries of aliquots to provide access to markets for farmers and so as to divide or destroy land that could be turned productive. As shown above, many roads in Perry County were aligned with both section and aliquot boundaries, a proven manifestation of the national discourse on the landscape. On the ground, these roads were seen as well within the study area. Figure 4.17 displays a picture taken on the ground showing an example of one of these section roads, though this one actually divides two aliquots (Figure 4.18), the southwest and southeast quarters of section 5 in Reading Township (in township 16, range 16). As can be seen in Figure 4.18, this road was constructed upon the aliquot boundary, materializing this discourse on the landscape and persisting the government sponsored discourse into the 21st century. Another example of a road constructed upon government surveyed boundaries was found on the border between Reading and Hopewell Townships (Figure 4.19), where a major road was routed that leads to Somerset, the largest town in the study area. From the photo shown, the road appears straight, a trait characteristic of the lines used to survey the aliquots it now divides. When the aliquot boundaries are overlain on the aerial view of the location (Figure 4.20), the boundaries of the townships cover the road, as it was built directly upon this dividing line; the extreme linearity of the road is also easily seen in this aerial view. This evidence supports the hypothesis that
straight roads dividing parcels of land in surveyed landscapes are influenced by the location of aliquot boundaries, and are thus a national discourse materialized by the federal land policy of the early 1800s. The photographs taken during the field survey conducted within the study area also support the argument that landscapes such as this, which are influenced by a powerful centralized author, can be interpreted using tangible landscape elements seen in-person on the ground itself.

Figure 4.17. Example of road aligned with aliquot boundary between the southwest and southeast quarters of section 5 in Reading Township (township 16, range 16). Photo by author.
Figure 4.18. Location where Figure 4.17 was taken, shown by the yellow pin, in section 5 of Reading Township (township 16, range 16), and overlain with aliquot boundaries (Google 2016).

Figure 4.19. Road (middle of picture with car and truck) dividing land in Reading (foreground) and Hopewell (background) Townships. Photo by author.
Figure 4.20. Location where Figure 4.19 was taken, on the divide between section 6 of Reading Township (township 16, range 16) in the south and section 31 of Hopewell Township in the north, and overlain with aliquot boundaries (Google 2016).

While roads are indicative of the national discourse materialized in the present-day, fences have fallen by the way as a method of bounding off land. Once described as “necessary for the survival of pioneer farmers” (Johnson 1976, p. 158) and a major contributor to rectangularity, many farms seen during the field survey of the study area had fields unbounded by fences. Fences were seen though, especially near farms that
raised cattle as they are necessary to prevent the escape of the animals (Figure 4.21), but fencing to the extent reported during the 1800s is non-existent. Much of the fencing seen as well was not built according to aliquot boundaries, as in Figure 4.21, but instead to fit the needs of the individual; in this case, to keep cattle out of crops and from crossing the road running by his farm. This represents a shift from what Johnson (1976) stated, where “fences contributed to the appearance of rectangularity in the landscape” (p. 161), as now fences may represent the materialization of the individual discourse. Within the study area, fences significantly aligned with aliquot boundaries must surely exist, but none were seen during the field survey portion of this research, and as such, cannot be said to be a definitive national discourse materialized on the present-day landscape.

Figure 4.21. Example of the type of fencing typically seen in the study area, from section 26 in Thorn Township. Photo by author.
One interesting aspect of the federal land alienation system that has only been briefly mentioned until now is the inviolate nature of the government survey. This characteristic of the federal land survey system was first established by the Land Act of 1796 and carried through every piece of land legislation passed since, positioning this facet of federal land policy as one of the most dominant forms of its expression upon the landscape. The inviolate nature of the survey, meaning that errors made during the original surveys are not corrected by later surveys, became manifested in the cultural and physical landscapes of Perry County during the initial settlement of the study area, in the period of public land sales, through the bounding and demarcation of aliquots that had been platted wrongly by the original government-hired surveyors. Generally, the government surveys are pretty accurate, especially in the western United States; however, in Perry County, one of the earliest regions surveyed after the passage of the Land Act of 1796, survey errors are found in almost every township, due to the relatively primitive techniques used by the surveyors in this period, as well as the rapidity at which the surveys were completed, in order to open the lands for sale as soon as possible. In this manner, the survey errors doubly express the national discourse, in that they represent the commodification of the land by the federal government (as do all other government surveyed lands), but also as they represent the extreme desire for revenue that the government displayed during this sensitive era of the Early American Republic.

