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EDITOR’S NOTE

We are pleased to reprint Brona Simon’s obituary of Dr. Barbara Luedtke from the Bulletin of the Society of American Archaeology, together with reminiscences from two colleagues, and a paper dedicated to Barbara by Alan Leveillee on differing perceptions of archaeological meaning. It is expected that papers that were given in her honor at the Annual Meeting, Spring 2000, will be published in next year’s Spring issue, 2002.

The Fall issue, 2001, will honor Russell Gardner (Great Moose). It was decided in deference to Wampanoag custom to wait a year since his passing.

In this issue William Taylor describes sets of several types of narrow triangular points, often overlooked because they are usually found singly, and the early dates that may be attributed to them. Jay Waller’s and Alan Leveillee’s paper shows how Pre-Contact graves can be associated with the Narragansett. Unusual artifacts continue to be explored in Bill Moody’s paper and the Letters to the Editor section, and Philip Brady provides references demonstrating the historical use of wampum.
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IN MEMORIAM: BARBARA E. LUEDTKE

1948-2000

Brona Simon

Barbara E. Luedtke, 52, died in Boston on May 2, 2000 after fighting cancer over the past few years. Determined not to let the disease slow her down, Luedtke concentrated on the things that made her happy and fulfilled - archaeology, teaching, writing, traveling, and singing in a local choir. Luedtke was professor of anthropology at the University of Massachusetts at Boston, where she had taught since 1974 and had served as departmental chair. She also taught lithic analysis at the Center for Materials Research in Archaeology and Ethnology at MIT, serving as its associate director from 1991-1994.

Born in Milwaukee, Luedtke grew up near San Diego, California. She graduated from Pomona College magna cum laude and Phi Beta Kappa, and earned a Ph.D. from the University of Michigan in 1976. Her doctoral research on lithic materials from the Woodland period in Michigan started her on a lifelong career in lithic studies. Her seminal work, An Archaeologist’s Guide to Chert and Flint (1992, reprinted in 1994, by UCLA’s Institute of Archaeology) is widely used as a reference by lithic specialists throughout the world. Transplanted from the West Coast to the East Coast, Barbara took on research in the Northeast with fervor and creativity. In 1975, she launched a pioneering survey to identify prehistoric sites on the islands in Boston Harbor, and continued her investigations by directing many seasons of field schools and CRM surveys since then. Through multidisciplinary studies of the archaeology and geology of the Harbor Island sites, Luedtke filled in large gaps in the understanding of Native American coastal and maritime adaptations over the past several thousand years. Most recently, she tackled the research question of identifying prehistoric social boundaries by analyzing archaeological and ecological data from sites in the Boston area.

Luedtke made important contributions to lithic studies in the Northeast through many published...
articles and collaboration with lithic specialists and geologists in the region. She made an open call for the development of regional databases for the identification of lithic materials beyond visual inspection, by using thin-section petrographic and geochemical analyses. Her call did not fall on deaf ears, as many of her colleagues have seriously taken up her cause.

Luedtke’s recent publications on the lithic technology of historic-period gunflints in the Northeast have provided an important analytical perspective for archaeologists. By examining flaking patterns, Luedtke was able to distinguish gunflints made by European manufacturers from those made by local colonists or Native Americans. In far contrast, Luedtke researched lithic technologies of early sites in Patagonia that had been excavated by Junius Bird, through a Collections Study Grant from the American Museum of Natural History.

Luedtke was an enthusiastic teacher who provided support and guidance to her students at UMASS and MIT. Many of her students have continued on in careers in archaeology. In addition to teaching courses on New England prehistory, lithic analysis, archaeological science, huntergatherers, and method and theory to anthropology majors, Barbara sought to reach out to the general student body by teaching a course called "Archaeological Facts and Fantasies." Using archaeological data, logic, and reasoning, students learned how to dispel myths concerning aliens, Precolumbian visitors to the New World, and other fantasies made popular through fiction, television, and dubious media coverage.

Luedtke’s public service record was outstanding. One of her favorite organizations was the Massachusetts Archaeological Society, whose membership is chiefly comprised of avocational or amateur archaeologists. "Amateurs are on the front lines," she once said. "They have so much enthusiasm to harness." To focus that energy, Barbara encouraged amateurs to document and inventory their artifact collections and to help conserve sites. As the editor of the *Bulletin of the Massachusetts Archaeological Society* from 1980-1986, she fostered contributions of site reports from avocationalists, many of whom had never published before.

Luedtke was active in many professional organizations, especially SAA, serving on and as chair of the Fryxell Award and Book Award Committees, and as a member of the Committee on Public Archaeology (COPA). She also served on the Conference on New England Archaeology Steering Committee and was secretary-treasurer of the Society for Archaeological Sciences. She was a member of the Massachusetts Review Board, serving as a commissioner of the Massachusetts Historical Commission from 1990-2000. In 1999, she received the SAA’s Award for Excellence in Lithic Studies. In 1988, she was given a Preservation Award as part of the Massachusetts Historical Commission’s special 25th Anniversary Awards.

Her publications total over 30 articles and monographs, 20 technical reports, and numerous small articles and pamphlets. Luedtke made important contributions in academic archaeology, science, CRM, and education. Her positive outlook, support of her colleagues, and enthusiasm for life and solving the mysteries of the past were her trademarks. Barbara influenced many other archaeologists, anthropologists, students, avocationalists, Native Americans, and the general public. She is sorely missed.

*Article reprinted from the Bulletin of the Society for American Archaeology, volume 18, number 4, page 17, with permission.*
REMINISCENCES OF DR. BARBARA LUEDTKE:

This is a difficult letter to write. There is so much to say. Barbara was such a special friend, colleague, and mentor to me and to us all. She was a wonderfully relentless and careful scientist. What she learned she shared with the rest of us. She even wrote a book about chert just for us packed with information as well as ideas and suggestions for further research.

Last year she called to ask if I was going to the SAA meeting. Because I would not be there, she shared with me in her modest way that she was going to be given an award by the SAA in recognition of her years of work in lithic research. She was so pleased. Archaeologists across the country valued her work.

We in New England have been fortunate to have her in our midst. For me, her 1980 unpublished manuscript about volcanics in the Boston area, identification, and source attribution was seminal to my own research. I always looked for Barb in the audience when I was presenting papers to see her reaction to my observations and conclusions. I was hoping that she would be nodding her head in agreement.

Barb and I loved to “talk rocks.” We would seek each other out to share the latest information that we had learned however arcane. She knew what I was talking about, would correct me when necessary, and shared in my excitement.

Now she has quietly slipped away leaving us her research as a gift. Our memories of her and her graciousness are gifts as well. It was a pleasure and honor to know her. I will always miss her.

Barbara Calogero

I first met Barbara when I visited her anthropology department as a prospective graduate student in 1986. She eventually served as a member of my M.A. thesis committee and happily joined in my graduation celebration. When I began to work in cultural resource management Barbara provided professional guidance and friendly support and she was often the first person I appealed to for professional references.

As a colleague I respected Barbara’s rigorous scholarship, her limitless, unselfish support of students and avocational archaeologists, and her fair and balanced review of other academics. As both a colleague and a friend what I most respected about Barbara was her personal integrity. Apart from a single hilarious observation about a public figure, neither in public nor in private did I ever hear Barbara undermine the work of other archaeologists or academics. I celebrate Barbara’s integrity and cherish her memory.

Joyce Clements
NARROW TRIANGULAR POINTS IN SOUTHEASTERN MASSACHUSETTS:
A PALEOINDIAN-EARLY ARCHAIC TRANSITION?

William B. Taylor

It has become evident in recent years that many people, even professionals, have been calling all large triangular points Levanna points. It is time to correct this problem by pointing out the existence of much earlier triangles.

