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EDITOR’S NOTES

The Bulletin of the Massachusetts Archaeological Society is published as a permanent record for archaeology in the region by and for our members. Our members and authors include amateurs and professionals, beginners and experts. While the papers may range fairly widely in subject matter, we always aim for accuracy.

Another of our aims is to encourage the writing and enable the publication of archaeological reports. Ethical archaeology requires that one not destroy a site by excavation without recording the data and writing a report. In too many cases, well-meaning people, with or without archaeological background, have begun an excavation enthusiastically. But, if they haven’t considered the need for recording, analysis, and a report, the results can be limited to the redeposition of artifacts, now without context, into cartons in the excavators’ closets.

We heartily welcome the report in this issue of a dig in Duxbury carried out in 1979 and 1980 at the Howland Orchard Site. The authors have a research objective: do Ritchie’s 1969 findings at Martha’s Vineyard Island also hold at Duxbury? They satisfy themselves and us that Ritchie’s finds and interpretations south of Cape Cod are in large part reflected at this site on the coast of north of Cape Cod. They here report on the stratigraphy, point styles, and shell, faunal, and ceramic remains.

Beyond archaeology as digging, Dr. Horner’s article on Metacom’s other names (Philip, Moanam?) provides social and genealogical background for the history of the native people in Massachusetts.

Increasingly, we include book reviews, such as that by Barbara Luedtke on The First Peoples of the Northeast (1994), written by E. and D. Braun.

One of our oldest traditions is to memorialize the lives of notable members now departed. Obituaries for two past presidents and an author appear in this issue. They will indeed be missed, but what great lives they had!
THE HOWLAND ORCHARD SHELL MIDDEN (M37S-26A)
DUXBURY, MASSACHUSETTS

Russell Holmes and Bernard Otto

In the years 1964 to 1967, William Ritchie, then State Archaeologist for New York, undertook a series of site excavations on the island of Martha's Vineyard as part of a prehistoric settlement pattern study of the Northeast. He stated that "stratified shell midden sites in comparatively undisturbed condition, containing substantial refuse accumulation, could demonstrate the existence of a particular assemblage or complex of traits that could properly be designated a coastal culture." This would, in turn, "be applicable to other portions of southern New England" (Ritchie 1969).

In the published report of his efforts (Ritchie 1969), he established the presence of a Late Archaic manifestation (Laurentian, Squibnocket, Susquehanna [Snook Kill], through the transitional Orient complex), an Early Woodland period (Stage I pottery, Lagoon, Rossville), a Middle Woodland period (Greene, Fox Creek, Jack's Reef, Stage II pottery), and a Late Woodland period (Levanna, Stages III and IV pottery).

Would this sequence of complexes, which Ritchie designated as representing a widespread "coastal culture," reveal itself also at the Howland Orchard Shell Midden? It was with this in mind that members of the Massasoit Chapter, Massachusetts Archaeological Society, undertook the excavation of a shell midden in Duxbury, Massachusetts in the years 1979 and 1980.

The culture-period chronology used in this report is (in $^{14}C$ years):

- Late Archaic: 4950 to 2450 B.P.
- Ceramic - Woodland, Early and Middle Stages: 2450 to 1150 B.P.
- Ceramic - Woodland, Late Stage: 1150 B.P. to Contact

INTRODUCTION

Some years before our excavation of the shell midden, the Howlands raised vegetables and fruit not only for their own use but sold their produce at their farm stand on Bay Road in Duxbury. Peaches and strawberries were the main fruit crops. Except for this surface farming, the stratigraphy and topography has changed little here since prehistoric times. Bernard Otto, a member of our chapter, knew Mrs. Howland as an old acquaintance, and received her permission for our group to conduct an excavation at the farm property. Two years prior to this, Professor Moehler, of Bridgewater State College, had conducted an excavation project with his students at the extreme east end of the farm. We have no knowledge of what his project produced.

Not wishing to explore any areas that were badly disturbed by farming activity, Bernard Otto and Dennis Martin made a cursory walkover of the entire property. An extensive stand of young sumac bordering a peach orchard and extending toward a brook was the key clue to the undisturbed shell midden lying below. Some believe that sumac has a strong
affinity for in-ground shell deposits. Russell Holmes, also a chapter member, used his expertise as a surveyor to lay out the necessary base line and grid, and to record all recoveries and features. Other participants were Robert Po, Dana Seaverns, Judith Barnes Fachini, John Halunen, and Sarah Barnes.

PRELIMINARY EXCAVATION OF THE HOWLAND ORCHARD SHELL MIDDEN

Preliminary reconnaissance of the Howland Orchard Site revealed a gently sloping area some 100 feet (about 30.5 m) in width lying between an orchard of fruit trees and a narrow, slow flowing brook; being partly open field, partly heavily overgrown with staghorn sumac (and sporting a scattering of poison ivy), and enjoying a general southern exposure. Surveying control data (Figure 2) showed the orchard to be 30 feet (about 9 m) above present mean sea level, the brook being some 12 feet (3.7 m) less in elevation. The portion of the site under consideration lies approximately 1200 feet (366 m) north of the present high tide mark.

Random test holes produced evidence of
substantial shell refuse containing chipping debris and bone fragments, but failed to reveal the true limits of the midden. It was therefore decided that a test area 12 feet by 25 feet (3.7 m x 7.6 m) in size was warranted in order to determine if the midden was in fact stratified or non-stratified throughout, if the midden had been disturbed by agricultural activity known to have occurred on the premises, and to determine the average depth of the shell refuse and the culture period or periods to which this portion of the site might belong. Recoveries of artifacts and features in the shell midden test area were recorded for vertical placement only, as it was felt that would reveal adequate data on the cultural aspects of the midden and indicate whether the site justified further investigation.

