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EDITOR’S NOTE

An important multi-component site in Kingston, Massachusetts, excavated from 1984-1988 by the Massasoit Chapter, is reported by Bernard Otto. The artifact illustrations are from his personal collection, and cover periods from the Middle Archaic to Late Woodland. A rolled copper bead which may be out of context in Feature 5 could even indicate a Contact date that connects to the English explorer, Martin Pring.

Russell Gardner (Great Moose) provides illustrations of anthropomorphic stones and artifacts that he associates with the spiritual traditions of his people, the Wampanoag. Dennis Connole’s account of John Wampas’ conflict with his fellow Nipmucks and English settlers is a story of human pathos surrounding land ownership values, and Philip Brady describes a curious bone artifact with a face.

A tribute to Lillian Harding is written by a long-time friend, Jacqueline Tidman, who says that she misses Mrs. Harding’s enthusiasm and dedication.
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THE POWELL-HECKMAN TRUST SITE: A SALVAGE EXCAVATION BY THE MASSASOIT
CHAPTER NEAR THE MOUTH OF THE JONES RIVER, KINGSTON, MASSACHUSETTS.

Bernard A. Otto

Introduction

In the year 1602, Martin Pring sailing out of England, crossed the Atlantic Ocean and sailed up into the mouth of the Jones River. His mission was to bring back a cargo of sassafras that was of medicinal value to the English. In this coastal area and upland he found a large Late Woodland village with acres of cultivation; cultivars such as tobacco, maize, squash, and beans. Each bark- and mat-covered round dwelling had its own garden plot, and he was amazed not to see a single weed. He was well received by the native population, and after two or more weeks, he filled the holds of his ship with sassafras. As he was preparing to embark back to England, a force of natives appeared in a threatening manner, but all ended well when his two mastiff dogs dominated the scene, for the Indians were in great fear of these huge dogs. The Massasoit Chapter's salvage site (Massachusetts Historical Commission site number 19-PL-584; Massachusetts Archaeological Society site number M41-NW-113) was on a coastal upland less than a quarter of a mile inland from the mouth of the Jones River. Although in the vicinity of this historic scene, it appears to have preceded the encounter, and to have extended backwards in time thousands of years.

About forty years ago, the Powell house on River Street, Kingston, was moved across the street to its present location, and excavations for a foundation disturbed a shell midden. Hearing of this in 1984 I became interested in the possibility of a site research on this fifty-four acre Powell-Heckman property. On an August evening in 1984, accompanied by chapter member Russell Holmes, we asked the Powells for permission to do some excavating research on their property. Without hesitation they gave us their permission, but we were told that the entire property was up for sale with interested buyers.

This property was once part of a one hundred acre, turn-of-the-century dairy farm. Half of this acreage later became under the management of the town of Kingston and is now an environmental area for public walking activities with marked trails. The Powell acreage was allowed to revert back to a woodland state of dense brush and clumps of cedars. We then knew that any excavation activity by our chapter would be strictly a salvage effort against time and eventual development. As far as I know the site is now effectively destroyed by development with the exception of the easterly down-slope of the once existing cedar grove which is under the jurisdiction of the town of Kingston. This area was on the extreme limit of the intact site and not archaeologically productive.

Excavation of the Powell-Heckman Trust Site (M.H.C. 19-PL-584; M.A.S. M41-NW-113)

On an afternoon of the same month of August, 1984, five chapter members made a shovel testing investigation in a small clearing behind the house which is also an Inn. Here we unearthed a scattering of chipping flakes and two broken felsite points in the loam zone over a clay substrate. The mixed vertical position of the chipping debris was definite evidence of years of farming activity, and any further testing was abandoned. We then
decided to split up and make a walkover survey of the entire property in a direction towards the river. Coping with dense brush that grew over our heads in height, we happened on a cedar-grown elevation that was relatively flat and level. Shovel testing this elevated cedar grove we uncovered chipping waste and several quartz triangular projectile points all lying in a flat position in the lower zone of a loamy topsoil. This preliminary testing revealed that this cedar growth area had seen little or no disturbance of any nature in topsoil or topography. We now knew where we would conduct our salvage excavations. Testing the stratigraphy of the site, beneath cedar debris and mossy areas, we found a dark brown loam zone lying over a tan subsoil that extended to the lowest substrate of clay and hardpan. We encountered many in-ground boulders throughout the site. The clay and hardpan defeated many perk-testing attempts by would-be buyers. Surveyors cut down many cedar trees for sight lines, and counting the annular growth rings of these trees, we obtained an average of twenty to forty years of cedar growth. Wherever feasible, we excavated in a controlled manner between the cedars and their ample root systems. Features were recorded on a site control sheet.

During the four years we were excavating the site, we were constantly dodging huge backhoes that were perk-testing the whole area and caused us to be very uneasy and resulted in many interruptions. The local news media were also distracting with unwanted attention and publicity. The Powell Trust property was finally sold in 1988 and then subdivided.

Following are the chapter members who participated on a regular basis: Bernard Otto,

| Table 1. Approximate number of projectile points recovered from the Powell site. |
|-----------------------------------------------|--------|------------------|
| Stark (Figure 7)                           | 41     | Middle Archaic  |
| Hastate-form points (Figure 1)             | 7      | "                |
| Large Stemmed blades- lance and knife       | 16     | Middle/Late Archaic |
| Brewerton Eared Notched (Figure 7)         | 35     | Late Archaic     |
| Brewerton Side Notched (Figure 7)          | 14     | "                |
| Wading River points, quartz (Figure 5)     | 220    | "                |
| Wading River points, other lithics         | 107    | "                |
| Squibnocket Stemmed, mostly quartz (Figure 5) | 189   | "                |
| Squibnocket Triangle, quartz (Figure 5)    | 174    | "                |
| Isosceles or Beekman                       | 11     | "                |
| Long triangular, quartz, other lithics     | 64     | "                |
| Otter Creek                                | 7      | "                |
| Snook Kill (Figure 7)                      | 7      | "                |
| Susquehanna Broad                          | 6      | "                |
| Genessee (Figure 7)                        | 14     | "                |
| Normanskill                               | 3      | "                |
| Orient Fishtail (Figure 5)                 | 10     | "                |
| Rossville                                  | 12     | Early Woodland   |
| Adena (rounded stem)                      | 13     | "                |
| Greene                                     | 23     | Middle Woodland  |
| Levanna (Figure 2)                         | 39     | Late Woodland    |
| Fish points, whole and broken (Figure 2)   | 115    | Woodland         |
| Leaf type point                            | 23     | Woodland         |
| Untyped points                             | 20     | All periods      |
Artifacts:
We were able to recover almost three thousand artifacts from the Powell site excluding pottery sherds and many broken points. Each participating member was allowed to keep his or her recoveries. For some members, including myself, the total ran into the hundreds. It would be quite impossible for me to list all the artifacts that were excavated, but Tables 1 and 2 are compiled lists of the estimated totals of the artifact types. Table 1 is an approximation of the number of projectile points recovered during excavation. Many broken points were excluded, and some later recoveries were not recorded. Table 2 is an estimated list of artifacts other than projectile points recovered by all participants. Total assessment and evaluation was conducted at a later time. Names of projectile point types follow Ritchie's typology, but their dating by periods follows the Massachusetts Historical Commission's