The source of much of the surveying errors stems from the fact that lines of latitude and longitude, used by surveyors in platting land, are not equidistant from each other at all points of the globe. As one travels north, lines of longitude become closer in distance to each other, and farther away when travelling southward. Because of this fact,
northern townships and sections would contain less land than those to the south. To offset this, new baselines, an east-west running survey line, were established after every fourth township, from which meridians, north-south lines, were shifted to and surveyed from. This precedent was established in 1815 and greatly reduced the error produced in government surveys; however, lands surveyed prior to this date were completed usually with fewer correction lines, producing more errors in the survey in terms of the amount of land that each township and section contained (Johnson 1976). Perry County is included in these early surveys, and the errors seen in the landscape at the time of settlement and in present-day are caused by this circumstance.

Examples of the offset nature of several sections within the study area are best found where township boundaries meet, such as the divide between Hopewell and Reading Townships (Figure 4.22). As can be seen, even though these two congressional townships lie in the same column based off of the original Ohio River baseline (i.e. their range number is both 16), their sections do not match evenly. The center of section 34 of Hopewell Township (represented by the central line dividing the aliquots), shown in Figure 4.22 in the top of the photo, is seen to be shifted to the left of the central line of section 3 in Reading Township. Not only visible on the aliquot drawings, these shifted lines are also seen on the landscape itself: Figure 4.23 highlights the landscape elements caused by this error, with the aliquot boundary from Hopewell Township, circled in red and represented by a line of trees seen to be shifted to the left of the aliquot boundary from Reading Township, circled in yellow and displayed in the cutting of trees and the field boundaries. This mistake is not fixed until a correction line was drawn between Thorn and Hopewell Townships, which also divides the congressional townships that
comprise the two civil townships. The correction line drawn here, in order to rectify the mistake in surveying down between Reading and Hopewell Townships, gives extra acreage to the western sections of Reading and Hopewell Townships. It is reported, in fact, that the west half of section 7, in township 16, range 16 of Reading Township, actually consists of over 400 acres, at least 80 more acres than would usually be found in a standard half section (Bettinghaus n.d.). One account suggests that the original purchaser of this half section, Peter Overmire, took advantage of this mistake by using the extra acreage in his half section to develop one of the first towns in the county, New Reading (Bettinghaus n.d.). If this is so, the national discourse materialized had some influence in the individual discourse that led to the founding of the town as the circumstances caused by the survey error allowed Overmire to make a decision about land use that he otherwise might not have made. In section 7 of Reading Township, a national discourse materialized, the surveying error and subsequent correction line, influenced the expression of an individual discourse during the initial settlement era, that of Peter Overmire, discourses materialized that still exist in the complex landscape of Perry County to this day.
Figure 4.22. Example of survey error from section 3 of Reading Township (township 16, range 16) in the south and section 34 of Hopewell Township in the north (Google 2016).

Figure 4.23. Survey error shown in Figure 4.22, with landscape elements caused by error highlighted: Red is Hopewell Township, yellow is Reading Township (Google 2016)
The reverse effect of this error, the subtraction of land from a section in order to correct a surveying error, is seen as well in the landscape of the study area. The western column of sections in Madison Township are all substantially narrower than the rest of the sections within the same township, a fact that came about due to the poor surveying of meridians to the east. Of the small number of patents that listed the actual surveyed acreage of a purchased aliquot, one from this column listed a quarter section as only containing 98.68 acres, almost half as many acres as there would be in a normally-sized quarter section. The difference in sizes can be seen in Figure 4.24, which shows a comparison between the reduced quarter sections of Madison Township on the right, and the regular quarter sections of Hopewell on the left. In the present-day landscape, the difference in aliquot size is still expressed on the physical and cultural landscapes of the county (Figure 4.25). Aliquot boundaries can still be seen in the photo, expressed in tree lines, field boundaries, and roads. The noticeable difference in size between the section boundaries of Hopewell, on the left, and Madison, right, Townships can still be seen as well. The fact that the boundaries drawn in error are still expressed on the landscape 200 years after they were drawn is a testament to the inviolate nature of the federal land survey, as well as the persistence of and adherence to the national discourse first presented at the beginning of the 1800s.
Figure 4.24. Comparison of section and aliquot sizes caused by survey errors in Hopewell (on the right) and Madison (on the left) Townships (Google 2016).