Figures 3a & 3b show the three well-defined strata, I, II, and III. The upper layer (stratum I) is composed of light brown loam, of greatest depth on the uphill side of the test area. That it had been plowed was confirmed by the recovery of pieces of building brick, scraps of black plastic sheeting, glass, small pieces of coal, a few rusty nails, a "T.D." pipestem, and one quartz knife, all mixed in the soil at varying depths. Much of the overburden seemed to be from up the slope by erosion.

The shell refuse layer (stratum II) is a well-defined compact layer of black sooty soil containing shell (primarily softshell clam and quahog), bone fragments, chips, fire-shattered stone, ceramic potsherds, and whole and broken bone and stone artifacts. The shell layer appeared in undisturbed condition except for the southernmost edge, where plowing for a celery patch had taken place. Recoveries from stratum II, which varied in thickness from 1 to 11 inches (2.5 to 28 cm), included 4 bone tools, scattered ceramic potsherds, a few small pieces of worked graphite, 3 scrapers, 1 flake knife, 1 retouched flake, 3 blanks or preforms, 1 antler tine, (1 Rossville type projectile point from lower third of stratum II- not illustrated), 1 pentagonal projectile point, 1 Greene point, 2 small triangular points, 1 soapstone potsherd, plus numerous chips and substantial bone refuse, and scattered firestone. Features present were 3 refuse pits, one of which included artifacts (Feature 2).

A yellow sand layer (stratum III) underlay the shell refuse and in most cases was of undefined depth because of the presence of ground water, which hindered the full investiga-
a. Photograph and b) sketch of stratigraphy in midden test area (N95-E230), showing stratum I (15" [38 cm] thick), stratum II (shell refuse, 6" [15 cm] thick) and the underlying stratum III.

Figure 3. "Photograph and b) sketch of stratigraphy in midden test area (N95-E230), showing stratum I (15" [38 cm] thick), stratum II (shell refuse, 6" [15 cm] thick) and the underlying stratum III.

While perhaps not prolific in archaeological evidence, the mere presence of a well-defined, compact shell lens in undisturbed condition did dictate the need for the establishment of a grid to control further excavation, and the need for profiles, which were taken on the E200 line from the orchard to the brook (Figure 2) and on the N95 line (Figure 3). After our preliminary research and consideration of the potential archaeological value of the
site, William Ritchie’s published results of his excavations of six shell midden sites at Martha’s Vineyard (Ritchie 1969), and William Fowler’s publication on the excavation of the Sweet-Meadow Brook Site by the Narragansett Archaeological Society (Fowler 1956:1-23) were utilized as guidelines during our further excavation.

For further work, members of the Massasoit Chapter utilized a grid (made up of 5 foot [1.5 m] squares) for horizontal control of the location of all artifacts and features, and the position relative to the bottom of the shell layer was chosen for the vertical plane. All recording was done on pre-printed 4”x6” cards, and a large plan of the entire excavation was eventually drafted (Figure 12). Since many of the artifacts remain in the possession of the participants, this documentation will enable further study of all recoveries and allow comparison of this site to other past, present, and future coastal shell midden discoveries. Soil and midden removal was accomplished using trowels and short-handled hoes after careful removal of the sod layer.

ARCHAIC

The way of life during the Archaic period is described as predicated on a central-based seasonal wandering settlement pattern (Ritchie 1969) within a well-defined and fairly extensive area. In basically forest-oriented and forest-dependant extended family groups, these people practiced hunting, fishing, and gathering (probably in that order of importance) in a lifestyle that was tied very closely to the environment, to which they were undoubtedly very well adapted. In a round of activities based upon seasonal availability of local food resources (e.g. herring runs in the spring, waterfowl migration and the presence of acorns and nuts in the fall, etc.), the family groups eventually returned to a semi-permanent base camp (Robbins 1959).

Indications of occupancy of the Howland Orchard Site during the Middle Archaic Period are provided by the recovery of a possible Neville point in association with a hearth (Feature 36) at a depth of 13 inches (33 cm) below the midden (Figure 4). At the top of stratum III, immediately below the shell midden, were recovered a Brewerton Eared Triangle (Figure 5:9), a Late Archaic diagnostic. A Brewerton Eared point (Figure 7:10) was also found in the middle layer of stratum II. No ceramic potsherds were found in stratum III.

LATE ARCHAIC - TRANSITIONAL - EARLY WOODLAND

The Transitional Period is characterized by a shift from the well-established hunting - fishing - gathering pattern of the Late Archaic to a greater utilization of shellfish resources and occupation of sites along the coast, with the glimmer of the dawn of the age of ceramics on the horizon. This was not an instantaneous change, but one which at some sites produced...
steatite and ceramic remains at the same occupational level.

The events, or phenomena, that caused the passing of the Late Archaic way of life and the developing of another can only be speculated upon, but food availability and climate (changes which affect the inhabitants and their food supply) would be high on the list of factors. In her excellent paper Dena Dincauze states,

About 3,000 years ago an interrelated series of climatic, environmental, cultural and social changes was initiated in southeastern New England.... Eventually a cooling climate caused a change in forest composition, hickory trees declining in numbers and being replaced by chestnut and other more northern flora....Some critical resource may have been destroyed or diminished by the climatic cooling, forcing abandonment of interior sites....In southern New England, the utilization of shore resources intensified as the coastline stabilized.... Whatever the ultimate causes, the shift to the coastal fringe and the increasing reliance on shellfish as a dietary staple are among the definitive traits of the adaptive patterns of the Woodland Period....Whether the introduction of ceramics at this time was more than a coincidence remains to be demonstrated (Dincauze 1974).