The Narrow Triangular points presented in this article are quite different in both shape, size, and manufacture from Levanna points of the Late Woodland period (A.D. 700 to A.D. 1350). These points possess the general traits of much earlier Clovis points, except they are shorter and have no flutes. However, all have a concave base with ears, and short thinning flakes are present, struck from the base towards the point on one or more sides. Some bases exhibit grinding or smoothing, especially on quartz examples. The edges are quite sharp and thin, with some examples having edge serrations. About midway along the sides close scrutiny sometimes reveals minute notches. This might make it easier to haft the blade to the spear shaft. The average Narrow Triangle has a basal width of 2.2 cm (7/8 in.) to 2.9 cm (1 1/8 in.) and is 4.8 cm (1 7/8 in.) to 5.4 cm (2 1/8 in.) long. Thickness measures 0.64 cm (1/4 in.) to 0.79 cm (5/16 in.).

After some research I found two references to this type of point. One book (Overstreet 1999) calls them Dalton Classic, Early Archaic 9500-8000 B.P. The other reference calls them Early Archaic Dalton with an age of 8280±80 B.P. at the Astra-3 site, Westborough, Massachusetts (Hoffman 2000, Smith 1994). There are several sub-types of Dalton that have been recognized under this term in the East. They all seem to be transitional forms from Paleoindian to the Early Archaic Period. (Dragoo 1982) The Massachusetts Historical Commission Guide to Prehistoric Site Files and Artifact Classification System (MHC 1984) calls them Dalton-Like and says they are extremely rare in eastern Massachusetts, but are more common in other areas such as the southeast or midwest where they are Paleoindian or Early Archaic in date.

Throughout the last 59 years of surface collecting in the Titicut area, I have noted 15 specimens that seem to fall within this classification. Favorite materials appear to be felsite and quartz, but argillite and jasper also occur. The lack of flint, chert, and other fine exotic materials is noticeable. All but one of my finds was made on known Early Archaic sites along the Taunton River or nearby tributary brooks. One brook site was located two miles from Titicut on the edge of a large swamp (Robbins 1967). Fifteen Dalton-Like points from the area of Berkley, Bridgewater, Middleborough, and Taunton, Massachusetts, and Tiverton, Rhode Island, are shown in Figure 1, and their specifications in Table 1.

The Taunton specimen (Figure 1, no. 9) came from the Frank Hammond collection. He hunted along the Three Mile River, in Taunton and Dighton, to the confluence of the Taunton River. This point is unique in that both sides have double notches just above the basal ears to facilitate hafting. There are deep thinning flakes on both sides of this quartz point.
Figure 1. Early Archaic Dalton-Like points from Taunton River Sites. All show some basal thinning; many exhibit serrations. Left to right: top row, 1-5; middle row, 6-10; bottom row 11-15. Data in Table 1.

Table 1. Data for points in Figure 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 1 Type</th>
<th>Length (cm)</th>
<th>Width (cm)</th>
<th>Thinning: No. of Sides</th>
<th>Thinning: Length of Flake(s)(cm)</th>
<th>Lithics</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top row 1</td>
<td>Dalton-Like</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1, 2.1</td>
<td>argillite</td>
<td>Titicut Site</td>
<td>Bridgewater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.64, 0.64</td>
<td>felsite</td>
<td>Seaver Farm</td>
<td>Bridgewater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 3</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.79, 0.95</td>
<td>felsite</td>
<td>Poor Farm</td>
<td>Bridgewater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 4</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1, 0.95</td>
<td>felsite</td>
<td>Kravitz Farm</td>
<td>Bridgewater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 5</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3, 1.3</td>
<td>felsite</td>
<td>Bay View Ave.</td>
<td>Berkley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle 6</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>Seaver Farm</td>
<td>Bridgewater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 7</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>Fort Hill</td>
<td>Middleborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 8</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.64, 0.95</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>Sapowet Ave.</td>
<td>Tiverton, RI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 9</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4, 1.9</td>
<td>quartz</td>
<td>Three Mile River</td>
<td>Taunton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 10</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom 11</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>felsite</td>
<td>Titicut Site</td>
<td>Bridgewater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 12</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>felsite</td>
<td>Titicut Area</td>
<td>Bridgewater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 13</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>jasper®</td>
<td>Titicut Site</td>
<td>Bridgewater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 14</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>felsite</td>
<td>Taylor Farm</td>
<td>Middleborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 15</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>felsite</td>
<td>Kravitz Farm</td>
<td>Bridgewater</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
① Numbers read from left to right in Figure 1.
② William Taylor
③ Elmer Wood
④ Frank Hammond
⑤ Pink jasper
One Titicut Site specimen of felsite (Figure 1, no. 11) has incurvate blade edges. The other Titicut Site Narrow Triangular specimen of argillite (Figure 1, no. 1) starts out straight from the base, with the incurvate narrowing occurring midway along the edges. Two felsite examples from Titicut and Kravitz Farm (Figure 1, nos. 12, 15) show asymmetrical resharpening on damaged points. A further Titicut point (Figure 1, no. 13) is made of a pink jasper. This point was dug by my father around 1949 at Titicut (l9-PL-161, MAS no. 4116), the only Dalton-Like point excavated. All the others are surface finds. The Berkley specimen (Figure 1, no. 5) came from the Elmer Wood collection. He collected along Bayview Avenue in Berkley.

Other collections with this type of Narrow Triangular point include the William Gingrass (Attleborough, Massachusetts) frame of points at the Robbins Museum (not illustrated). He collected at Diamond Hill in Cumberland, Rhode Island, and on other sites along the Blackstone River. There are three fine examples of Early Archaic Dalton-Like blades in this case, two of felsite and one of black flint.

Another fine collection of early points is the William Hallaren collection, on display at the Scituate Historical Society building on Cudworth Road, Scituate, Massachusetts. The Plymouth Street site in Bridgewater has many Bifurcate, Parallel Lanceolates, Neville, and other early types on display. Also Bill’s Bridge of Styles exhibit of early points from the North River drainage sites include Kirk Stemmed with fine serrations, Classic Eden, Parallel Stem, and Colbert-Greenbriar, forms from the 10,000-8,000 B.P. transitional period (Hallaren 1988). This exhibit is well worth the trip to study.

In 1992 and 1993 members of the W. Elmer Ekblaw Chapter excavated at the Astra Pharmaceutical site in Westborough, Massachusetts. During their excavation of Astra-3, a crystal quartz triangular point with a concave base was found and mislabeled a Levanna point (Smith 1994). Radiocarbon dating on charcoal confirms an age of 8,280±80 years B.P. (Beta-79094, corrected for δ13C). This age was corroborated by Dr. Curtiss Hoffman and places this Early Archaic Dalton-Like form at the close of the Early Archaic Period.

Other reports of radiocarbon ages from early sites include the Annasnappet site in North Carver, with nine radiocarbon dates between 8,300 to 7,300 B.P. One date 7,570±150 B.P. (Beta 58115) was from an old burial with Neville points and two perfect wing atlatl weights. Another early date was 7,880±240 B.P. (Beta 63078, from charcoal) (Doucette and Cross 1997). At the Bassett Knoll Site in Raynham, Massachusetts, two Early Archaic dates of 8480±140 B.P. (Beta 33410) and 8430±170 B.P. (Beta 35400) were obtained from charcoal samples recovered from a deep pit feature (Begley and Davin 1996). The Plymouth Street site in Bridgewater has early dates ranging from 7,850±70 B.P. to 7,980±200 B.P. (Beta 15192) for a Bifurcate occupation and Kirk Stemmed group (Hallaren 1988).

Other contemporaneous points from the Titicut area during this transitional period, some of which have basal thinning, include Parallel Lanceolates, Parallel Stem, and Eden-Like. (This typology follows Hoffman 1991, MHC 1984, Fowler 1963.) These early types are occasional finds on Early Archaic sites. Several examples are included in Figure No. 2.