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifacts other than projectile points from the Powell site.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abrading stones</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlatl weights, broken, and perforated</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beads, rolled copper (Figure 2)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone artifacts, worked (Figure 2)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drills, all cultures</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full grooved ax with some bit damage</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gouges (Figure 6)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphite, worked</td>
<td>many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grooved net weights (Figure 6)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammer stones, percussors, grooved and pitted (Figure 6)</td>
<td>many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand spades and hoes (Figure 2)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knives, stemmed, stemless, ovate, leaf, etc. (Figures, 5,6,7)</td>
<td>many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large lance heads and knives</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pendants and gorgets: fragments of concentric slate pendants, other ground slate pendants, and perforated (Figure 8)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pestles, natural and modified stones, (long cylindrical)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pestles, pecked and ground (Figure 8)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plummets or knobbed weights (Figure 6)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pottery sherds, untempered, grit tempered, shell tempered plain and decorated exteriors (Figure 3)</td>
<td>many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red paint stones, hematite</td>
<td>many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrapers, stemmed, side, and end</td>
<td>many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaft scraper and straightener; multi channeled</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinew stones (Figure 7)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steatite fragments (Figure 8)</td>
<td>many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulu, and fragmented Ulus (Figure 8)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whetstones, all materials (Figure 6)</td>
<td>many</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Russell Holmes, Judith Barnes Facchini (now deceased), Dennis Martin, Dana Seavers, Robert Po, John Hallunen, Eric Strom, Daniel Walker.

Results:

Stratigraphy:
The loam zone under cedar duff and moss, and the subsoil were our main levels of excavation. These strata varied in depth: a dark brown loam of 23 to 34 cm in average depth overlay a tan, sandy subsoil of 40 or more centimeters in depth. This subsoil overlay the lowest substrate of clay or hardpan. The loam contained Woodland artifacts, the tan subsoil was the location of Archaic finds, and the clay was sterile.
Figure 2. Top left: artifacts from Feature No. 5: ground bone projectile point (1), 3-holed bone fragment (2), bone whistle with incised markings (3), ground bone tool (4), rolled copper bead (5). Top right: Late Woodland Levanna points. Bottom left: hoes. Bottom right: Early Woodland "fish" points.
Guide (Ritchie 1971, 1969; MHC 1984). The artifacts shown in the photographs are mostly from my own collection, and are merely representative of the vast assemblage recovered from our salvage excavations at the Powell Trust site (Figures 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8).

Several unusual point types were found. Seven examples of a rare hastate point occurred in the lower levels of the tan subsoil (Figure 1), a position that would indicate a Middle Archaic date. On other sites I have excavated I have found them in Middle Archaic strata. Sixteen large stemmed lance and knife blades represented single finds in the tan subsoil, suggesting Middle to Late Archaic date. Long triangular points, probably Late Archaic, were also found in the subsoil. Leaf type points occurred in the loam indicating a Woodland date (Table 1).

A unique, very well-made point always found in the lowest zone of the topsoil I designated a Woodland, perhaps Early Woodland period 'fish' point (Figure 2). This specialized point was pressure flaked expertly to a long taper with a corresponding thickness in cross section. The tip was finely tapered. The point averaged 7 cm in length and one and one half to 2 cm in width and 1 cm in thickness. The configuration of these weak stemmed points is ideally suited for small, deep penetration, possibly by thrusting. I believe that they may have been hafted on spear-like shafts for impaling fish in the river by the use of a thrusting method. In fact 65 to 70 percent of the points recovered had their tips missing, and this could possibly indicate breakage when striking stones on the river bottom. These well-made specialized points were usually made of felsite, quartzite, and infrequently of green argillite.

With respect to the sherds (Figure 3), tempering was of bark, shell, shell and grit, and pulverized quartz. Exteriors were paddled or tool-smoothed with little or no design attempts on rim, neck, or body, on some vessel fragments. Other sherds exhibited wet slip trailed designs and tool impressions on rim, neck, and upper body areas.

**Dating:**

We saved many charcoal samples from many hearths and fire pits and chose two samples for carbon\(^{14}\) processing. These samples were processed by Geochron Lab. in Cambridge, Massachusetts; one was paid for by our chapter funds, and the other paid by our chapter and partially reimbursed by the matching funds program of the Massachusetts Archaeological Society. We had planned to have more charcoal and possibly bone samples carbon\(^{14}\) dated, but so far we have not done that. Charcoal samples collected from a fire pit near feature No. 9 gave us a \(^{14}\)C age of 1025 ± 75 years B.P. (\(\delta^{13}\)C...
This would equate to a Late Woodland phase of occupation. The second Geochron dating came from charcoal collected from the fire pit feature No. 15 which gave us a C\(^{14}\) age of 4175 \(\pm\) 145 years B.P. (\(\delta^{13}C\) corrected)(GX-14167), a Late Archaic occupation.

**Features:**

There were nineteen features excavated and recorded by the Massasoit Chapter. The plan of the site is shown on Figure 4.

**Feature No. 1: Stone Slab Platform and Refuse Pit**

Adjacent to a stone slab platform resting on the subsoil strata was a small refuse pit with charcoal stained soil containing flakes of quartz, felsite, fragments of incinerated bones. The pit also contained one steatite sherd with a drilled repair hole recovered in the uppermost level of the pit.

**Feature No. 2: Large "Kiln" Fire Pit**

Excavation of No.2 disclosed a large bowl-shaped fire pit measuring 91 cm across its oral diameter, which was stained by blackened soil. Also within its perimeter were scattered sherds of ceramic pot ware at its uppermost limit that occurred at the terminus of the loam and subsoil. The uppermost fire burnt stones within the pit were located 33 cm below the loam terminus; the pit area there being marked by black greasy dirt containing potsherds, chips, and many pieces of charcoal. At this level the pit was outlined by reddish fire- burnt soil around its entire perimeter. Scattered potsherds, fire stones, small fragments of bone, and broken clamshell and chips occurred at mid-depth in this feature. Seventy-one centimeters below the junction, the bottom of the feature was constructed out of a bowl-like layer of large stones 31 cm to 36 cm in diameter, with large chunks of charcoal mixed with black dirt. Below all of this, huge stones or boulders too large to move were found. No stone artifacts, but many sherds of ceramic ware were recovered. Because of the large amount of ceramic fragments, charcoal, fire-altered stones, and the evidence of intense fire and heat, this feature may have been a structure for the firing of clay pots. Feature No. 2 is identical to No. 6.

**Feature No. 3: Small Stone Hearth**

A small stone hearth with charcoal, associated with chipping waste, protruded into the subsoil from the loam junction.