Ritchie, in the discussion of his excavations in southeastern New England, says,

A succession of cultures on six Martha's Vineyard sites exhibits a progressive shift toward a fuller utilization of the resources of the sea....With ample shellfish resources throughout the year, the normal inland seasonal cycle of subsistence activities of the Archaic groups, involving the use of different site locations convenient to particular food resources, seems to have been abandoned in favor of perennial residency at a single site location having an abundance of shellfish nearby...." (Ritchie 1969).

The Howland Orchard Shell Midden is one location at which a part of this transition is represented. At the top of stratum III, immediately below the shell layer, were recovered (see Figure 5) diagnostic Late Archaic/Transitional period sherds of steatite, two Corner-removed #7 (Snook Kill) points, and one Susquehanna Broad type, along with an Early Woodland Lagoon-type point. No ceramic potsherds or shell were found in stratum III.
EARLY - MIDDLE - LATE WOODLAND

Man, being the adaptable creature that he is, was able to overcome the hardships of change during the Transitional period, and to modify his culture and subsistence habits to the near coastal environment in which he had taken up semipermanent residence. Climatic conditions during this time are believed to have been similar to those experienced by the early colonists who settled here on the southeastern Massachusetts peninsula (see Fig. 1) during the 1600s, which is borne out by the fact that shellfish remains within this midden (Appendix I) are much the same as are found in local waters at the present time. The type of dwellings that provided shelter from our southern New England coastal climate are unknown, as no post molds or other indications were found.

Woodland people had in common with their predecessors a fundamental reliance upon hunting-fishing-gathering to provide the basic necessities of life. The easily obtainable shellfish of nearby Kingston Bay assured a ready supply of one type of food nearly year round, and the sizeable amount of animal and bird bone refuse throughout the midden (Appendix II) gives evidence of a varied diet that still included a substantial amount of animal protein and fat (fat being a necessity not found in shellfish). The total diet probably still included nuts, berries, fish, etc., as this was reported by early explorers of the New England coastline.

The presence of the pottery remains within the midden (see Appendix III) are evidence of utilization of this site during the Woodland period, as this factor is considered a diagnostic of that era (Ritchie 1969; Fowler 1956). Recoveries from the lower third of the shell midden are shown in Figures 7 and 8. These artifacts are noticeably different from those of the preceding Transitional period, which were recovered below the shell layer. This tool assemblage undoubtedly represents an adaptation to the specialized needs of the new environment and the new food gathering (and processing) requirements. It is believed that by 1950 B.P., a pattern of coastal settlements and extensive exploitation of shellfish had developed, which would continue throughout the remaining Woodland Period (Fetchko, Grimes, Phippen 1976). The presence of the Orient Fishtail point and Early Woodland Stage I and Middle Woodland Stage II pottery in the lower level of stratum II (Figure 6), Stage II pottery and small Levanna-like triangles in the middle level of stratum II (Figure 7), and Middle Woodland Greene, Jack's Reef, and small Levanna-like triangles as well as large Levanna triangles with Stage II pottery in the upper level of stratum II (Figure 8), all provide evidence at this site for continuity from the Late Archaic through the Middle Woodland and at least into the Late Woodland period. There may be some Stage III pottery (like Stage II, but with finer temper). The untyped small Levanna-like triangles are not at present well dated (MHC 1984; Little 1984). There does not appear to be any thin-walled Late Woodland pottery (Stage IV) present, but New England pottery is notoriously poorly defined for dating purposes.

Unprovenienced pottery found at the edge of the site is shown in Figure 9. Figure 10 shows a deposit of large *Mya* shells, which were stacked like dishes, and Figure 11 shows a hearth feature (No. 23). Figure 12 shows the site layout with features, and Appendix IV gives a summary of the contents of 21 features at the site.
Figure 6. Artifacts recovered from the lower 1/3 of stratum II at the Howland Orchard Site: 1: Orient Fishtail point; 2: plain drill; 3: soapstone fragment; 4: potsherd (grit & shell temper); 5: end scraper; 6: possible graver; 7: undecorated potsherd; 8: bone tool from deer ulna with incised markings; 9: crescent-shaped knife form (serrated); 10: small triangular point; 11: quartz burin; 12: antler tine; 13: basal fragment of tool; 14: corner-notched type of point; 15: celt (polished).
Figure 9. Grit, shell, and bark tempered pottery sherds recovered at edge of site.

Figure 10. Large *Mya* shells (9" x 4&1/2") (23 x 11 cm), found stacked like dishes.

Figure 11. Hearth feature No. 23.
INTERPRETIVE EVALUATION AND COMMENTS

**Stratum 2:** The blackish shell layer being of a compact density, showed overlapping cultural shell and camp rubbish without perfect chronological definition. It would seem that the inhabitants produced the shell refuse at the Howland Orchard Shell Midden from the Transitional or Early Woodland, through the Middle Woodland, and just into the Late Woodland Period. Diagnostic point styles such as Orient Fishtail, Side Notched, Rossville (2), Lagoon, Greene, Jack's Reef pentagonal, Levanna triangle (3), together with clay potsherds of grit and shell tempering (Stages I, II, and possibly III) are the indicators of this interpretation. A Late Archaic Brewerton was out of place in the middle of the midden, and untyped small triangles increased in numbers toward the top of the midden. Bone tools and occasional point fragments made up the bulk of the residual recoveries. Fire altered stones were scattered throughout.