This short article is submitted as a wake-up call to encourage further study. Collectors of Early Archaic sites should re-examine the assemblage of artifacts found on these sites, to see if they unknowingly have picked up any of these early transitional points. It is interesting to note that knappers of Early Archaic Dalton-Like points made
Figure 2. Early Archaic Blades from Taunton River Sites. Left to right: top row 1-5, Parallel Lanceolate; bottom row 6-8, Parallel Stem; bottom row 9-11, Eden-Like. Data in Table 2.

Table 2. Data for points in Figure 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 2 Type</th>
<th>Length (cm)</th>
<th>Width (cm)</th>
<th>Thinning: No. of Sides Length of Flake(s) (cm)</th>
<th>Lithics</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Town Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top row 1 Parallel Lanceolate</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>felsite</td>
<td>Seaver Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4, 1.6</td>
<td>felsite</td>
<td>Heinz Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.95, 1.6</td>
<td>felsite?</td>
<td>Sapowet Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.79, 1.3</td>
<td>quartz 3</td>
<td>Fort Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>hornfels</td>
<td>Seaver Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom 6 Parallel Stem</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>felsite</td>
<td>Three Mile River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>felsite</td>
<td>Bay View Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>flint?</td>
<td>Taylor Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>broken</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>felsite</td>
<td>Fort Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>felsite</td>
<td>Taylor Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>felsite</td>
<td>Fort Hill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
1 Numbers read from left to right in Figure 2
2 William Taylor
3 Black-veined quartz
4 Frank Hammond
5 Elmer Wood
good use of quartz, while knappers of Bifurcate, Eden-Like, Parallel Stem, and Parallel Lanceolate blades preferred felsite.

I have always thought that somewhere within the Titicut area a small Paleoindian site would be discovered. With the strong Early Archaic assemblage found here, it is not unreasonable to expect paleo-migrants to have passed through this district in earlier times. Much of the land on both sides of the Taunton River has been wooded and not open to cultivation within modern times, my own land included. There are some excellent locations for early sites on high ground that have never been excavated. With the recognition of these Early Archaic Dalton-Like points, we are one step closer.
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ARCHAEOLOGY AND MUNICIPAL BURIAL ORDINANCES: A CASE FROM NARRAGANSETT COUNTRY

Joseph N. Waller
Alan Leveillee

Abstract

In December 1999, house construction activities in Wakefield, Rhode Island, resulted in the unanticipated discovery of several pre-Contact Narragansett Indian burials. The proximity of this location to the nearby Woodland Period village and burial complex of RI 110 indicates likely association between the sites. The Christopher Street Site is further evidence that the shores of the upper Point Judith Pond represent a significant locus of First American settlement. The discovery of burials at Christopher Street suggests the possibility of additional graves in proximity, and that elements of a larger site complex extending from the nearby village may be located in the immediate vicinity.

Introduction

The shores around the extensive salt marshes and tidal mudflats of the Point Judith Pond estuary of southern Rhode Island were a focus of pre-Contact Native American occupation, settlement, exploitation, and burial for over 1,000 years. Professional and avocational investigations conducted along these shorelines have resulted in the identification of numerous Native American archaeological sites situated along the salt marsh periphery. The Christopher Street site, located near the confluence of the freshwater Saugatucket River and the upper Point Judith Pond estuary, and immediately southeast of the freshwater Silver Lake, consists of several burials recently unearthed during construction of a single-family house. The site is situated approximately 650 meters (m) west northwest of the large pre-Contact Narragansett village and burial complex of RI 110, located immediately east of the South Kingstown and Narragansett town line (Leveillee and Harrison 1996; Waller 2000). Considering the nature of the Christopher Street site burials, it is likely that the site is temporally and culturally associated with the larger RI 110 site complex. Taken as a whole, these sites indicate a significant locus of pre-Contact Narragansett settlement focused at the head of the Point Judith Pond estuary of southern Rhode Island.

Project History

Excavation of a sewer main connecting a home with a town sewer line in a residential section of the town of Wakefield, Rhode Island, was halted when the graves of at least three individuals were inadvertently impacted during excavation of the sewer trench. Following the identification of exposed bones as human remains, the state’s medical examiner, local and state police, representatives of the Rhode Island Historical Preservation and Heritage Commission, and Narragansett Indian Tribal representatives were contacted and consulted. Interested parties concurred that the remains were Narragansett Indian in origin. An archaeological recovery of human remains and partial cemetery delineation
was subsequently conducted at the site of the residential lot by Public Archaeology Laboratory, Inc., (PAL) staff in late 1999 and early 2000.

**Project Scope and Authority**

Rhode Island General Law 23-18-11 *et seq.* regulates any construction or excavation in a city or town which may damage or destroy cemeteries or burial grounds. R.I.G.L. 23-18-11, and related municipal ordinance Chapter 14, Article IV, Section 7 of the South Kingstown Town Code, prohibits any excavation or alteration of ground surface within 25 feet (ft) of a cemetery further requiring a cessation of “construction, excavation, or other disturbing activity” “whenever an unmarked cemetery or human skeletal material is located inadvertently.” Upon encountering human remains, the law stipulates that “the property owner shall undertake an archaeological investigation to determine the boundaries of the unmarked cemetery” prior to the continuance of construction activity.

Prior to PAL archaeological recovery efforts at the Christopher Street Site, it was apparent that the remains of at least two individuals had been impacted during trenching of the sewer line. The first interment (Burial 1) was located in the approximate center of the south wall of the sewer trench. Burial 1 consisted of a number of apparently articulated human bones including a calcaneus, meta-tarsals, tarsals, and phalanges eroding out of the trench wall and grave shaft. A second burial shaft (Burial 2) situated approximately 1 meter east of Burial 1, also within the south wall of the sewer trench, exhibited substantial staining and deposits of red and yellow ochre, but no visible human remains. However, the association of human bone with red and yellow ochre in the trench backdirt piles confirmed that this feature was also a human burial. The presence of at least two graves was further substantiated by John Brown, Narragansett Indian Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, who collected two crania on the day of his initial site visit (Brown 2000).

**Archaeological Recovery of Human Remains**

PAL fieldwork began with the screening of disturbed trench soil through hardware cloth. Fragmentary and complete human skeletal elements were recovered from backdirt piles south and east of the house. Recovered elements include vertebrae, scapulae, ribs, phalanges, a calcaneus, humeri, fibulae, tibias, femurs, a mandible and associated maxilla, and a third cranium consisting of portions of the frontal, right parietal, right temporal, and occipital bones. Dense deposits of powdered red and yellow ochre (2.5 YR 3/6 dark red and 10 YR 6/8 brownish yellow) with associated human remains were recovered from following a re-sanctification ceremony conducted by the Narragansetts in the spring of 2000.

**The Christopher Street Site**
backdirt piles immediately north and south of the open sewer trench. Artifacts associated with the human remains were few in number, consisting of a hone/abrating stone, a low density of quartz chipping debris, some crushed shell, and a round pecked stone that may have served as either a hammerstone or weight. All artifacts were recovered from disturbed contexts. Weather conditions necessitated securing the site before it could be completely excavated during the winter of 2000.

A return to the site following the Spring thaw resulted in the recovery of additional skeletal elements from backdirt including a thoracic vertebra, a metacarpal, and several ribs and rib fragments.

**Excavation of Impacted Graves**

Following the collection of disturbed remains from trench backdirt piles, representatives of the Narragansett Indian Tribe requested that the two partially impacted grave shafts visible in the south wall of the sewer trench be exposed and any skeletal remains still lodged in the grave shafts be collected. In this way, recovered remains could be reintegrated with those collected earlier and the impacted deceased might be re-interred into the ground complete. Archaeological investigation of the grave shafts commenced with the exposure of remaining grave shaft fill in plan, initially aided by careful machine-assisted topsoil removal. Subsequent finer-scale clearance of the topsoil/subsoil junction using hand shovels and masonry trowels resulted in the identification of a third potential burial feature (Feature 3), immediately south of Burial 1. All features were then photographed and mapped. Grave fill was then removed by shovel and trowel. Following the identification of skeletal remains, excavation continued with hand trowels and wooden sculpting tools until all of the remaining skeletal elements were exposed. Burials were photographed and mapped on scaled plans and the remains were exhumed.