Figure 4.25. Comparison of section and aliquot sizes caused by survey errors in Hopewell (on the right) and Madison (on the left) Townships, present-day landscape (Google 2016).
Summary

Discourses are present in all aspects of society, and each discourse causes people to perform certain actions that have results, sometimes creating tangible elements in the cultural and physical landscapes. This is what appears to have happened in the early landscape of northern Perry County, where a powerful centralized authority, the federal government, created a discourse, land commodification, and the desire for revenue, which produced tangible landscape elements due to the authority held by government. By specifically stating how much land settlers could buy, where they could buy that land, and when they could buy, the government controlled the settlement landscape, creating a discourse materialized through farmsteads, boundaries, and roads. This discourse materialized then influenced the actions and decisions others made concerning the landscape, including state agencies and individual citizens. The powerful influence the national discourse had over these later discourses is seen in the landscape today, through tree lines, field boundaries, roads, and tangible landscape elements that the federal government authored over 200 years before. As the study region of this research, the five civil townships of northern Perry County, is representative of the public domain sold under the federal land alienation system, the conclusion of this research may be applied to other areas of the United States open for sale during this period. In fact, it can be stated that, because of the large swath of land covered by the public land sale system, that the powerful, centralized authority of the United States government acted as a large-scale landscape author during the Early American Republic, and that this authorship is still being enacted to this very day.
Chapter Five: Conclusion

The results of this study present the initial settlement pattern of northern Perry County, Ohio, using data collected from the original land patents granted by the federal government to the purchasers of land sold from the public domain. From these data, general trends were seen in the dates of patent issuance, and therefore land sales, and in the size of aliquots purchased. Overall, land was purchased from the federal government quickly after the region was surveyed and opened for sale, with the peak year of patent issuance, 1812, coming only 11 years after the opening of the local land office. However, this peak did not mean the end of land sales, as patents continued to be issued steadily until 1820, with the last patent not officially granted until 1842. Throughout this period, the rate of patent issuance varied, due to external circumstances, such as the economic recession in the mid-1800s and the War of 1812, as well as internal factors, like the availability of land. Likewise, the type of aliquot purchased varied throughout the public sale era. In the first years of sales, whole sections and half quarters were the most popular, though a reduction in size occurred as the quarter section became the preferred aliquot during the early-1810s. Once the half-quarter section was introduced in 1820, this smaller aliquot was seen in certain areas of the study region, again alluding to a preference for the preference of reduced minimum acreage. Like the dates of patent issuance, aliquot size was influenced by both external forces, such as the federal government, and internal factors, like the suitability of land. Both characteristics of land sales mentioned above were presented as patterns that supported results seen elsewhere, and may be applied to other similar areas of the United States that were sold under the early federal land laws.
The location of sold patents within the study area presented a predictable pattern as well. The first patents were issued mainly in the western half of the study area, in Thorn, Hopewell, and western Reading Townships. Once the prime land was unavailable in these areas, migrants settled in the central portion of the study area, focusing on areas that were very suitable for farmland and areas close to routes of transportation, specifically Zane’s Trace. Finally, towards the end of the public sale era, purchases were concentrated in the eastern end of the study area, where the most rugged land is found. The size of aliquots sold generally followed this pattern as well, with the largest parcels sold in the western sections of the study area and the smallest parcels in the eastern area. This result seems to be a function of the date of purchase, as certain aliquots were not available until the later years of the public land sale era. However, the quarter section dominated the number of patents issued and was found in all areas of the study area, creating a landscape characterized by 160-acre squares bounded by fences and roads during the Early American Republic.

Other restrictions and processes concerning the sale of lands during this period influenced the pattern of settlement in Perry County as well. The reservation of certain sections by the government caused portions of the study area to be passed over for lands elsewhere, creating a landscape where some sections remained unimproved while their surroundings were developed by settlers. Assignments, a process allowed under the federal land sale system, may have attributed to this landscape as well, as assigned sections were, on average, settled slightly later than unassigned aliquots. The same pattern was seen with tenanted patents; these patents contributed to the creation of the landscape in other aspects too, especially by providing an agency through which settlers
could change the size and shape of their purchased aliquots and express their individualistic tendencies. However, later records and plat maps show that individual discourses were still influenced by the earlier national discourses, constructing a complex landscape where several materialized discourses exist and interact with each other over a period of many years.

It is clear from the data collected from land patents concerning the purchase of federal land that a national discourse was materialized on the settlement landscape of northern Perry County during the Early American Republic. Not only was it seen in the cultural landscape, where settlers of Perry were ingrained with the desire for rectangularity first introduced by the federal land survey, but in the physical landscape as well, through the bounding of rectangular plots with fences and roads. This discourse remains in the present-day landscape of Perry County, though it has been obfuscated by 200 years of actions by other agencies, by government, and by individuals. The national discourse still influences or controls land use decisions in the current landscape, as seen by the landscape elements created by the original surveying errors. Discourses of choice and individual freedom are also materialized on today’s landscape, but these seem to align with the government discourse wherever it was most opportune. Because of the persistence of the national discourse over the entire settled history of the region, as well as the influence and control it has had on other discourses throughout this period, this study concludes that the federal government was the primary “author” of the landscape that is seen today in Perry County, Ohio.