**Stratum 3:** Immediately below the midden, artifacts of a Late Archaic origin were revealed, such as Snook Kill, an Eared Brewerton point, and sherds of steatite vessels. Note that the Susquehanna tradition points at this site are not associated with shell. Twelve inches (30 cm) below the shell mass, two broken points of the Middle Archaic hastate form (Neville-like) were recovered.

Features such as cooking pits, stone hearths, fire pits, and a large 4 ft. by 6 ft. (1.2m x 1.8m) squarish stone platform, possibly for drying or roasting, seemed to indicate that this shell accumulation area was used as a food preparation locus. This assumption is based on the large number of artifacts surface collected by the Howland family from the upper slopes and level areas of the farm, most likely the main habitation area. The bone implements, chipped stone tools, potsherds, and other articles amidst the shell were probably due to accidental loss when dumping food residue and camp trash.

CONCLUSIONS

It does appear that there are many similarities between the types and sequence of artifacts recovered at this Duxbury shell midden and middens at Martha's Vineyard. At the lower levels of our excavation, however, we did not find the expected Wading River, Squibnocket Stemmed, and Squibnocket Triangular points, with or without shell. Not found in the shell midden were Jack's Reef Corner-Notched and Steubenville Stemmed (Fox Creek). We recovered no agricultural tools nor Contact goods in our excavation. The site does not appear to have been occupied in the Contact period.

We would now accept that the two locations are related within the proposed "Framework for the Prehistory of Southern New England," the exception being that the Late Archaic is better defined for Ritchie's six sites at the Vineyard. It is also evident that the Howland Orchard Shell Midden is an important segment in a study in coastal ecology and adaptation, and needs more study (excavation and interpretation) in order to fully understand its story of usage.

A systematic excavation of a shell dump can provide a wealth of information from the bone preserving action of the shell that reveals the use of a variety of mammals and avians by the prehistoric inhabitants (Appendix II). The predominate bone material of the Howland midden was of the white-tailed deer, followed
Denotes area excavated by Massasoit Chapter.
Figure 12. Howland Orchard Site Shell Midden Grid, showing Site Layout, with Features.
secondly by the remains of beaver. The almost complete skeletal remains of a skunk in articulation were recovered. Several compact clusters of very small unidentifiable avian bones were found. They may have been of fledglings or immature birds.

An easy distance to the harbor and shellfish beds, a fresh running spring-fed brook, a well-drained living area; all these attributes were why the Howland farm was a choice site for a succession of early Americans.

Acknowledgements: Special thanks to Tonya Largy - Consultant in Archaeology for her identification of bone recoveries, and for encouraging us to publish this report. Also our gratitude to Elizabeth Little for her encouragement, suggestions, and editorial efforts.
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APPENDIX I: SHELL ANALYSIS AT THE HOWLAND ORCHARD SITE, by Russell Holmes

Shellfish present at Howland Orchard Site Midden:
- Softshell Clam (Mya arenaria)
- Quahog (Mercenaria mercenaria)
- Blue Mussel (Mytilus edulis)
- Bay Scallop (Aequipecten irradians)
- Razor Clam (Ensis directus)
- Ribbed Mussel (Modiolus demissus)
- Moon Snail (Lunatia heros)
- Sea Clam (Spisula solidissima)
- Virginia Oyster (Crassostrea virginica)
- Boat Shell (Crepidula fornicata)

Samples of shell midden refuse were taken from the shell midden (stratum II) (see Figure 12 for
locations). The upper and lower halves of the midden layer were analysed separately for the purpose of determining the frequency of species present.

**Shell Test “A” (12”x12”x7” [30 x 30 x 18 cm³]).** The upper half sample consisted almost exclusively of softshell clam - badly broken up (probably by trampling) - and loosely packed. The remainder consisted of 2 small pieces of broken bone and 6 pieces of broken quahog shell, probably representing about 2 whole quahogs. No chips were present.

The lower half sample consisted of approximately 75% softshell clam, 25% quahog, and a single shell of razor clam. Also present were a few quartz and felsite chips and 12 small pieces of broken bone. The entire sample of the lower half was closely packed - the softshell clam shells being badly broken up. This sample contained a shell volume four times larger than that of the upper half.

**Shell Test “B” (12”x12”x8” [30 x 30 x 20 cm³]).** The upper half sample of 1/8 cup of midden refuse was found to be 90% softshell clam, 10% quahog, and 2 small pieces of broken bone. The entire sample was fragmented into very small pieces.

The volume of the lower half was approximately the same as that of the upper half, and was composed of 95% softshell clam, less than 5% quahog, 7 small pieces of razor clam shell, 2 felsite chips, and 1 small piece of broken bone. This, as the upper half, was fragmented into very small pieces.

**APPENDIX II: ANIMAL SPECIES IDENTIFIED AT THE HOWLAND ORCHARD SHELL MIDDEN**

by Tonya Largy, Zooarchaeology Lab, Peabody Museum, Harvard

Remains Present In Howland Orchard Site Shell Midden

Raccoon, Beaver, Deer, Skunk, Chipmunk, Woodchuck, Gray Fox, Turkey, Duck (Species Unknown), many bones of immature birds.

Immature Bird Bones at the Howland Orchard Site

A well-preserved collection of non-calci­ned animal bone was recovered from unrecorded proveniences at the Howland Orchard site, a coastal shell midden in Duxbury, Massachusetts. The assemblage included mammal, bird and fish bone. Of special interest is the occurrence of numerous bones of immature birds. The elements represented included the tarsometatarsus (the lower leg bone), and the humerus (the upper arm bone in the wing).