**Burial 1**

Manual clearance of the Burial 1 grave shaft indicated that a large portion of this burial feature had been impacted by sewer line construction. The grave shaft became visible immediately below the plowzone and subsoil interface at a depth of approximately 30 centimeters below ground surface. Only approximately 20 cm of the southern half of the original grave shaft remained intact, the remaining feature portion having been removed during sewer trench excavation. East to West measurements of the feature indicate that the burial shaft was at least 146 cm in diameter.

Human remains associated with Burial 1 were first encountered at a depth of 62 cm below surface grade and were recovered to a depth of 94 cm below grade. Recovered skeletal materials from the burial pit included digits, phalanges, metatarsal and tarsal bones of the feet, two patellae, digits, phalanges, metacarpal and carpal bones of the hands, a right clavicle, a single premolar, and severely impacted cranial fragments including a portion of the fused zygoma, sphenoid, temporal, and parietal from the right side of the cranium. The majority of the cranial and post-cranial elements associated with the burial were undoubtedly displaced during trenching activities.

Archaeological investigation confirmed that Burial 1 contained the remains of one person. The overall orientation of the recovered human skeletal elements that remained *in situ* suggest that the individual was placed on his or her right side with the head facing east in a moderately to tightly flexed fetal position, hands to the chest. The axis
of the individual was oriented roughly west southwest (254° Magnetic North) from foot to head. This pattern was documented at the seventeenth century Narragansett Indian burial grounds of West Ferry (Simmons 1970) and RI 1000 (Robinson 1990). The absence of a large majority of the remains, including the mandible, maxilla, and pelvis, precluded an assessment of age and sex of the individual. However, the size and density of the bones and the completely fused cranial sutures suggest that this individual was likely an adult male. Confirmation of a dark brown organic stain indicated that the individual was placed atop a reed, grass, or bark grave lining or mat.

Burial 2

Exposure of the Burial 2 grave shaft indicated that it too had been severely impacted during the sewer line construction. Only approximately 28 cm of grave shaft was discernible below the surface grade. East to West measurements of the feature indicate that Burial 2 was at minimum 148 cm in overall length. Exposure of a 1.4 m x 0.7m excavation box around the feature resulted in the identification and confirmation of an additional pit feature (Feature 4) located approximately 20 cm southeast of Burial 2. The nature of the feature fill, its shape, and its association with confirmed burial features makes Feature 4 a potential candidate for an additional grave shaft that remains intact at the Christopher Street Site.

Excavation of the Burial 2 grave shaft indicated that almost all of the skeletal elements had been removed and impacted during the digging of the sewer trench. Identifiable elements were limited to a single phalange and a rib fragment recovered at a depth of 66 cm below grade. Few small fragments of unidentifiable bone were also recovered from the grave fill. Most noticeable was a dense concentration of fine red ochre (2.5 YR 3/6 dark red) sprinkled over and in association with the skeletal remains. Archaeological excavation of the remnants of Burial 2 indicates that the feature contained the remains of one person. Its orientation could not be firmly established, although the grave shaft was aligned roughly west southwest (252° Magnetic North) along its longest visible axis. Similar to Burial 1, Burial 2 exhibited clear evidence for an organic lining first visible at 60 cm. The stratigraphic relationship of all of the feature elements indicates that the body was placed atop the lining in the very bottom of the grave shaft. No assessment of age or sex of the individual was possible due to a lack of gender and/or age-diagnostic skeletal elements.

Cemetery Delineation

Following discovery of the Christopher Street Site and the subsequent recovery of disturbed human remains, R.I.G.L. 23-18-11, and related municipal ordinance Chapter 14, Article IV, Section 7 of the South Kingstown Town Code, required that a cemetery delineation be conducted at the burial ground. Initial clearance of the topsoil in the vicinity of Burial 1 and Burial 2 aided in the identification of two additional potential burial features. These anomalies were given assignations Feature 3 and Feature 4. Subsequent stripping of the topsoil in the east yard of the Christopher Street property failed to result in the identification of any additional potential burial features within 25 feet (ft) of the burial cluster located below the proposed driveway. Therefore, archaeological excavation and machine-assisted removal of the topsoil in the east yard of the site resulted in the identification of cluster of 4 to 5 burials, three of which have now been removed.
Discussion

First American and Narraganset Indian mortuary data in Rhode Island is limited to few investigations by local avocational societies, professional archaeologists, and inadvertent discoveries of isolated burials and larger cemetery complexes. Upon initial discovery of the Christopher Street Site, Narragansett Tribal representatives and the Rhode Island State Archaeologist concluded that the remains were likely seventeenth century in origin. This assessment was primarily based on the excellent state of the skeletal remains and their immediate association with red ochre in at least one case (Robinson 2000). Subsequent investigation at the site indicated that the impacted burials at the Christopher Street Site appear to predate the seventeenth century (lacking European grave goods), and were therefore Woodland in origin. The integrity of the remains was likely the result of good site drainage characteristics.

A pre-Contact temporal association for the remains was determined, in part, by the absence of seventeenth century trade goods of European origin, a lack of Native wampum, the exclusive occurrence of few Native American artifacts, and the site's proximity to the documented Late Woodland burial complex RI 110, which has been firmly dated to 750 radiocarbon years before present (1200 to 1300 A.D.).

Archaeological site RI 110 and the related Christopher Street Site may provide evidence for cultural continuity or common heritage linking the pre-Contact Native inhabitants of the Point Judith Pond area with the contemporary Narragansett, extending their influence over the area as a homeland back beyond 1,000 years ago. Narragansett Indian oral history binds the Narragansett to the Point Judith Pond region for thousands of years. Linguistic evidence of an ancestral tie between the Narragansett and the earlier Woodland inhabitants of the Point Judith Pond is provided by Roger Williams. Williams noted that the “Nahiganset (Narragansett) was so named from a little Island between Puttisquomscutt [Pettaquamscutt] and Musquomacuk [Misquamicut] on the sea and fresh water side” (Bartlett 1874: 407). Sidney S. Rider (1904:200-204) argues that the island “Nahiganset”, from which the tribe derived their name, is a small island in Point Judith Pond, likely present-day Beach Island. This evidence appears to link the Narragansett to the Point Judith Pond as advocated by the contemporary Narragansett, despite an apparent contradiction in concentrated Narragansett settlement in the Davisville/Wickford area by the early to mid seventeenth century. Roger Williams apparently explains this contradiction in pre- and post-Contact Narragansett settlement preference by noting that “Cannonicus’ father and ancestors living in those southern parts [Point Judith Pond region], transferred and brought their authority and name [emphasis added] into those northern parts all along by the seas side” (Bartlett 1874: 407).

Giovanni da Verrazano also describes an encounter between the Narragansetts in Point Judith as early as 1524 A.D.. In his journal Verrazano recorded that:

We weied Ancker, and sayled towarde the East, for so the coast trended, and so alwayes for 50. leagues being in the sight thereof wee discovered an Ilande in forme of a triangle, distant from the maine lande 3. leagues [Block Island]... And wee came to another lande being 15. leagues distant from the Ilande, where wee founde a passing good haven, wherein being entred [the mouth of Narragansett Bay] we founde about 20. small boates of the people which with divers cries and wondrings came about our ship. (Hakluyt cited in Chapin 1919:1-2).
Verrazano’s account appears to describe the area around Point Judith. Verrazano’s description of his meeting with “2. kings” is suggestive of a dual sachemship political structure symbolic of the Narragansett.