**Feature No. 4: Secondary Mortuary Feature**

For recording purposes we classified this small, elongated bowl-shaped pit and its contents, a secondary mortuary feature. Originating at the loam terminus at 20 cm, it protruded 26 cm into the subsoil and measured 18 cm across its top diameter. The fill of this small pit consisted of small incinerated bone fragments and charcoal. We did not know the identity of the small bone fragments until we spread them out on a rubber mat. We were able to identify a few small fragments of human skull, rib fragments, and a phalange bone, the whole assemblage of identifiable human remains barely filling a coffee cup. Six Squibnocket triangular points of quartz, quartzite, and felsite were also part of the fill. Two of these points appeared to have been burnt. The inclusion of these points suggests a Late Archaic mortuary feature. For 15 cm around the top area of the pit more bone fragments were found along with one felsite Wading River point and one of quartz. Even though we knew that the site would be torn up by development, with due respect, we returned with care all the fill of this little pit to its original state of repose and returned the loam cover.

**Feature No. 5: Large Refuse Pit of Shell and Bone**

A large shell and bone refuse pit, this was the largest pit feature found in the whole salvage
Figure 4. Plan of the Powell-Heckman Trust site with features numbered.
excavation. Its shape was an oval basin with a diameter of 365 cm, and it originated in the lower zone of the loam stratum extending 61 cm down into the subsoil. One side of the loam stratum of the pit was black and greasy in appearance. The shell mass had a maximum depth of 24 cm at the bottom level of the pit. At the north end was a rectangular wall of very large stones chinked with smaller stones. This stone works extended well below the bottom of the pit. As there was no evidence that this stone structure was assembled for thermal use, its presence was problematical. The dominating bivalve was the hard shell clam or quahog, mostly found whole. There was a small percentage of the blue mussel and soft shell clam. Several oyster valves completed the mollusca mass of the shell refuse.

There were more than one hundred splintered bone fragments of the white tail deer, and also antler bases. Many of these bone fragments were burnt black, as were many of the shell valves. Completing the bone refuse of this feature were several toothed jaw bones of adult beaver, segments of turtle plastron, two canine-toothed jaw bones, and remains of small mammals vertebrae. The artifact contents of the pit were three quartz triangular points, two ground bone projectile points, and a bone whistle with incised markings (Figure 2). Pottery sherds of shell and grit tempering were also present (Figure 3).

Feature No. 6: Large "Kiln" Fire Pit

Feature No. 6 is linked with No. 2 because on excavation it proved to be identical to No. 2. It was located 273 cm across our base line opposite No. 2. This large round pit feature proved to have the same stone structure and fill as No. 2, suggesting that it too was for the firing of clay pottery.

Feature No. 7: Small Refuse Pit of Clams and Fish

A unique small refuse pit, basin-shaped with an oral diameter of 76 cm, originated at the terminus of the loam and subsoil, and projected 30 cm into the subsoil. Sixteen valves of the hard shell clam were the uppermost refuse deposit. Lying directly beneath were the skeletal remains of a very large fish that included ribs, gill plates, vertebrae, etcetera. Two of the smaller clams were never opened, and with much curiosity and a little force, I opened them to find the original sandy muck from the sand bar or mud flat they came from. The shell contained by this pit feature no doubt preserved the delicate remains of this large fish. I am inclined to believe that it was a large codfish or a small sturgeon.

Feature No. 8: Tool Kit

This feature was in association with the shell and bone refuse pit No.5. Ninety-two centimeters away in a southerly direction a tool kit was unearthed in situ, consisting of a well-made pecked and ground pestle, a felsite stemmed knife, a granite beach cobble with ground surfaces, and a quartz cobble rubbing stone.

Feature No. 9: Tool Kit near fire pit with charcoal

A large in-ground stone situated 6 cm below the sod zone and extending well into the subsoil, was the focal point in the recovery of four small gouges. Lying 10 cm from the large stone at a depth of 36 cm into the subsoil, they were contained within a 30 cm circle. These gouges are in excellent condition without edge damage, are shallow concave-bitted, and are pecked and ground to a high degree. In association were several quartz and felsite flakes, fire-fractured stones, a broken quartz stemmed point, and a felsite Wading River point. Charcoal samples collected from a fire pit near feature No. 9 gave us a C14 age of 1025 ±75 years B.P. (δ13C corrected) (GX-13719). This
Figure 5. Late Archaic points, Small Stemmed Point Tradition: top left: Wading River; center left: Squibnocket Stemmed, quartz; bottom left: Squibnocket Triangles, quartz. Top right: stemmed end-scrapers. Center right: untyped points; at right, Orient Fishtail point. Bottom right (1,2,3): stemmed and stemless knives, quartz.
Figure 6. Top left: shallow-bitted gouges: Archaic grooved (1,2). Center left: stemless knives. Bottom left: Archaic plummets. Top right: whetstone. Center right: percussors or hand hammers. Bottom right: grooved net weights.
appears to have been a Late Woodland fire pit intruding into an Archaic horizon.

**Feature No. 10: Hammer Stones**

Four small oval hammer stones, beach-collected and with battered ends, were recovered 15 cm into the subsoil lying close together.

**Feature No. 11: Hammer Stones**

Four large heavy hammer stones or percussors, 3 being of granite with end- and edge-battering use, and 1 pitted, were found in a close group 18 cm into the substratum. They also were beach collected as were most all the hammer stones and percussors unearthed at the site.

**Feature No. 12: Earth Oven**

Originating in the lower zone of the topsoil and extending 31 cm into the subsoil, this small earth oven with a 79 cm diameter, was lined with fire fractured cobbles. In direct association were five crude knives or knife preforms in close proximity. Four of these blades were of quartz and one of felsite. Close by, a quartz, notched eared Brewerton projectile point was excavated.

**Features No. 13 and 14: Small Refuse Pits of Shell**

Found 180 cm apart, and sited between 16 cm and 38 cm down in the subsoil, these small shell refuse pits were identical in shape and depth. They were compactly filled with blue mussel valves mostly in broken condition.

**Feature No. 15: Fire Pit**

A ground slate fishing accessory tool (my own estimation of the artifact) with serrations, channels, and incised markings, was recovered adjacent to, and approximately at the same depth as, the top circumference of the opening of a fire pit that contained charcoal, fire-burnt stones, and scattered felsite and quartz chips. The top of the pit was located at the junction of the loam and subsoil. Charcoal gave a date of 4175 ± 145 C¹⁴ years B.P. (δ¹³C corrected)(GX-14167).

**Feature No. 16: Crescent-shaped Stone Platform**

Located in the substrata at a depth of 23 cm was a crescent-shaped stone platform structure approximately 122 cm in length by 31 cm wide. Its use is problematical, possibly a drying platform for a source of food.

**Feature No. 17: Square Stone Platform**

A square stone platform of many rocks and stones was laid below the loam zone at a depth of 152 cm. Several small fires had been built on the top of this structure by the evidence of charcoal residue in the stones. This may well have been a smoking and drying platform for food preservation.

**Feature No. 18: Pestles**

A rather large pestle 37 cm in length, 18 cm in girth, and very well made, was found 15 cm below the loam terminus. This pestle was broken cleanly in half, and the two halves were neatly stacked one on top of the other. (I was able to glue them back together.) Very close to the broken pestle at the same depth, an unfinished pestle 24 cm in length, 17 cm in girth, and made from an argillite slab, had been split lengthwise in half. These two halves were also stacked neatly one on top of the other.