The tarsometatarsus is unfused, indicating a very young bird. Two species of birds are present in the assemblage. However, because a comparative collection of immature bird skeletons is not available, the species cannot be identified. Their presence in such numbers in the assemblage indicates a period of habitation in the spring of the year, possibly from mid to late June.

Several hypotheses can be made regarding the prehistoric exploitation of such young birds. One hypothesis is that the birds were taken from eggs before hatching. A second hypothesis is that the birds are hatchlings, or fledglings that were collected from the nests of a breeding colony of coastal birds before attain­ning fusion of the tarsometatarsus. Thirdly, the young birds may have been collected for their downy feathers for some unknown purpose.

The young bird bones from the Howland
Orchard site have shown the necessity for including immature birds in modern reference collections of skeletons. Species identifications can be made only when these are available for comparison with bird bones of the same developmental age from archaeological sites. When the species is known, then conclusions can be drawn about the environment and subsistence strategies of coastal dwellers.

Copyright 1995 Tonya Baroody Largy

APPENDIX III: CERAMICS, by Bernard Otto

Approximately 175 sherds of pottery were recovered at the midden site and isolated refuse pits and hearths. These sherds average about 2.5 cm in length and breadth. The fracture ends are eroded, probably due to natural elements and trampling. Thus, trying to join two or more of these fragments is difficult. Also, with the exception of some refuse pits that yielded a few sherds of the same vessel, most of these fragments were widely scattered throughout the midden. 75% of these recovered sherds represent stage I (grit or mineral temper of pulverized quartz, thick walled). The remaining 25% represent stage II (crushed clam shell or shell and grit temper, relatively thinner walled; often decorated near the rim). Possibly some stage III (finer temper) was present. No stage IV (thin walled Late Woodland) pottery was present. See Hoffman (1991) for a recent guide to these pottery types.

Some insides appear to be wiped with grasses. Others smoothed by scraping with clam shell. Some sherds are blackened deeply by possible use of charcoal and animal fat. One or two body sherds show what look like finger marks. Body sherds in general wrapped stick malleated.

The largest pieces of grit ware of the same vessel were uncovered at the bottom of a refuse pit in very poor condition. This was a large, well-made pot with outflaring neck and waffle-like traced design with same design flaring at an angle toward body ending in deeply incised line circumventing body proper. As usual, bottom sherds were not found.

Characteristics of Illustrated Howland Site Pottery:

Figure 6 (4) and (7): grit and shell temper body sherds, tool smoothed interior and exterior. Stage 2.

Figure 7 (13) body sherd, (16) rim sherd, and (18) rim sherd: grit and shell temper, tool smoothed interior and exterior. Stage 2.

Figure 8 (1): body sherd, shell temper, cord malleated, interior wiped. Stage 2.


(3): interior body sherd, shell temper, wiped surface.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEATURE</th>
<th>Firestone</th>
<th>Charcoal</th>
<th>Hearth Stones</th>
<th>Shell</th>
<th>Bone</th>
<th>Potsherds</th>
<th>Chips and Flakes</th>
<th>Artifacts</th>
<th>Probable Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. 1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Firepit Refuse pit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Firepit Refuse pit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Firepit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Firepit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Firepit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Firepit Refuse pit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Refuse pit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Earth oven Refuse pit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Refuse pit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Firepit Refuse pit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Refuse pit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Firepit Refuse pit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Refuse pit (Razor clam)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Animal burial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Earth oven Refuse pit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Refuse pit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Refuse pit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Refuse pit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Firepit Refuse pit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Refuse pit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Refuse pit w/Ash</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MASSASOIT AND HIS TWO SONS: WAMSUTTA AND METACOM

George R. Horner

Massasoit had five children: three sons and two daughters. This paper will focus on his two older sons Wamsutta and Metacom. The question of Massasoit’s relationship to these sons, also known as Alexander and Philip, has been raised by an obscure publication, reprinted by the University of Michigan in 1966. The claim that Massasoit was the grandfather of Wamsutta and Metacom was presented in an interesting but undocumented narrative titled: The Present State of New-England with Respect to the Indian War, Together with most Remarkable Passages that have happened from 20th of June, til the 10 November 1675. This narrative was "faithfully composed by a Merchant of Boston; communicat­ed to his friend in London" and published on December 13, 1675 by Roger L’Estrange of that city (L’Estrange [1675] 1966:1; Easton [1699] 1913:24).

Support for the theory of the unknown Boston merchant appeared in a 1989 article by Betty G. Schroeder in the publication of the New England Historic Genealogical Society (Schroeder 1989:211-213). Schroeder abstracted two of the four references from the Narrative, calling them "treaties," and offering them as proof that Massasoit was not the father of Alexander or Philip. These so-called "treaties" are, in fact, confused and sometimes inaccurate allusions to actual events that can be documented in historical records. Such claims need clarification. To do so we will examine each of the two "treaties" in the Narrative quoted by Schroeder. Quotations from some of Massasoit's contemporaries will follow. These will include William Bradford, G. Mourt, John Smith, John Easton, Roger Williams, Nathaniel Morton, and the Rev. William Hubbard. Plymouth Court Records and Orders will complete the clarification process.

Treaty I. "I thought it needful to acquaint you that on the 21st day of March, Anno. 1621, the English made a League of Peace with Massasoit, who was the Grand-father to the present King Philip," wrote the Boston Merchant (L’Estrange [1675] 1966:1). Neither Mourt (1622:37) nor Nathaniel Morton (1669:21) make mention of Philip or a grandson in connection with this meeting.