Commonalities in mortuary practices between the Christopher Street burial site and the later seventeenth century Indian burial grounds of North Kingstown and Jamestown may be additional evidence for a descendant relationship between the pre-Contact inhabitants of the Point Judith Pond region and the Narragansett. Roger Williams noted in the seventeenth century that “to the southwest is the Court of their [Narragansett] great God Cautantowwit: At the South-west are their Forefathers soules: to the South-west they goe themselves when they dye” (Williams 1973 [1636]: 86). Archaeological investigations at the seventeenth century Narragansett Indian burial grounds of RI 1000 in North Kingstown and West Ferry in Jamestown indicate that the Narragansett oriented their dead from northeast to southwest (Robinson 1990; Robinson et al. 1985; Simmons 1970). Said individuals were typically interred on their sides (especially on the right side) in a tightly flexed position facing Cautantowwit’s House to the southwest. This is consistent with Williams’ description of Narragansett belief in the afterlife. This pattern is apparently preserved, at least for Burial 1, at the Christopher Street Site, and reflects a continuity of mortuary practice.

Mortuary commonalities between pre- and post-Contact burials also include lining the bottom of the grave shaft with organic remains and the use of red ochre. A dark brown organic lining was located around the perimeter of the Burial 1 and Burial 2 grave shafts at the Christopher Street Site. This practice is recorded in period chronicles and was documented at the seventeenth century West Ferry burial site. Edward Winslow (n.d: 63) records that “When they [Massachusetts Indians] bury the dead, they sow up the corpse in a mat, and so put it in the earth.” Simmons (1970: 63) noted that the “perimeter of the grave shaft [for the West Ferry burials] was always delineated by a clear brown ring that stood in contrast to the clean undisturbed soil outside the original excavation.” He interprets this brown layer as “the decay of organic debris-mats and perhaps bark, branches, and planks that had lined the surface of the pit and covered the corpse before the hole was filled in” (Simmons 1970: 63). The same can be said for the Christopher Street burials.

Furthermore the use of red ochre in seventeenth century burial practices has been recorded in period documents. Mourt relates “as we came into the plain ground we found a place like a grave...and resolved to dig it up...At length we came to a fair new mat, and under that two bundles...We opened the greater and found in it a great quantity of fine and perfect red powder, and in it the bones and skull of a man...The red powder was a kind of embalment, and yielded a strong, but not offensive smell; it was as fine as any flour” (Heath 1963: 27). The description of this “perfect red powder” communicates exactly the essence of the red ochre recovered from Burial 2 at the Christopher Street Site. Additionally, the use of red ochre was further documented at a seventeenth century Wampanoag burial ground in Warren, Rhode Island (Gibson 1980) again reinforcing a cultural practice with roots in antiquity.

Unlike many of the seventeenth century Narragansett burials excavated in Rhode Island, those from the Christopher Street Site contained very few, if any, artifacts from secured burial contexts. Williams (1973: 248) notes that “after the dead is laid in Grave, ... sometimes (in some parts) some goods [are] cast in.” The relative occurrence of grave goods appears to be the norm for the seventeenth century Narragansett, at least as represented at West Ferry, RI 1000, and Burr’s
Hill. Their apparent absence in Late Woodland Period contexts may signify an alteration in Narragansett cosmology after sustained contact with Europeans.

Demographic studies conducted on exhumed Narragansett remains indicate that the seventeenth century Narragansett were relatively tall in stature (Kelley et al. 1987). Although stature estimates could not be computed for individuals at the Christopher Street Site, visual inspection of the long bones (i.e. femurs, humeri, tibiae, and fibulae) indicate that the buried individuals were very large and robust. In the words of Verrazano the individuals exhumed at the Christopher Street Site "exceed us in bigness" (Hakluyt cited in Chapin 1919: 2).

Archaeological investigations in Rhode Island at RI 1000 (Robinson 1990) and Devil's Foot Cemetery in North Kingstown (Cook 1985), the West Ferry Site (McBride 1990; Simmons 1970) on Jamestown, and possibly even RI 196 in Warwick (Waller and Leveillee 1999), indicate that by the seventeenth century multiple interments and cemetery complexes had become the norm for final treatment of the dead. These locations likely reflect sacred or spiritual landscapes. Although isolated burials dating to the pre-Contact period are occasionally encountered, increasing site data from sites RI 110 and the Christopher Street Site at the head of the upper Point Judith Pond indicate that Late Woodland burial patterning included noticeable clusters and even formal burial grounds or cemeteries. Archaeological investigations at RI 110 clearly show evidence for multiple interments (Leveillee and Harrison 1996; Waller in press).

Burials investigated during salvage investigations and the cemetery delineation at the Christopher Street Site may, in fact, represent an extension of the RI 110 burial complex. Consequently, the shores of the upper Pond appear to represent a sacred or spiritual landscape important to the pre-Contact Narragansett.

Summary and Conclusion

At present the human remains recovered from the Christopher Street Burial Site indicate a minimum of 3 individuals. Two graves remain intact. The exposed Christopher Street burials were flexed and oriented to face southwest, characteristics that were continued into the seventeenth century. Machine-assisted stripping of the topsoil indicate the potential for an additional one or two grave shafts in the east yard of the site. The overall nature of the burials suggests that these burials are pre-Contact in origin and are likely contemporaneous with the large Late Woodland village site and burial complex of RI 110. Pre-Contact Narragansett Indian burial grounds and cemeteries were not analogous to modern cemetery concepts. They do not include linear arrangements of the deceased in fenced plots with individuals placed at standard distances. Late Woodland burials are commonly clustered constructs of single or multiple burials within larger sacred landscapes.

Given what we now known about pre-Contact burial patterning, there is the potential for the unanticipated discovery of additional graves in any location not systematically investigated along the shores of, and in proximity to, the upper Point Judith Pond.
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AN UNUSUAL PLUMMET-LIKE OBJECT FROM MARY'S LANDING WEST (19-PL-878)

William E. Moody

Several members of the South Shore/North River Chapter of the Massachusetts Archaeological Society regularly keep a watch for new construction activity in the Marshfield to Hanover area of southeastern Massachusetts. The purpose is to record any new archaeological sites that might come to light and, with permission of the builders, to salvage any prehistoric artifacts before they are destroyed. It was on just such a foray that the subject of this article was recovered.

Less than one-half mile upstream from the Route 3A bridge crossing the North River, a house was under construction in Marshfield on the south bank of the river during the fall of 1998. As is typical of such construction activity, a large amount of soil was disturbed in preparing the building’s foundation and adjacent driveway area. The author and his spouse, Whitney W. Moody (also a chapter member), were able to visit the site on four separate occasions before construction work was completed. A small artifact assemblage was inventoried at this site, which included three diagnostic projectile points: Otter Creek (sidenotched, of argillite); Merrimack (stemmed, of felsite); Wading River (stemmed, of quartz) (Figure 1); one knife (quartz); two knife fragments (argillite, felsite) (Figure 2); three scrapers (quartz); three flake scrapers (two of argillite, one of felsite); two choppers (argillite, quartz); two sharpening stones (argillite); one biface (quartz); two cores (quartz, rhyolite); one gorget or pendant fragment (black slate, with biconical drilling evident at break) (Figure 3); one muller (quartzite cobble showing use wear) (Figure 4); and two historic kaolin pipe bowl fragments.

Debitage recovered amounted to 71 flakes, consisting of 15 of argillite (weight=672 grams, or 11b. 8 oz.); 31 of felsite (weight=364 grams, or 13 oz.); 25 of quartz (weight=308 grams, or 11 oz.).

The most unusual artifact, however, was recovered on the final visit to the site. Just prior to departing, the author noticed the distal end of what appeared to be a smooth cobble protruding slightly from one of the loam piles that had been pushed to the side of the building site. With a casual flip of a walking stick, out rolled this remarkable specimen (Figure 5). It measures 16 cm long (6 5/16 in.) by 7.3 cm wide (2 7/8 in.) at its widest point, with a circumference at that point of 21.1 cm (8 3/8 in.).