**Feature No. 19: Complex of Residual Bone**

Of all the features we discovered in our salvage excavations of the site, the most mind-boggling and thought provoking, at least for me, was a complex of diversified residual bone, although probably not a feature in the true sense of the word. Almost everywhere we dug at the site, we found many hundreds of small fragments of incinerated bone in the subsoil stratum. Most
Figure 7. Late Archaic points: top left: Genessee; bottom left: Snook Kill (1,2), knives; top right: Brewerton notched and eared. Bottom right: Middle Archaic Stark points.
fragments were no larger than a match head, but some were as large as 1 and 1/2 cm, and rarely others were larger still. Overall the majority of the bone was quite small and unidentifiable. The vertical distribution was unbelievable: from the junction of the subsoil to more than 61 cm into that stratum. Sometimes fragments would be found in clusters of ten or more, sometimes less in number, but always present, especially in association with fire-altered stones. These grey little fragments of incinerated bone, from one or two pieces to clusters, were in the whole site wherever we dug. Many of us saved small containers of these problematical bone fragments. I showed a jarful of the larger fragments to Tonya Largy, bone analysis specialist, but she could not identify them because of their small size. I also showed a jarful to a local mortician who said that they were not unlike the remains of modern cremation.

If these unidentifiable incinerated bone fragments are faunal remains in origin, why would the prehistoric site occupants go through all the labor and time of burning and pulverizing the bone of the animals they ate, and then scatter them about their camp site? Also how could they be scattered in such an unbelievable range in depth? Many of these bone pieces were found deep in sterile substrate. Was this an Archaic ritual to pay homage and respect to the spirits of slain animals they consumed? Might possibly some of those little bone fragments have been human?

**Interpretation**

Forty-one Stark projectile points would indicate typologically that at one time a Middle Archaic people occupied the site. A Late Archaic Laurentian tradition was demonstrated by the recovery of thirty-five or more Brewerton notched eared points. A preponderance of Wading River and Squibnocket stemmed points were indicators of a Late Archaic complex at the Powell site, representing the Small Point Tradition typical of New England. Late Archaic triangular Squibnocket points made almost always of quartz support a preference for the almost exclusive use of quartz in cobble form. Quartz cobbles and fragments were easily collected at cobble-strewn shoreline beaches, and due to the built-in fracture planes of quartz, the technology of reducing it in stages to make small triangular and stemmed points required modest knapping skill. We collected a good number of small Wading River points made of argillite and infrequently of slate with their blades heavily ground. Quartz Squibnocket triangular points were frequent recoveries. In lesser numbers, other Late Archaic types were represented such as Otter Creek, Snook Kill, Susquehanna Broad, Genesse, and Normanskill.

It would seem that this site location was favored for occupation by people of various time frames from the Middle Archaic into an early phase of the Late Woodland. From the overwhelming evidence in artifact recoveries, a substantial group of coastal Late Archaic people occupied the site for a good number of years. Because of the preponderance of Late Archaic recoveries, I believe that most of the shell refuse pits were of Late Archaic origin. Random screening of these shell pits did not reveal any evidence of fish remains.

A fairly large number of steatite sherds were found which would normally indicate a transition from the Late Archaic to the Early Woodland periods. The Orient Fishtail points also belonged in that category.

Woodland evidence was demonstrated by many sherds of ceramic pot ware, usually in association with stone hearths and earth ovens. Early Woodland use of the site was indicated by Rossville and Adena points, Middle Woodland by Greene points, and Late Woodland by Levanna points. There were also 23 leaf-type points, and
Figure 8. Top left: Transitional steatite vessel fragments. Bottom left: ulu fragments (1,2); knife, quartz (3); tri-channeled shaft abraider (4). Top right: Woodland pestles. Bottom right: holed gorget and pendant fragments.
115 "fish" points of Woodland origin described earlier in this report.

The Powell site being close to the Jones River and the Kingston Bay would encourage fishing activities by the site inhabitants, and shell fish were readily available for the taking. A number of plummets or knobbed weights and grooved net sinkers were excavated frequently, and the utilization of mollusca was very much in evidence in the refuse pits at the site.

Two radiocarbon dates indicated Late Woodland and Late Archaic occupations. Charcoal samples collected from a fire pit near feature No. 9 gave us a \( ^{14}C \) age of 1025 \( \pm 75 \) years B.P. (\( \delta^{13}C \) corrected) (GX-13719). Others collected from feature No. 15, a fire pit with a ground, incised, and grooved slate fishing accessory tool, gave us a \( ^{14}C \) age of 4175 \( \pm 145 \) years B.P. (\( \delta^{13}C \) corrected) (GX-14167). The latter date definitely indicates a Late Archaic time frame and supports conclusively the cultural evidence we recovered at the site that theoretically a Late Archaic populace inhabited the site for a much longer time or time periods than the cultures before or after them. This assumption can be supported by the high percentage of weaponry and edge and ground tools that we recovered at the site, overshadowing the other cultural artifact evidence that we collected. On other coastal sites that I have researched the Late Archaic always dominates the collective evidence on multi-site occupations.

**Conclusion**

The fifty-four acre Powell trust land was approximately one half the acreage of the turn of the century Bay Farm dairy. The environmental area is still known as the Bay Farm. Formerly it was said that when the dairy was still operational, dairy workers had pails of artifacts that they casually picked up. When the fields were turned over for cattle fodder, surface collectors from near and far came to walk the fields and fill their pockets with 'relics.'

Martin Pring was one of the very few to see this coastal area when the native population was at its peak, and there were villages with many acres of cleared land under cultivation before the great plague of the years 1617 and 1618 when 90 percent of the coastal inhabitants perished.

Amid this farmland, the elevated cedar grove we excavated under salvage conditions somehow never was plowed. I still ponder that if I had not pursued the hunch that a worthwhile site was there somewhere in that large farm tract, the exceptional site that we discovered might never have been known, and might have been totally lost to the bulldozer and development. Digging between the cedars and their root systems I would estimate that we excavated about seventy percent of the main site and recovered almost three thousand artifacts. I cannot help thinking, how many more hundreds of pieces were under all those cedar trees we could not dig under?

I truly believe that the Powell site was one of the most significant prehistoric sites of this whole coastal plain, and I am glad to have been able to salvage even a part of it.
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Here in southeastern New England there is a special class of stoneworks represented that has, to date, received little notice or interpretation by the archaeological or anthropological disciplines. Specifically, the anthropomorphic and fertility forms of various sizes, located on mainland sites in this region, are the focus of this paper. Many have been described in the writings of James W. Mavor Jr. and Byron E. Dix, and particularly their joint work *Manitou* (1989).

These stoneworks are found in the form of manitou or god-stones of various sizes, effigy pestles, phallic forms, and Archaic period plummet types (Mavor and Dix 1989:218, 219, 332-342). Historically, archaeologists have recognized only utilitarian importance in many of these forms. I suggest that it is more likely that they have spiritual implications that relate directly to native archaic concepts of the interrelation of all things animate and inanimate, and the perpetuation and regeneration of life through sexuality, concepts surviving through our oral tradition today (Gardner 1997).

The dating of these stoneworks has been somewhat of a problem, but there are possible clues which could help to pinpoint their creation based on geologic and climatic changes in this southeastern region and successive incursions of humankind in relation to these natural fluctuations (Robert S. Peabody Museum 1997).