Schroeder’s (1989:213) case is further based on the following: "When, on the 25th day of September, in the year 1639, this great Sa­chem Massasoit, with Moanam his Son, came personally to the Court held at Plimouth in New England...." (L’Estrange [1675] 1966:16). Indeed, a Memorandum in a Plimouth Court Order of 1639 does read: "...Vssamequin and Mooanam, his sonn, came into the Court in their owne pper psons (proper persons), and desired that the auncient league & confederacy...may stand and remain inviolable..." (Records 1639:1, 133). There are a number of ways to spell and pronounce "Vssamequin" (Massasoit). The "V" can be either a "W", "A", or "Ou."

Treaty II. The second "treaty" (L’Estrange 1675:17), reads: "Anno. 1662. There being occasion of some suspition of a Plot intend­ed by the Indians against the English; by Philip, the Son of the aforesaid Moanam, the Grandson of Massasoit...." (Schroeder 1989:214). Here the records in Plymouth say that the Plymouth Court ordered Philip to appear in Court and to account for the rumor of a threatened uprising.
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Philip "absolutely deneyed that hee had any plovt...against the English; and offered his broth­er (Sunconewhew) as hostage, which the Court considered as unnecessary." Later that day at a Court of Assistants, "Philip did earnestly desire the continuance of friendship between this gov­ernment and his deceased father and brother..." (Order 1662, IV:25, par 28,29). Except for the date of the Order and for the signature of witness John Sassamon, there is no similarity between the alleged "treaty" and the Court Order (Order 1662 IV:25, par 28,29), and certainly no mention of Moanam.

Puckanoket/Wompanoag Indian Names

At this point, a valid question may be asked: How can we account for different names, often for the same individual? It never remotely occurred to the 17th century Plymouthers that changes in Native names reflected changes in age, social status, and responsibilities. The English had no comparable custom. The "at­birth" names of Massasoit (Woosamequin), Wamsutta, and Metacom are not known. Early 1630 records began to distinguish between "Mas­sasoit" (Great Leader), i.e., his title, and "Oussa­maquin" (Yellow Feather), his given adult name. These records also noted that his title was pronounced Ma-sas-so-it (Bradford 1912:200, fn 1). The Pilgrims first called Massasoit's people the "Massasoits". "This morning," March 17, 1621, "we send Samoset to the Massasoits, our next neighbor (from) whence he came..." (Morton 1669:65).

On his second voyage to New England in 1614, Captain John Smith wrote of the "King of the Massasysys" (Smith 1624, 6:233).

Governor John Winthrop writing in his Diary of April 12, 1632, noted that: "the Naraganset Indians...set upon an English house...and have taken Owasamequin, Sagamore of the Packanocott" (Winthrop [1632] 1825:72). Roger Williams ([1643] 1973:15) lived in Plymouth from 1631 to 1635 as a teacher in the church and friend to the Indians. While at Plymouth he had almost daily contact with the Sachem, whom he knew by both his title and his given name. "The present county of Bristol was occupied by the tribe of Wampanoags under a sachem Oussamequin or Massasoit" (R.I.H.S. Collections III,1835:2). The name Moanam never appeared in William's writings.

Plymouth Court Records note that between 1642 and 1659 there were at least five major land conveyances (deeds) signed by Oussamequin. There is no record of Massasoit's signature for any reason during his life-time. One significant land sale made by Oussamequin reads: "...I Oussamequin and Wamsutta my sonne have sold to William Bradford, captaine Standish, Thomas Southworth, John Winslow,...a tract of land..." (Records 1652 II:109). Each of these men, as well as other colonists, knew the difference between a given name and a title.

If the Moanam of 1639 was Massasoit's oldest son, by 1652 he could have reached adulthood. With his adult name, Wamsutta, the eldest son of Assamequin was next in line for the hereditary sachemship. Massasoit/Assamequin died either in late spring or early summer of 1660, at a probable age of between 65 and 70 (the 400th anniversary of his birth will be sometime during this present decade.) After his father's death, Wamsutta went to Plymouth and requested the Court to change his name. The Court Order reads as follows: "At the earnest request of Wamsitta, desiring that in regard his father is lately deceased, and he being desirouse, according to the custome of the natives to change his name, that the court would confer an English name upon him, which accordingly they, and therefore ordered, that for the future hee shall bee called by the name of Alexander Pokan­okett; and desiringe the same in behalfe of his brother, they have named him Philip" (Order 1660 III:192). Alexander (Wamsutta) was
scarcely in office a year when he died while a captive enroute from his Monponset village to Plymouth to stand trial for selling land to Providence (Hubbard [1677] 1865:44-50). Philip (Metacom) inherited the sachemship in 1662. These records should leave no doubt either of Wamsutta’s (Alexander’s) or Metacom’s (Philip’s) parentage: both were the sons of Massasoit (Assamequin).

The Narrative, written by an unknown Boston Merchant, may have introduced an early name for Wamsutta (Moanam), but appears to have erred about the parentage of Philip. In 1913, Charles H. Lincoln edited a book titled *Narratives of the Indian Wars 1675-1699*, by John Easton. In his introduction, he speculated that Richard Hutchinson, nephew of Anne Hutchinson, was the "Merchant of Boston." His father of the same name was a wealthy ironmonger in London to whom, possibly, this letter was addressed.

**Acknowledgments:** In particular, I wish to thank Mrs Martha Campbell, former Plymouth Colony Archivist, for her assistance in providing me with copies of the 17th century Court Records as well as sharing with me her knowledge and insight of the early Pilgrim years; Mrs Frances Leach, Fellow, Pilgrim Society, for pointing me toward relevant historic references; my wife for her suggestions; and Betty Little, for ensuring the printability of this article.