Figure 1. Diagnostic points: Otter Creek (argillite), Merrimack, (felsite), Wading River (quartz).
It weighs 1.008 kilograms (2 lbs. 4 oz.). The artifact is made from a cobbler of dense, gray argillite, with a large groove pecked completely around the stone 1.7 cm (29/32 in.) from the top end. The groove itself is 2.3 cm (21/32 in.) wide. The implement is generally in the shape of a plummet, but is quite large and shows some evidence on the distal end of use wear (battering marks?) that would be consonant with pounding or hammering.

In the revised edition of "A Handbook of Indian Artifacts from Southern New England," the authors posit that plummets may have most often been used in fishing. Describing the so-called "clumsy plummet," however, they write: "Sometimes it is made from a pebble without shaping, while at other times it is pecked." Very large specimens could have been used to anchor canoes." A 2 1/4 lb. specimen seems to fall in a category that is larger than expected for a fishing weight but not large enough to anchor a canoe, although it certainly could slow a canoe's drift. Also worth noting is that a friend of the author's, an avocational archaeologist from New Mexico, reports that recently when travelling through Oregon, he stopped at a local historical society along the Rogue River. While viewing their collection of Native American artifacts, he was surprised to see an artifact, in his words, exactly like the specimen pictured with this article. It was displayed with a dugout canoe and labeled as a canoe weight (Mark Swinney, personal communication).

Another member of the South Shore/North River Chapter has suggested that the artifact may have seen service as a hafted pestle with a handle designed for a two-handed grip, lashed horizontally to the grooved end (Robert Trotta, pers. communication). Also, if the implement is simply grasped in one's hand, with the index finger and thumb surrounding the groove, the top knob

**Figure 2.** Top: knife fragments (argillite, felsite). Bottom: knife (quartz).

**Figure 3.** Gorget or pendant fragment (black slate).
Figure 4. Muller: quartzite cobble showing use wear.

Figure 5. Two views of plummet-like artifact (gray argillite): shows use wear.
protrudes slightly, and a very comfortable fit is provided for a hand-held pestle or muller.

Either of these last two options is as good a possibility as any other and would explain the apparent use wear, although it is also worth considering that the battering marks could have resulted from repeated contact with underwater rocks and boulders if the artifact had indeed found use in some form of plummet-like activity associated with fishing or canoeing in the adjacent river. (The author would appreciate any other suggested uses that readers may have.) Yet whatever its actual function in prehistoric times, it is a noteworthy artifact, which the author is grateful to have saved from damage or destruction by the construction crew's backhoe and heavy equipment.
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PUBLIC ARCHAEOLOGY, THE NEW AGE, AND LOCAL TRUTHS

Alan Leveillee

I am indebted to our late colleague Barbara Luedtke for encouraging me to publish this article, and I wish to dedicate it to her.

Abstract

Perceptions of environment vary on multiple levels. The use of informant interviews during Cultural Resource Management studies and related research in Southern New England provides insights on how interpretations of the environment result in "local truths" that professional archaeologists need to take into account.

Introduction

It is striking to observe the ways in which different people can perceive the same environment. The topic of this article is archaeological environments as perceived by interested parties with whom we, at the Public Archaeology Laboratory, Inc., (PAL), have engaged with in the course of recent Cultural Resource Management (CRM) projects in southern New England. The discussion will not focus on the zealot fringe, or cultists, as described by Harrold & Eve (1995). Rather, we address interactions with respected professionals in other fields than archaeology, people who hold office in organized avocational archaeological societies, and Native American Tribal representatives. In the public archaeology forum different perceptions have become variables in the political, sociological, and anthropological present and we wish to share three examples that help shape our opinion that the issue of "local truths" merits our collective attention. These perceptions may influence the ways we look at, and even interpret, the past.

Independent researchers’ perceptions of a landscape

The first instance concerned a parcel of land in Carlisle, Massachusetts. PAL was contracted by the town to conduct a reconnaissance level survey within an area known locally as the Conant Parcel. The subject property was the site of a proposed municipal building project.

Mark Strohmeyer was a professional grant writer, independent researcher, and lecturer until his untimely death, in 1998. In 1997, as PAL was conducting a reconnaissance archaeological survey as a planning element of planned development, he identified himself to the town of Carlisle as an interested party having knowledge of specific cultural features within the proposed municipal construction site. Mr. Strohmeyer walked the project area with PAL staff, pointing out multiple landscape features during one of several on-site interviews. The features drawn to our attention included stone walls, wall sections, glacial boulders, bedrock outcrops, stone piles, and low density surface concentrations of twentieth-century refuse.

During our interviews, Mr. Strohmeyer summarized interpretations following his independent research, often referencing Mavor and Dix’s book, Manitou: The Sacred Landscape of
Mr. Strohmeyer noted that, within the project area, walls run from large glacial boulder to boulder and then to vernal pools. He stated that this is a theme repeated throughout the region, and that the pattern reflects cultural meaning. He believed that these walls are not functional but ideological, and that they were built prior to European settlement as affirmation to a link between the earth, sky, water, and the people who built them. Mr. Strohmeyer concluded that the stone piles were markers for observation of the winter solstice and served ancient cultures as commemorative places. He noted that here, as well as other sites, he often sees recent "offerings" of beverage bottles, indicating that contemporary Native groups or individuals still visit these places. Mr. Strohmeyer reported that he had not been successful in verifying this through informant interviews with Native Americans, however, because he has found them reluctant to discuss the issue.

Mr. Strohmeyer pointed to what he described as "a face looking out toward the wetland and the winter solstice" among one boulder outcrop crevice. To our eyes, there was no evidence to suggest the stone had been worked, nor were there any recognizable anthropomorphic details in the unmodified rock orifices.

The Conant Parcel was, in fact, a typical rural New England landscape dominated by remnant nineteenth and twentieth-century agrarian land use features. Walls, glacial erratics, and bedrock outcrops punctuated the project area's wooded topography. Several rock piles pointed out by Mr. Strohmeyer were impressive, but not necessarily enigmatic. One in particular was built upon the exposed portion of larger glacial boulder. Upon it were six to seven courses of dry-laid fieldstone. It was constructed, rather than piled, and reflects a labor-intensive effort. This particular feature has been referred to as a "winter solstice" marker in a 1997 editorial published in the local newspaper, the Carlisle Mosquito, characterizing it as a mysterious past relic.

A second informant, Anita Fast, Ph.D., also accompanied PAL staff on a walkover of the Conant Parcel. At that time, Dr. Fast provided copies of three contribution pieces written by her and printed in the Carlisle Mosquito, as part of a series focusing upon stone features as cryptic landscape elements.

Dr. Fast is a professional psychotherapist and independent researcher who practices holistic therapy and counseling. She moved to Carlisle in 1991, and became interested in stone features throughout the town. Like Mr. Strohmeyer, she cited Mavor and Dix (1989) as an influence in her research. Prior to Mr. Dix's death, he had accompanied Dr. Fast to the Conant Parcel, where they conferred on the possible origins and meanings of the stone features there. Dr. Fast also referenced an association with a woman she described as "a Cherokee medicine woman" who "guided her along paths of spirituality and visioning." During our interview, Dr. Fast reported experiencing extrasensory insights while meditating in proximity to the stone features on the Conant Parcel. Based in part on her personal experiences and on her independent research, Dr. Fast characterized the landscape at Conant as a spiritual place where Native Americans held community ceremonies and taught their children to attune themselves to the metaphysical aspects of their culture. Dr. Fast noted irregularities in stone wall segments as representing "prayer seats," solstice stones, and other ideological manifestations.