The cultural aspects as suggested by the stoneworks are mute evidence of the spirituality of these Archaic people, and if only the coastal mainland was available or habitable to them, it would explain the mainland location of these sites. They are usually found, also, on high points of land that are not habitation sites. Even in colonial times Native ceremonial sites were on these high points of land, such as the Dancing Field of my ancestors at Christiantown Praying Town at Tisbury's Indian Hill on Martha's Vineyard (Mayhew 1956; Gardner 1970), or Dancing Hill of the Namassakeesetts at...
Figure 1. Top: 2 views of anthropomorphic manitou stone, Hanson, MA (size: 18 in x 11 in [45 cm x 27 cm]) (Photographs by Don Pearson; Russell Gardner collection). Bottom left: phallic plummet with grooved head and scrotal features, Clark's Island, Plymouth, MA (size: 4 in x 3 in [10 cm x 7 cm]) (Eric Strom collection). Bottom right: ancient Hand Rock on Tuspaquin Hill, Nemasket, Middleboro, MA (petroglyph size: 5 in x 10 in [12.7 cm x 25.4 cm]). The hand symbol was a personal mark of a sacred place.
Pembroke, Massachusetts, or Tuspaquin's Hill at Namasket in Middleborough, Massachusetts, site of ancient Hand Rock (Figure 1). It is obvious that the practice persisted. These ceremonial places with their god-stones were also described by Ezra Stiles in Connecticut as late as 1767 (Mavor and Dix 1989).

Types of Manitou Stone

The larger forms created from natural boulders with certain features that were of a suggestive nature, were then enhanced, by human agency, to represent a head, neck, and body of between two to three feet in measurement. This anthropomorphic or zoomorphic (human/animal) monument also sometimes included identifiable male or female genital representations which were doubtless fertility symbols relating to powerful cultural beliefs of these Archaic people (Mavor and Dix 1989), the spiritual concepts of their interrelation with the natural world, and harmony and balance of all things. Thus interpreted, this is a likely origin for our own oral tradition which tells us exactly what the above implies (Gardner 1997). In this concept lies the power of procreation and regeneration, of eternal renewal. This, I believe, is the unwritten message of the manitou stones, standing stones, and fertility stones, on the sacred landscape of this region (Gardner 1997).

Manitou stones pictured here are primarily from a most remarkable site I shall identify as Manitou Knoll near the headwaters of the Acushnet River in Acushnet, Massachusetts, and one example in my personal possession from Hanson, Massachusetts (Figure 1). They speak for themselves.

Manitou Knoll site

At the Manitou Knoll site in Acushnet, Massachusetts, it takes little imagination to conger up an image of Archaic shamans reposing on the great stone seats, presiding over ceremonial fertility rituals among the manitou and standing stones that cover approximately an acre (4047 sq m) on the knoll. The seats, natural formations probably placed by human agency (Figure 2), are on the perimeter of the area, and at a slightly higher elevation, overlook it. In close proximity to each other at Manitou Knoll, those stones displaying male and female genital features were positioned closest to the stone seats, the male form representing phallic, scrotal, and anal features, the female form including a cleft to the ground, and possibly representing connection to the "uterus of the earth," as indicated by Mavor and Dix (Figures 2,3). The site total is 6 manitous and 1 standing stone.

Preservation of this site's remarkable features is due mainly to the fact that only two families have occupied it since colonial settlement, the present one since 1820. There are also numerous stone mortars not original to the site, which do not therefore indicate a later (Woodland) date. They were placed there by the 1820 ancestor of the present owners who brought them from the Pokanoket Fields in the lower Taunton River valley, his former home.

Plummet Stones

The interpretation of these smaller forms with respect to utilitarian use has historically been problematic for archaeologists, but plummets are now usually identified as fishing sinkers or weights of some kind (Fowler 1975:31-32). There is another distinct possibility however. Their similarity to the larger Manitou Stones is quite obvious, and some also have phallic and scrotal characteristics (Figure 1). Mavor and Dix (1989:219) consider them to be small, portable manitou stones, and I tend to agree. Also, it is a curious fact that plummets are most commonly found at Archaic sites, and not at Paleoindian or
Figure 2. Manitou Knoll, Acushnet, MA. Top: stone seats (area: c. 12 ft x 12 ft [3 m x 3 m]). Bottom: side and back views of zoomorphic manitou stone (size: 40 in x 20 in [1 m x 0.5 m], height 28 in [0.7 m]).
Figure 3. Manitou Knoll, Acushnet, MA. Top: opposite sides of a manitou stone with female genital characteristics (size: 27 in x 23 in [0.6 m x 0.5 m], height 24 in [0.6 m]). Bottom: opposite sides of a manitou stone with male genital characteristics (size: 30 in x 22 in [0.7 m x 0.5 m], height 17 in [0.4 m]). Bottom left shows phallus, scrotum, and anus.
Woodland sites (Fowler 1975: 31-32; 1963:13-15; 1953: 97, Figure 40). If plummets were primarily fishing weights, why would their use be abandoned? Woodland people also fished. I must thus conclude that these objects were more likely culturally related than utilitarian, and were spiritual and ceremonial in nature (Gardner 1997).

**Effigy Pestles**

Pestles as a category also demonstrate utilitarian use and symbolic possession, with effigy pestles representing the latter. Some effigy pestles, but not phallic ones, have been shown to date to the Contact period (Volmar 1994). It is generally accepted that the pestle was primarily a woman's implement. It is commonly found in female burials. The only exception I am aware of is among the historic Mohegan of Connecticut who claim that in their tribe, the men wielded the grinding pestle, but they were certainly unique in this (Tantaquidgeon 1994). It is also true that most of the effigy pestles show no use wear, as the unadorned pestles do. This is a significant fact.

There are two principal forms of effigy pestle ornamentation, the first being animal or bird figures. These almost certainly indicate the clan of the owner. The other representation is in the form of a phallus (Figure 4). It is well known that in most local native tribal societies, women were the stronger partners clan-wise in a marriage, the husband joining his wife's clan after the ceremony. Thus, I suggest that a likely conclusion is that the effigy pestle was woman's symbol of superior domestic authority, depicting the superior status of her clan and her position in the domestic scene, not to overlook her power in procreation of the race (Gardner 1997).

**The Time Bridge**

It is generally accepted that the Paleoindian and Archaic peoples of New England had no written language, and the later Woodland Algonquians only by means of a phonetically devised form instituted by European colonials and their Christian missionaries.

There were, however, petroglyphs and pictographs, usually on stone surfaces, serving as physical evidence of symbolic pictorial writing from earlier times. These symbols survived the Christian conversion to appear on Praying Indian gravestones of the Colonial period, proving that the oral traditions and concepts were preserved and thus bridged the gap between prehistoric and historic time with yet another form of native New England sacred stonework (Figure 5).

**Conclusions**

It is evident that no humans could have existed in southeastern New England prior to the shrinking of the Wisconsin Glacier back from the coast (King 1965:836, Figure 4A). This shrinkage triggered climatic change, drastic changes in landscape, and change in tree growth along this coastal region (Braun 1994). Pollen studies, palynology, such as the recent work of Paige Newby, research associate of the Department of Geological Sciences at Brown University, show that identification of ancient plant pollens is one means of dating these fluctuations.