**CITED REFERENCES**

Bradford, William


Easton, John


Hubbard, Rev. William


L'Estrange/Newman


Morton, Nathaniel


Mourt, G.


Schroeder, Betty


Smith, John


Williams, Roger


Winthrop, John


*Court Records and Orders of New Plimouth in New England*

1639 Records Vol. I:133
1660 Orders Vol.III:192
1652 Records Vol. II:109
1662 Orders Vol.IV:25, par 28-29

*Collections: Rhode Island Historical Society*

In Memoriam: Ralph S. Bates, 1906-1994

by S. Mabel Bates

Ralph Samuel Bates, a past president of the Massachusetts Archaeological Society died in February. He was professor emeritus at Bridgewater State College for many years. Born in Oshkosh, WI, son of the late Samuel and Alice McLaughn Bates, he received a bachelor’s and a master’s degree from the University of Rochester. He earned a masters’ degree and his doctorate (1938) from Harvard University.

In 1945 he authored the book, Scientific Societies of the United States, a copy of which was chosen for the White House Library. He began his teaching career in the history department of MIT and later taught at Brown University and Findlay College before coming to Bridgewater State College, where he was acting chairman of the history department, chairman of the economics department, and the first archivist of the college. According to his students he taught history as though he had been there.

During World War II, Ralph served in the 51st Brigade Field Artillery, the Infantry, and the Air Force. He was stationed at Camp Edwards with the Yankee Division and later, at Eglin Air Force Base. He retired from the Air Force Reserve with the rank of Major. He was president of the Old Bridgewater Historical Society 1957-1976, chairman of the Bridgewater Historical Commission 1976-1984, and a member of the Bridgewater Conservation Commission. He belonged to the Central Square Congregational Church. In addition to his wife, S. Mabel (Thombs) Bates, he is survived by two sons, Thomas S. and James R., and a granddaughter, Michelle Marie.

Ralph was a 38-year member of the Massachusetts Archaeological Society, serving as chairman of the Cohannet Chapter and president of the Society 1971-1973, corresponding secretary 1976-1984, and archivist, from 1982. I remember his saying that he became interested in archaeology through digging with Ritchie. That would have been in Rochester, NY. Soon after we came to Bridgewater in 1952, he saw a notice in the paper about a dig in Middleboro. He wasted no time but took us down that very weekend to visit and to join! It was always good for a discussion as to who joined first, Ralph or Art Lord. Both claimed it. Ralph enjoyed the digging, I think first near the Water Superintendent’s cottage, for I remember the clambake we had there that year, and then at Wapanucket 6.

He gave quite a number of slide-talks to various chapters. For several years after his retirement he kept the Museum open every Monday, and about once a month I would go with him to catalog the Library. Doc would drop in to open his mail, and sometimes J.J. Rivard would be there. Visitors and researchers were pleased to find it open on a weekday.

His father had taken him out to observe Halley’s comet when he was only four years old, so he was one of the few people to observe the comet twice. A member and president of the Bond Astronomical Club meeting at Harvard, he was a Variable Star observer, a Sun Spot observer, and a Sputnik observer, reporting his observations regularly to the Smithsonian (Cambridge). He was always interested in science and the history of science.
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In Memoriam: Arthur C. Lord, Sr., 1911-1994

by Elisabeth Ehlers McGrath

Arthur Cole Lord, Sr. passed on quietly in his sleep this spring. He had been in the yard raking leaves. Arthur was a lifelong resident of Bridgewater. He mentioned a long time ago that he could never remember when he had not been interested in history. If you knew Art, you would be awed by the amount of information that he had collected. I seriously doubt that he ever forgot anything. The Reverend Nickerson of the Central Square Congregational Church mentioned in his eulogy in April that Arthur was a walking encyclopedia. One only had to mention a fact or ask a question and Art would be able to add to the conversation or more than likely straighten out some misinformation. He kept records of almost every historical place in the area.

I first met Art and Doris, his wife, also deceased, at Wapanucket #6. The archaeologists were digging in our backyard behind our garage at Lakeside. My father Bill Ehlers had already taken an interest in archaeology in New York and was thrilled that even on a summer vacation he got to do what he liked best, dig. I was about seven years old, and it was 1955. I remember that because there was certain etiquette required of all children: no running or jumping in or over or between backfills, because it could collapse a sidewall and make it more difficult for a person digging, or you could get hurt if you fell on a grid stake. I’m sure Arthur and Doc Robbins spoke to me about just that.

Our highlight of the summer would be the Tour de Arthur or Tour de Lord, which we found amusing and were never disappointed. We would all climb into Art and Dots’ car and the tour would unfold, with back roads, millsites, furnaces, boat ramps from the 1600s, natural anomalies, old sites, old houses, old bridges, you name it, always informative and fun.


He was an electrician for 30 years and a member of the Electrical Union Local 223. He also worked at Bethlehem Steel in Quincy. He was also a member of the Fellowship Masonic Lodge of Bridgewater, AF&AM. As a member of the Bridgewater Historical Collectors, Art worked on several publications: Tales Around the Common 1988, The Crane History of Bridgewater and The Crane Family 1986, and A Pictorial History, Bridgewater, Massachusetts 1986. His sister, Dorothy Lord Mann, also a Bridgewater Historical Collector, helped coordinate these publications.

We were going to do the North Middleboro or Titicut Parish Tour, where historical and archaeological time periods overlap, for Massachusetts Archaeology Week in 1994. Two summers ago he had explained to me how archaeologically and historically significant the area was. I managed with the information he had given me. I can only imagine how much more could have been added if he had been there.