Dr. Fast pointed out a large glacial erratic, the surface of which had been modified by limited pecking and grinding. The granitic glacial boulder
had a bowl shaped "basin" on its crown, and two "arrows" or pointed triangles (pointing west) on opposing sides. These "arrows" appeared to have been weathering and cracking features enhanced and outlined through directed percussion, or pecking. The "basin" appeared natural, and differential weathering suggested to us that the pecking was of recent origin. Like Mr. Strohmeyer, Dr. Fast believed that the Carlisle landscape represented expressions of spirituality and attributed them to a long history as a sacred place.

We solicited the insights of Onkwe Tasi, a Native American, and long-time resident of nearby Dracut. He accompanied PAL staff on a walkover of the Conant Parcel. We asked him to comment on the project area including the landscape features that were the foci of Mr. Strohmeyer and Dr. Fast’s interest.

Onkwe Tasi felt the stone piles were not of Native American origin. While he agreed that they are of interest and represented considerable effort, he noted that his ancestors had no need to construct elaborate calendars, or to "go to all this trouble and work to mark the rising or setting of the sun."

Onkwe Tasi stated that he knew of no contemporary Native groups using sites like this for ceremonial purposes. He did acknowledge that today there are many people, non-Natives as well as Natives, who embrace a non-mainstream spirituality and who could have been expressing it on the Conant Parcel.

After synthesizing the available data, PAL concluded there could be little doubt that EuroAmericans were the agents of the landscape features observed within the Conant Parcel: that existing walls had their origins in specifically EuroAmerican agrarian practices. The land served as wood lots, orchards, and pasturage: the project area was cleared of trees by the early to mid-nineteenth century to meet increasing demands for firewood and to open pasture lands. We posited that if Native American above-ground features existed within the project area prior to European settlement, it was highly unlikely that those features would have been recognized, respected, curated, or maintained by the settlers who cleared the land and modified it so radically through the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. We offered that any hypothesis attributing extant features on the Conant Parcel to pre-European land use would have to account for the survival of those features during centuries of sequential occupations, ownership, and associated landscape modifications.

Specifically addressing Mr. Strohmeyer and Dr. Fast, we concluded that the Conant landscape should be considered a legacy resulting from the dynamic interaction between human culture(s) and the environment. The region has been occupied by Native American hunters and gatherers, Euro-Americans settling the frontiers after initial colonization, subsistence farmers, agriculturalists, cottage industrialists, and most recently families residing locally and commuting to nearby commercial and urban centers. Each of these differing cultures has, in their own time, impacted the land. Each has also perceived their surroundings differently, understanding and interpreting them in terms of unique sets of cultural criteria: beliefs, technologies, economics, and politics.

We advised the town that projections of the Conant Land parcel landscape as "a special place" have their origins in people’s beliefs over time, and in how people relate to and project those beliefs. As such the project area is an important cultural landscape, defined not so much in terms of its potential for archaeological sites that meet criteria for listing on State and National Registers, but as a
place conducive to the development of the intimate, and sometimes enigmatic, relationships between the present and the past, and between people and the environment (Leveillee 1997).

Mr. Strohmeyer contacted PAL after reading our report and expressed his regret that we failed to become enlightened. Until his death in July, 1998, he continued to speak to civic groups and use public forums to lecture on his independent research. His research, however, was not always unquestioned by the public. Some people took the trouble to check with the archaeologist at the Concord Museum, Concord, Massachusetts, who provided them with a different interpretation in line with PAL's (Shirley Blancke 2001, personal communication).

Avocational archaeologists' perception of a site

In 1984, Mr. David Andriozzi volunteered as a field assistant to help PAL conduct a survey and planning grant study to locate and document sites along the Sakonnet River in Rhode Island. After that study he made a hobby of surface collecting those and many other sites along the Bay. In time he became a member of the Narragansett Archaeological Society and in recent years, served as its President.

More recently the Narragansett Archaeological Society conducted a series of investigations on a pre-Contact Native American site within a privately owned golf course in Rhode Island, with the owner's permission. Knowing the greater site area to have contained burials, the Rhode Island State Archaeologist requested that the group suspend their excavation of the site.

Mr. Andriozzi and a small delegation met with local professional archaeologists in an attempt to convince the Rhode Island Historical Preservation and Heritage Commission and the professional archaeological community of the ability of his membership to excavate the site. The meeting included a lengthy slide presentation by Mr. Andriozzi, during which he proudly illustrated the methods and results of his team's fieldwork. Two things became very clear. One was that Mr. Andriozzi was entirely object oriented. It was the artifacts and only the artifacts they took from the site that were "of value." Secondly, the crescent-shaped features they were excavating, when considered in the context of nearby burials, were almost certainly more significant than the simple hearths the excavators believed them to be. The meeting had taken place under an erroneous assumption that a commonality of language and concepts existed between the amateur and professional archaeological communities. But the underlying anthropological principles of archaeology were not shared by Mr. Andriozzi and his group. They were confusing enthusiasm with qualifications. They had been engaged in collecting, not archaeology. At the time, as a professional representative, I felt that lacking the commonality required for effective communication, a continued forum would not be productive. Mr. Andriozzi later became a Town Councilman, and as such had some influence on the future of archaeology in his municipality.

A Native American's perception of an assemblage

The third instance that constitutes a very different perception of the present archaeological environment is exemplified by a recent meeting, the subject of which was the repatriation of cultural materials and human skeletal remains from the West Ferry Site on Conanicut Island in Narragansett Bay. The materials are presently housed in the Sidney Wright Museum. The West Ferry burials were excavated in the 1960s under the direction of William Simmons and the results of the
research published as *Cautantowwit's House* (Simmons 1970). John Brown, the Narragansett Indian Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, and principal representative of the Narragansett Indian Archaeological and Anthropological Committee met with museum board members to facilitate repatriation in accordance with the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA).

In the nearly 20 years that Mr. Brown has represented the Narragansett, he has crossed paths with archaeologists many times, occasionally crossing figurative swords. He knows a great deal about archaeology, and he knows material culture. With respect to the West Ferry Site, there was no question as to the application of NAGPRA so the Board of Director’s agenda for discussion related to repatriation were limited to process and logistics. Mr. Brown’s perspective and agenda differed.

In past dialogues, Mr. Brown had often taken the position of a defensive and pugnacious warrior, on occasion literally placing himself between archaeologists and the archaeological record. In discussing the West Ferry collection, we were introduced to a different persona: that of a Tribal Medicine Man. He was eloquent as he addressed the museum representatives. He deftly moved from a discussion of the cultural materials themselves to the people and spirits to whom they belonged, and then on to the existential meanings of the grave goods. He spoke of a “higher science” of his people, a science that literally allowed him to travel through space and time. He was at the meeting as a voice for, and of, the keepers of a sacred place and that he would do their bidding. As he spoke, Sitting Bull’s rise through Lakota societies to become a Witch-ha-sha Wa-kan (Utley 1993) came to mind. It included elements reminiscent of C.S. Lewis’s “deep magic,” transcending time remembered (Lewis 1950), and Carlos Castaneda’s *Don Juan* (Castaneda 1968). He spoke with complete conviction of traveling to the stars and conversing with the long dead. After Mr. Brown spoke there was a long silence. It was a very effective presentation and if there had been any opposition to repatriation the weight of his aura prevented it from being voiced.

John Brown has assimilated a great deal of archaeological and anthropological information to complement his traditional Narragansett upbringing as understudy to the Tribal Medicine Man. In maturity, with his authority as Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, he has become a personality who will shape the future of the Narragansett Tribe. His interpretations of form, function, and meaning of the archaeological record reflect not only a reconstruction of the ancestral past, but also a calculated projection of the anthropological present.