At the glacier's height, some 16,000 years ago, the ocean level was about 400 ft lower than at present (Braun 1994). About 11,000 to 10,000 years ago an abrupt cooling period, called the Younger Dryas, occurred (Robert S. Peabody Museum 1997), allowing Paleoindians to enter the region doubtless following the larger animals such as caribou, mammoth, mastodon, and others, along the exposed coastal plain whenever there was an abundance of low sedge and browse. A subsequent warming period of greatest glacial melt followed, and these forces certainly affected the Archaic peoples who, by this time, had entered New...
Figure 4. Top: 2 views of phallic pestle from Lower Neck Point, North Weymouth, MA (size: 4 1/2 in x 1 1/2 in [11 cm x 3.8 cm]) (William Bowman collection). Bottom: 2 pestles from Narragansett Bay area (Courtesy of the Robbins Museum, Middleborough, MA). Bottom left: phallic pestle (size: c. 8 in x 2 in [20 cm x 5 cm]). Bottom right: zoomorphic pestle (size: c. 14 in x 1 1/2 in [35 cm x 3.8 cm]).
Figure 5. Praying Indian gravestone marks. Left: gravestone from Dinah Field Cemetery, Plymouth, MA (size: c. 31 in x 21 in [0.7 m x 0.5 m]; stone now lost) (Photograph by George Horner; marks enhanced). Right: gravestone from Taunton, MA (size: 13 1/4 in x 8 1/2 in [31 cm x 21 cm]) (Courtesy of the Old Colony Historical Society, Taunton, MA).
England. The Archaic period, divided into Early, Middle, and Late phases, is dated from 9,000 to 3,700 years before the present.

In cultural ways the Archaic peoples evolved with the landscape (Gardner 1997). Whatever culture they inherited was subsequently influenced and molded by New England's changing environment through succeeding centuries. Their stoneworks bear mute testimony to spiritual aspects of Archaic culture, their concepts and beliefs. These objects, created from the very basic material of the earth, bearing anthropomorphic and fertility features, and located on prominent ceremonial sites of the sacred natural landscape, strongly suggest their spiritual importance in Archaic life. They especially suggest the power of male-female procreation and regeneration, and interrelation of all life forces, even extending to the inanimate. They represent basic Archaic concepts of our genetic ancestors of those times, and even translate into the basic message of our oral tradition.

It is, in effect, our legacy from our Archaic ancestors (Gardner 1997). Its message of harmony and balance with the natural world, reverence for all things animate and inanimate, and respect for the purity of the land, the air, and the waters, is ours to perpetuate, preserve, and pass on to succeeding generations. This message has great relevance in modern society. Simply stated, these life enhancing concepts, from Archaic times to the present day, are enduring and sacred.
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The story of John Wampas, a Nipmuck of considerable note, begins in the fall of 1646. In November of that year, Rev. John Eliot made two visits to the village of Nonantum (Newton, Massachusetts), to preach to the Indians living there. The town was under the direction of a Massachusetts Indian named Waban, appointed "Chief Minister of Justice" by the English. The evangelist had been well received by the villagers on both occasions and he was extended a cordial invitation to return on the 26th of the month to conduct a third service. Eliot was unable to attend on the scheduled date and sent instead one of his "able" assistants, a fellow clergyman (unknown), to preach on his behalf. Following the services, this minister requested that some of the parents allow their children to be brought up by the English so that they might be given a proper education and be of eventual use to the missionary program (Humes 1952:19; Wilson 1834:17-18).

Wampas' English Upbringing

A few days after the meeting of November 26, John Wampas' father, known as "old woampas," delivered his son and several other young Indian boys to the home of the assistant for placement in an English household. The incident is recorded in the second of the "Eliot Tracts" (Wilson 1834:1-24) in which the minister described the progress of the missionary work among the natives of Massachusetts. Eliot wrote, "the Saturday night after this third meeting (as I am informed by the man of God who then preached to them) there came to his house one Wampas a wise and sage Indian, as a messenger sent to him from the rest of the company, to offer unto him his own sonne and three more children to be trained up among the English." The children's ages are listed as nine, eight, five, and four years old, but no indication is given as to young Wampas' age. Wampas also brought with him two "young lusty men," who voluntarily offered to place themselves in the service of the English (Humes 1952:19).

When the preacher asked the elder Wampas why he would have the children raised by the whites, he answered, "because they would grow rude and wicked at home, and would never come to know God, which [he] hoped they should doe if they were constantly among the English." The clergyman accepted Wampas' offer and assured him that the children would be given a sound education, "either in learning or some other trade of life in time convenient." Old Wampas replied that the Indians "desired nothing more." In a later letter, Eliot remarked that the senior Wampas had "taken a keen interest" in the missionary work (Humes 1952: 19-20; Wilson 1834:18-19).

All that is known about the younger Wampas for the next sixteen years, is that he later enrolled in a program of education and training that would eventually lead to a career as a missionary preacher or teacher. At some point he apparently became discouraged and left his studies to become a merchant seaman. The next time Wampas' name appeared in the records was on May 21, 1661, when he married an "Indian Princess" named Anne Praske. Anne was the daughter of Romanock, a
Mohegan sachem, whose domain was at Fairfield in the colony of Connecticut. The couple exchanged wedding vows in a civil ceremony performed by Humphrey Atherton, Indian agent for the colony of Massachusetts. At the time the marriage took place Wampas was a resident of Boston where he probably had lived since being turned over by his father, and where he would continue to make his home for the greater part of his adult life (Humes 1952:20).

While living with an English family Wampas had been given the Christian name John. Sometime around 1672, he assumed the surname "White." John F. Humes, in his biography of Wampas, believes that White was the family name of the English couple that adopted him. No concrete evidence exists to prove or disprove this assertion. There is one other possibility: the name may have come from the English translation of the Indian word "wampi" or "wompi" for the color white (Humes 1952:20).

Wampas' Property Dealings

On January 28, 1666, five years after Anne and John were wed, the couple purchased a house and lot that fronted on Boston Common from Robert and Sarah Wyard for 37 pounds 10 shillings. The lot was located on the easterly side of what is now Tremont Street, between Winter Street and Temple Place. John F. Humes says that the location must have been one of the most desirable places in Boston for a home. John and Anne lived next door to Hudson Leverett, whose father, John Leverett, was elected governor of the colony in 1672. Former governor John Winthrop was present at the closing and signed the deed as a witness. In 1668, the property was used as collateral for a loan of 200 pounds. The debt was paid off after six months (Humes 1952:20; SCD 1666:5,490, 1668:5,541). Approximately five years later, on November 20, 1671, John Wampas deeded a 100 acre tract in the Nipmuck country to Thomas Steadman of New London, Connecticut. It is stated on the deed that the land was a "gift" from Wampas, "for and in consideracon of the great affection and love which I have and beare unto my well beloved friend" and also for "divers other good causes and consideracons." The property was to "lye and be next adjoining unto the farme which I thsaid John wampus Intend to lye and be upon the north Side thereof." Wampas, it appears, had tentative plans to settle down in Nipmuck country sometime in the future (Humes 1952:20; SCD 1671:8,421-422).