He is survived by a son and daughter-in-law, Arthur C. Lord, Jr. and Vivian (Gasper) Lord of Millersville, PA, two grandchildren, Kathy Dittman and Bruce Lord, and two great-grandchildren, Sarah and Andrew Dittman.
by Ginger Andrews and Elizabeth A. Little

Clint Andrews, whose roots went way back on Nantucket Island, kept detailed records of his observations and shared his great store of knowledge of the island, its natural history, and its archaeology with interested researchers. He provided me (EAL) a great deal of information relevant to coastal subsistence patterns, and he and I co-authored several published articles.

James Clinton Andrews, a son of James S. and Elizabeth Andrews, was born on Nantucket on July 10, 1914. He graduated from Nantucket High School and served in the Coast Guard Reserve during World War II.

While he earned his living as a boatman, scalloper, and charter boat captain, he never stopped observing and learning about the natural world around him. He helped many visiting researchers with their projects, and contributed articles on natural history to numerous publications. He was a member of the Natural Science Committee of the Maria Mitchell Association and served on its Board of Managers. In later years he acted as a resident naturalist, working for the University of Massachusetts at the Nantucket Field Station. In the words of Director Wesley N. Tiffney, Jr., he "provided the essential local knowledge that frequently saved (students' and researchers') projects from disaster."
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Andrews' Publications
A BRIEF NOTE TO CONTRIBUTORS

The Editor solicits for publication original contributions related to the archaeology of Massachusetts. Manuscripts should be sent to the Editor for evaluation and comment. Authors of articles submitted to the Bulletin of the Massachusetts Archaeological Society are requested to follow the style guide for American Antiquity 57:749-770 (1992). Radiocarbon ages should be reported as radiocarbon years (14C yrs) ± sigma (σ) B.P. Please state whether δ13C-corrected (give δ13C) or uncorrected and what material was assayed. If you wish to calibrate to tree-ring years, give source of calibration curve. Authors with MAC and IBM-PC compatibles are encouraged to mail floppy disks with files in WordPerfect 5.1 or ASCII to the editor. High density disks are preferred and disks can be returned. Additional instructions for authors may be found in the Bulletin of the Massachusetts Archaeological Society, Volume 55 (2), (1994).

Reviewed by Barbara E. Luedtke

Everyone reading this review has probably been faced with the problem of what to recommend to a family member, friend, or acquaintance who expresses an interest in learning about the archaeology of this region. Most of us have wished there was a book somewhere between *The New England Indians* by C. Keith Wilbur (lively but idiosyncratic) and *The Archaeology of New England* by Dean R. Snow (expensive and intended for a scholarly audience). Now Esther and David Braun have written a book that fills the gap. Written in clear and non-technical style, *The First Peoples of the Northeast* is a fine first book to recommend for people who are interested in the history of native peoples in this region in particular, or who are interested in archaeology in general.

For the most part, the book is organized chronologically. An "Introduction" discusses archaeology's role in learning about human cultural development throughout the world. Chapter 1, "The Ice Ages and the First Americans," introduces glaciation, glacial land forms, and the first peopling of the Americas. Chapter 2, "The Last Ice Age and the First People of the Northeast" discusses the PaleoIndian period. Chapters 3 ("The Early and Middle Archaic Periods"), 4 ("The Late Archaic Period"), 5 ("The Early and Middle Woodland Periods"), and 6 ("The Late Woodland Period") describe the artifacts, economy, seasonal round, housing, and way of life of the peoples of each of these periods. Chapter 7, "European Contact" talks about early interactions between the native peoples of the Northeast and Europeans, beginning with the Vikings. It ends with the important point that native peoples still live here and have maintained many of their traditions despite centuries of pressure to abandon them. Chapter 8, "Archaeology and Conservation" speaks eloquently about the need for conserving and protecting archaeological sites. Two useful appendices are included as well. Appendix A, "How Archaeology Works," is a concise summary of our major methods of survey, excavation, and analysis. Appendix B, "Places to See Archaeological Exhibits and Report Archaeological Finds" is sure to draw many new visitors to regional museums and may also help protect sites. At the end are an index and a bibliography, including suggestions for further reading.

Syntheses of regional archaeology are notoriously difficult to write and inevitably easy to criticize. First, an enormous amount of information must be synthesized, and much of the most up-to-date information is in relatively inaccessible sources such as contract reports and unpublished dissertations. Second, in order to generalize and make the main outlines of the past clear it is necessary to ignore or suppress some of the regional and temporal variation. Generalization is especially difficult in this case, because the Northeast is defined as stretching from New York City to Labrador, and inland as far as Lake Erie. This large region encompasses several very different environ-
ments, and human adaptations to these environments were necessarily quite different. Third, any book wishing to present complex information to a general audience must simplify somewhat. As a result, in this book, as in any synthesis, readers will find generalizations they disagree with, and even a few errors.

Nevertheless, The First Peoples of the Northeast has many strengths, and there are several points that I especially like. First and foremost, both illustrations and text emphasize that archaeology is ultimately about real people and their activities in the past, not just about artifacts, stratigraphy, and theoretical models. Drawings of seasonal activities for each time period are especially helpful in making the past come alive. In fact, the authors and the Lincoln Historical Society are to be commended for the high quality of all the illustrations and photographs, as well as the quality of the printing and of the paper. I also like the book’s strong emphasis on conservation of archaeological resources, and its view of archaeology as an ongoing process. Archaeological methods are addressed in Appendix A specifically, but throughout the text there are also brief explanations of how archaeologists get the facts we use to build up our story of the past. Thus, this book tells a good story, but it also demonstrates how much more there is still to be learned, and why we must all work together to protect the archaeological resources that are our major source of information about so much of this region’s past.
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