**Local truths**

As Bowlin and Stromberg (1997) point out, new forms of anti-realism have appeared in anthropology in recent years. Anti-realists are reacting against ideas of scientific realism, questioning the authority of western science and the legitimacy of its functional explanations, “casting doubt upon representing other cultural worlds in the language of western science, advocating instead the epistemic authority of local truths” (Bowlin and Stromberg 1997:123). As indicated in the above examples, it is happening in the anthropological present here in New England. Very different perspectives exist among interested parties and stakeholders. We are increasingly faced with different, and sometimes conflicting, interpretations of the past. Our ability to continue to do archaeology in the future may depend, to significant degree, upon how successfully we engage people like Mark Strohmyer, Dr. Fast, the
Conclusion

The contemporary anthropological, sociological, and political environments in which we operate are no less dynamic than those we research. We need to engage successfully to educate, inform, and bring the fundamentals of archaeological science, our scientific realism, into the public's conscience. The answer to anti-realists is not to ignore them, put our heads down, and "do archaeology," but to regard their perspectives as local truths and "do anthropology." In Cultural Resource Management, the insulation of wearing a cloak of objectivity is wearing thinner all the time. We cannot and should not excuse ourselves as agents of change. It is the age of applied anthropology in the service of archaeology.
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History tells us that Massasoit Ousamequin, the grand sachem of the Wampanoag people, wore a bracelet of white shell, and that the use of such shell was restricted almost entirely to "ye sachems & some spetiall persons." History also informs us that the Wampanoag people began the manufacture of shell, for use as money, only after the European settlers were allowed to use wampum to pay their Colony taxes! This shell money was called "wampumpeag" in the Algonquian language, and was made from periwinkle, quahog and clam shells, the latter referred to as "pogkomuk" or "poquauhock." The dark purple part of the shell was called "quahog" or "suckahock" (Brady: no date). The material that follows develops the story of wampum, citing pertinent sources.

According to William Bradford's history that he was writing in 1628 in Plymouth about European traders on the Kenibeck (Kennebec) River in Maine, the settlers at Plymouth were already introduced to wampum:

But that which turned most to their profite, in time, was an entrance into the trade of Wampampeake ....

And strange it was to see the great alteration it [Wampum] made in a few years amongst ye Indeans them selves; for all the Indeans of these parts, & ye Massachussets, had none or very little of it, [Peag], but ye sachems & some spetiall persons that wore a little of it for ornamente.

Only it was made & kepte amongst ye Nariganssets, & ye Pequents, which grew rich and potent by it, and these people were poor and begerly, and had no use of it.

Neither did the English of this plantation, or any other in ye land, till now that they had knowledge of it from ye Dutch, so much as know what it was, much less yt it was a comoditie of that worth & valew. But after it grue thus to be a comoditie in these parts, these Indeans fell into it allso, and to learne how to make it; for ye Narigansets doe geather ye shells of which yey make it from their shors. And it hath now continued a current comoditie aboute this 20. years, and it may prove a drugg in time. In ye mean time it maketh ye Indeans of these parts rich & power full and also proud therby; and alsowe them with peeces, powder, and shote, which no laws can restraine, by reasons of ye bassnes of suridry unworthy persons, both English, Dutch, & French, which may turne to ye ruine of many (Bradford 1899: 281-283).

Roger Williams in Key into the Language of America (1973 [1634]: 210) described the different kinds of wampum beads and their values in English money as follows:

The Indians are ignorant of Europes Coyne; yet they have given a name to ours, and call it Moneash from the English Money. Their owne is of two sorts; one white, which they make of the stem or stocke of the Periwinkle, which they call Meteauhawk, when all the shell is broken off; and of this sort six of their small Beads (which they make with holes to string the bracelets) are current with the English for a peny.

The second is black, inclining to blew, which is made of the shell of a fish, which some English call Hens, Poquaauhawk, and of this sort three make an English peny.

There is a mystery with respect to how wampum was made. We know the Indians were completely
familiar with the bow drill, and we can only suspect that the sharp object they used for a drill bit, to drill a hole in very hard shell, was a harder kind of stone.

The historian George Dow provides some different names for types of wampum, or parts of the shell, when he cites Williams's chapter, "Concerning their Coyne," in Key into the Language of America:

It is of two sorts; one white (which the Indians) make of the stem or stocke of the Periwinkle ... when all the shell is broken off. The white they call Wompam (which signifies white). Of this kind, six of the small beads, which they make with holes to string upon their bracelets, are current with the English for a peny.

The other kind, Suckduhock, which means black, inclining to blew, which is made of the shell of a fish which some of the English call Hens, Poquauhoc (now known as the hen-clam or quahaug). Of this description three are equal to a British penny. One fathom of the stringed money is worth five shillings (Dow 1935: 167).

Dow also states that in most of the Colonies the wampum of the Indians was extensively used and was frequently paid into the treasury in payment of taxes (Dow 1935: 166). To show the intimate relation of this Indian money to our early history, Dow continues, it appears that even Harvard College accepted it for tuition fees and otherwise; for in 1641 a trading company, charted to deal with the Indians in furs and wampum, was required to relieve the College of its super-abundance of this odd currency and redeem it, "provided they were not obliged to take more of it than L25, at any one time." The thrifty Dutch of New Amsterdam, however, Dow notes, took advantage of the scarcity of legitimate currency and the corresponding demand for wampum and established factories where they made it in such vast quantities that the market was broken and the value of wampum rapidly decreased.

Darrett Rutman, however, in Winthrop's Boston, A Portrait of a Puritan town, 1630-1649, shows that using wampum to pay taxes was eventually banned: "... in 1649 the General Court ruled ... that it was not in the liberty of any towne or person to pay peage to the county rate (Colony Records, III, 167)" (Rutman 1965: 212, footnote).
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To the Editor: In response to Jic Davis’s question, “What are these artifacts?” in the Fall 2000 issue of the Bulletin (Davis 2000), without the luxury of having hands-on examination of his artifacts in question, I would postulate that his surface-find artifacts are fish-scaling tools for scaling large fish such as sturgeon, striped bass, and carp, all of which have large scales. I presume that the scalloped edges are ground as well as the curved edges. The ground curved edges could have been used to open the fish to remove the viscera and slice off the dorsal fins, the pectoral fins, and also the tails.

His artifacts resemble in a crude form the slate “fishing accessory tool” that was excavated at the Powell site in Kingston, Massachusetts, that was quite sophisticated with ground scaling serrations and channel grooves for sharpening bone gorges and bone fish hooks (Otto 1992).

Bernard Otto, 
Plymouth, MA
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To the Editor: Enclosed please find two photographs (front and back) of an Indian artifact that was found by my friend, Chris Martin of Newville, Pennsylvania, while fishing this past fall (see Figure 1, next page).

The particulars are as follows: It was found in a stream approximately 20 to 25 feet wide, the Conodoguinet Creek in Cumberland County, Pennsylvania, which is in the center of the state. The artifact measures 14 in. long, 8 to 10 in. wide, and is 2½ in. thick. The hole does not go through the stone.

It was shown to the Head Archaeologist at the William Penn Museum in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, who made the interesting comment that it looked Mayan. Several other archaeologists in Pennsylvania looked at it also and said they had never seen anything similar to it.

Since I was a member of the Massachusetts Archaeological Society in the past and have a number of your excellent publications, I thought it would be fitting to contact someone there to help us in this matter. I could find nothing in the publications that was similar.

We would be most appreciative if you could direct these photographs to someone affiliated with archaeology who would recognize this artifact and enlighten us as to its identity.

Marian A. Snyder
Annville, PA

Editor’s note: Three professional archaeologists and several MAS members in the Robbins Museum saw the photos and remarked that it looked like an effigy of a horse, but no-one had seen anything like it, and did not know what it was. Does anyone have any ideas?
Figure 1. Two sides of an unidentified artifact from Cumberland county, Pennsylvania (see letter on preceding page). The artifact measures 14 in. long, 8 to 10 in. wide, and is 2½ in. thick. The hole does not go through the stone.