The acreage conveyed to Steadman, it was explained on the deed, was "one part" of a tract of land that was "fourteen miles square" (fourteen miles on a side). Wampas claimed that the land belonged to him, as his "proper right and inheritance." The tract was "one third part" of a larger parcel of land that he supposedly shared with two other members of his family (see below). The "inheritance" claimed by John Wampas, it is assumed, was part of the estate bequeathed by his father. Apparently, Wampas felt that he was entitled to a third of the whole as his birthright. On the document, the land is described as "lyeing and being within the confines of the Massathusetts or Connecticott aforesaid and is in it being between the towne of Malbery [Marlborough] and the towne of Mendum [Mendon]." The occupation of Wampas is listed as "Seaman," and that of Steadman as "marriner." All indications are that the two men had, at one time or another, worked together as shipmates (Humes 1952:20; SCD 1671:8,421-422).

In 1672, John Wampas, now using the alias "White," together with "Piam Buckow" (Piambow), and "Anthony Tra[y]," petitioned the
Massachusetts General Court with regard to certain lands in the colony which they claimed to own. Piambow was the "ruling elder" of the praying town of Hassanamesit. Anthony Tray, also of Hassanamesit, was Wampas' uncle (his father's brother). The purpose of the petition was to have the territory legally registered in their names and the names of a number of other individuals who had an interest in the land. The magistrates appointed a three-man committee to investigate the matter and present their findings at the next session of the court. A search of the court records for the report proved fruitless. The title to the property had originally been held by John's father, the eldest male of the family, and therefore the ranking member of the clan. Upon the death of the elder Wampas, sometime prior to 1655, the land was inherited in part by his son John, his brother Anthony, and Piambow. The relationship between Piambow and the other two men is not known (Humes 1952:21; MCR 1854:V, 537-538; MA 1681:XXX, 260a).

Nipmuck Attitudes to Property

Between 1671 and 1679, Wampas deeded numerous parcels of land in Nipmuck country to the whites. Tray and Piambow contested the legality of Wampas' claim to the territory on two major points. The first, was that they were co-owners, and that there were other members of the tribe who had a legitimate interest in the property. This made them tenants in common. Second, they argued that Wampas had no right to dispose of those lands because the property had never been properly or legally divided among themselves. The two men later tried to have all deeds to land given or sold by Wampas declared null and void (MA 1681:XXX, 260a, 262a).

Tribal societies among the New England Indians were divided into several large groups or clans, consisting of a number of families claiming a common origin or blood ties. Each clan controlled a major portion of the tribal domain, with title vested in the leader or leaders of the group. Individuals or family units within the tribe were allotted however much land was needed for their support. The allotment or distribution of land was a privilege reserved for the paramount or grand sachem of the tribe, who set out the bounds. Specific pieces of property included plots for residence and planting. The remainder of the tribal lands served as common areas for hunting, fishing, and gathering. Ownership or property rights resided in the individual or head of the family, and were bequeathed to surviving heirs through the male line. The sale of individual land holdings among the members of the tribe was a common occurrence (Vaughan 1965:33-34, 105-106).

The chief sachem held jurisdictional right, similar to that of eminent domain, over the territory of the nation. The power to sell or dispose of land was his alone. A land transfer was not considered legitimate in the eyes of the Indian, unless it had been approved by the grand sachem. He could also make a final determination as to what lands could or could not be sold. All English purchases had to be made directly from the sachem, with compensation being paid to the Indian who held personal tenure. Customarily, owners of private property had to agree to any alienation of land (Vaughan 1965:34, 107; Jennings 1975:136-137).

The Wampas clan was a major subdivision of the Nipmuck tribe, and held proprietary rights to the land "Bordering upon the Indian plantation of Hassanamesit" (see MA 1681:262a). Although the land was inherited by the younger Wampas, he could not, for reasons stated above, take control of what he considered to be his share and dispose of it piecemeal. Exclusive or private ownership of land, to be subdivided or resold at the will of the titleholder, was a practice introduced into America by the English colonists. Wampas must have
thought that since he was raised by and lived among the English he no longer had to abide by Indian custom or law. He must have believed that as long as he followed all necessary procedures governing real estate transfers under the English system the transaction would be perfectly legal. His relatives refused to allow this to happen (see below).

**Wampas Pays Off Debts with Land**

In the summer of 1675, shortly after the outbreak of King Philip's War, Wampas had created some sort of disturbance in a church in Cambridge (Massachusetts). He was arrested and incarcerated for the offense pending a hearing. A short time later, John reportedly "broke out" out of jail. The public records contain no further information about the episode. Humes comments that it would be interesting to know whether the disturbance was in any way related to the war. A short time after the incident occurred, Wampas signed on to serve aboard a merchant ship bound for England. Was his sudden departure from the colony a move made to avoid prosecution for the incident? Possibly he had been charged with being a fugitive from justice (Humes 1952:21).

In late 1675 or early 1676, while in Britain, he was thrown into debtor's prison for failure to repay a "small debt." During his incarceration he petitioned the Lords of the King's Council to use the land he supposedly owned in the colony of Massachusetts to pay off the creditor and bring about his release. Wampas' request met with favorable results, and on August 22, 1676, he was given a letter written by Charles II, King of England, ordering that he "bee restored to his said lands, or have liberty to sell the same for his present reliefe and the payment of his debts." The official decree was addressed to Gov. John Leverett of Massachusetts. Four months after the receipt of the letter, but before it could be delivered to the governor, Wampas was set free (Humes 1952:22).

The money to pay Wampas' debt, thereby securing his release from prison, and also for his support while awaiting return passage to the colonies, came from at least three individuals. Assisting him in his hour of need were Anthony Mudd and Nicholas Warner, both of London, and John Cole of Charlestown, Massachusetts, a "fellow seaman." In appreciation of their help, Wampas executed several deeds of conveyance for land, in lieu of cash payments to settle the debts. Warner was given a deed for an undetermined amount of land (no record of the deed exists). To Warner's son John, he gave a second deed for one thousand acres. According to the instrument, the land was located "in Quansacomack" (the area about Lake Quinsigamond in Worcester and Shrewsbury, Massachusetts). Mudd also received a deed for one thousand acres, to be laid out from "Qansachamands Ponds...Southwards." Both deeds were dated December 19, 1676. Cole received a deed for three hundred acres, located in "Bedford" (Massachusetts?) (Humes 1952:31; MCD 1676: 6,86-87; 6,101-102).

**Wampas Loses Title to his Home**

Wampas returned to Boston from England in the spring of 1677 to find that his wife Anne had died the previous September of "scalding" (she apparently suffered serious burns in some type of accident). On her death bed, she asked that the keys to her house be turned over to a man named Joshua Hughes, an immediate neighbor, who was later appointed administrator of her estate.

Hughes took legal possession of the property on the strength of three affidavits sworn to before Gov. John Leverett on September 28, 1676. The witnesses testified that while she was alive, Anne Wampas had on numerous occasions...
expressed the great love and affection she had for Hughes. She told them that if anything should happen to her, she wished to have her entire estate turned over to Hughes or his children for the kindness and generosity shown to her during her husband’s long absences. The sworn statements, plus the fact that John had not been heard from in well over a year, and may have been presumed dead, were the prime factors in the governor’s decision to award the property to Hughes (Humes 1952:31-32).