As echoed at the end of the previous chapter, the results of this research can be extended to other areas of the United States, especially those opened for public sale at
roughly the same date as the lands of eastern Ohio. The landscapes of the land districts open in 1812, as shown in Figure 4.1, may be characterized by the same national and individual discourses seen in the landscapes of settlement-era and present-day Perry County. The same national discourse that created the landscape of the study area would have been extended throughout these regions as well, since they were alienated to private hands under the same federal land policy that controlled sales in east-central Ohio.

Previous studies have focused mainly on landscapes west of the study region for this research, areas also disposed of from the public domain, but at later dates and under different circumstances. This thesis has examined the survey landscape of the earliest region alienated under the federal survey system that dominated public land distribution during the nineteenth century. Past research has also not examined the survey landscape within a discourse materialized context, a framework which, as in this present study, shows that large-scale landscape authorship was possible in the early days of the American Republic. The discourses espoused by the early federal government, in efforts to increase revenue in order to pay down the debt incurred by the American Revolution, were materialized on the early landscape in the form of land commodification. These discourses were so powerful that settlers included them in their decisions for decades afterwards, creating the complex landscape seen today, a true palimpsest as Schein (1997) would argue. Therefore, this research picks up where others have left off, by describing the production of a landscape in a sparsely studied region, by looking at a different scale than usual, and by framing the settlement process of this region within a theoretical paradigm not utilized before with this landscape. The implications of this study are far reaching as well, blazing trails for future studies concerning settlement
patterns of early America and the materialization of national discourses upon these settled landscapes.

Future research should focus more on the interactions between the national discourse materialized and the individual discourse materialized, an interplay which shaped the American landscape in the decades following the close of public land sales. How did settlers decide to retain elements of the national discourse materialized and why did they? Is there more to the answer than just reasons of convenience? Aspects of the federal land alienation system that have gone unstudied need to be examined as well, as an understanding of these processes would allow for more informed study into the subject matter at hand. For instance, the tenanting system in relation to the alienation of the public domain has not been covered in academic literature; this study provides a small insight into this process, though a more complete study needs to be conducted to further knowledge on the land alienation process. Learning more about patent tenanting would also provide more understanding into how discourses of the individual interacted with the national discourse, as tenanting was the ultimate circumvention of government-place aliquot size and shape regulations. Assignments also need to be studied further, as the motivations behind this process are largely unclear. Was it just economic reasons that caused settlers to assign their claim to someone else? What other reasons could have made a settler want to leave his claim for another? Determining the exact reasons why northern Perry County had a higher rate of assignments than seen elsewhere in Ohio must also be addressed to develop a complete picture of the settlement process in the study area.
Expanding the implications of this research to other regions of the United States is another avenue for future research, as it is necessary to determine if the large-scale land authorship by the federal government seen in this study is present in landscapes developed within the same period of time as Perry County. Studying regions such as southern Illinois and Indiana using the framework presented by this research should yield similar results, as lands in those states were sold under similar federal land legislation to the study area. Finding the persistence of the national discourse, as well as the present-day influences on individual discourses and the discourses of others, would exponentially support the argument for large-scale landscape authorship by a centralized, powerful authority. Looking at places further westward, settled later than Perry County, using the paradigm applied here may yield similar results, especially in the Great Plains states, about which much has been written concerning the survey landscape.

Overall, this study is significant because it shows that the past and present landscapes of America are not created through the actions of individuals alone. The federal government, through its discourse of land commodification and revenue searching, regulated and controlled the settlement pattern of an area in east-central Ohio, creating a unique landscape not seen before in the United States. Individual discourses also affected the nature of the landscape, both enhancing and obfuscating the national discourse; though due to the persistence of the national discourse materialized through 200 years of landscape decisions as well as the significant influence the national discourse had on individual decisions, the federal government could be called the main landscape author in both the settlement and present-day landscapes of government surveyed lands. This research adds to the current literature concerning the expression of
discourses on landscapes, especially through the expression of the national discourse materialized, as well as contributing to the settlement history of early Ohio. The work done in this study also creates avenues for potential future research, adding to the geographic body of knowledge in this way as well. The patterns and trends reported in the results of this research suggest predictable patterns we may expect to see in other similar landscapes, or that can even be extrapolated to other landscapes where a national discourse could have played a role in authorship. As concluded from the data gathered for this study, national discourses do materialize on landscapes, authoring these landscapes, and can influence later discourses that modify and create future landscapes that humans interact with every day.
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