When Wampas arrived back in Massachusetts, he found Hughes in possession of his home. For reasons that can only be speculated upon, rather than try to regain title through legal channels, which he would have had little trouble in doing, he agreed to a settlement and deeded the house and land over to Hughes. On June 22, 1677, Wampas signed a quitclaim to his interest in the Boston property for a consideration of 20 pounds, considerably less than the 100 pounds the property was officially appraised at only a few months before, and less than the price paid when it was purchased seventeen years earlier in 1661. This certainly was an odd transaction, and could be an indication that Wampas was in desperate need of money at the time. It is also quite possible that this was Wampas’ way of repaying Hughes for looking after his wife. (Humes 1952:31-32).

**Wampas’ Nipmuck Claims Contested**

In the spring of 1677, Daniel Gookin, superintendent of Indian affairs for the colony, conducted a hearing into the validity of Wampas’ claim to the Nipmuck lands. The court of inquiry was held at "Coowate" (Cowate), the lower falls in the Charles River, where a large group of the Christian Indians had been living ever since the conclusion of King Philip’s War of 1675-76. An account of what had transpired at the meeting, as well as Gookin’s subsequent findings, was recounted by the agent in a written deposition taken before a court of inquiry held at Natick on September 14, 1681.

Those called upon to appear at the hearings included, Waban, Piambow, Nowanit, Jethro, and Anthony and Thomas Tray. The Trays, "unkells by the father[’s] side unto John Woampas," testified "that they wel[I] knew John woampa[s] from a child: and his father also old woampas." They stated, that "Jo[hn] woampas, was no sachem, and had no more Right [or] title to Any lands in the Nipmuk country within t[he colony] of Massachusetts, than other comon Indians ha[d]." Anthony Tray did acknowledge that several years before (1672), the group authorized Wampas, because he spoke English well and was familiar with the court system, to register a claim to those lands in his own name and the names of all other persons having a legitimate interest. The attempt by the group to legalize the claim in the courts was apparently never followed through to the end, which left the ownership of the property open to question. They denied that Wampas was ever given the power to "sell, give, grant or barter any land in those parts," and therefore, did "utterly disclaime" all subsequent transfers made by him (MA 1681:XXX, 260a).

John Wampas was present at the inquiry, and was called upon to testify in his own behalf. He was questioned concerning "his instan[c]es in claiming a great tract of land and marking trees with his letter W. in several places in the Nipmaks Country Challenging those lands for his propriety, and offering to sell those lands." Wampas could "not prove or demonstrate" to the court that he had any more right to sell or otherwise dispose of those lands than any other "como[n]" Indian. All the principal Indians invited to present testimony bore witness against his illegal practices and renounced his claim. They did also, for the future, "inhibit and forbid him to medle any more about those
claimes." Last, the Indians "withdrew any former Betrustment commited to him in this Affaire" (MA 1681:XXX, 259a).

Several of the witnesses testifying before Gookin made numerous attacks against Wampas' character, charging that he was an "evil" and "very wicked" person, and that "all he aimed at was to get mony to be drunke and spend upon his lusts." The deposition was followed by a statement that Rev. John Eliot was in attendance at the hearings. He, along with the Indians present, were willing to appear before the magistrates at any time to swear under oath to the truth of his recollections regarding what testimony had been given and the eventual outcome (MA 1681:XXX, 259a).

Despite all that had transpired at the hearings, Wampas continued to claim the Nipmuck lands as his own and to use them for personal gain. On August 16, 1677, while living in Boston, he took out two mortgages, one for 18 pounds and 4 shillings and the second for 10 pounds. Apparently, it was not widely known around the Boston area that Wampas had been stripped of his entitlement to the Nipmuck lands. Each mortgage was secured by a deed for 4,000 acres of land, and ran for a period of thirty days at an interest rate of 5 shillings. Both parcels were located at the "north end of Quonsicamond Pond," and included the "benefit and easement" of the "Connecticutt high way" (Springfield Road). There is nothing on record to indicate if either of the loans was ever repaid (Humes 1952:32; MCD 1677:6,82; 6,84-86).

**Wampas' Claim to his Wife's Land**

In the spring of 1678, Wampas went to Connecticut Colony to take possession of a large tract of land at "Aspitock" (Aspetuck) that he inherited or acquired from Sachem Romanock, his father-in-law, through his marriage to Anne Praske. Mrs. Wampas received the land as a gift from her father on September 11, 1660, (the sachem died sometime in the late 1660s), about eight months before she married Wampas. The exact location of the plot is not known. Humes says that it seems to have been almost identical with that later embraced by the English town of Fairfield (Humes 1952:32-33; 39-40; Schenck 1889:1, 210-211).

Wampas presented his claim to the officials of Fairfield, along with a request that he be allowed to have the land surveyed. When they refused, he demanded that the property be bounded out to him. So persistently was the matter pursued he incurred the displeasure of the local magistrates who ordered that he be arrested and thrown into prison. The possibility that Wampas might have a valid claim to town lands was very disturbing news to many of the townspeople. With the threat of future litigation hanging over their heads, authorities of the town were prompted to obtain a confirmation of the original deeds from the local sachems who approved or made the transfers (Humes 1952:32; Schenck 1889:1, 210-211).

After his release from jail, sometime late in 1678, Wampas returned to England and again sought the help of the Crown. His petition to the King's Council, headed by the second Earl of Clarendon, was accepted for review and he was granted a hearing date to present his case. Wampas appeared before the Privy Council sometime early in 1679, to complain that when he went to Fairfield to take possession of his estate, he was prevented from doing so by the "evil practices" of one Major Nathan Gould, a wealthy property owner and influential leader of the community. Gould, along with several other citizens and elected officials, had him unjustly imprisoned without benefit of counsel. As proof of purchase, Wampas presented a copy of the deed given to his wife by her father. The transfer had been duly registered with the proper authorities at Hartford, Connecticut, on October 14, 1667. Also entered as evidence were papers showing that he had previously sold a portion of the
tract to a group of Englishmen for the sum of 350 pounds (Humes 1952:33, 39; Schenck 1889:1, 211).

During the hearings Wampas further complained to the council "of the great hardships and miseries he and other native Indians are subject unto by the laws of that colony." A few weeks after the close of the proceedings a decision was rendered in Wampas' favor. Per order of his Majesty the King, Clarendon declared "that not only the petitioner, but all such Indians of New England as are his subjects and submit peaceably and quietly to his Majesty's government, shall likewise participate of his Royall protection" (Humes 1952:33; Schenck 1889:1, 211).

Wampas was given an official letter dated March 28, 1679, to deliver to the governor and magistrates of Connecticut "rebuking" them for the treatment he had received and "demanding that justice be accorded him." The letter states that the council, "by his Majesties express commands," require that the Connecticut authorities "doe the Petitioner such justice as his case may deserve." For the future, they were "to proceed in such a manner as his Majestie's subjects may not be forced to undertake so long and dangerous voyages for obtaining justice, which his majestie expects shall be speedily and impartially administered unto them." Before Wampas was able to deliver the letter and make good on his bid to take legal possession of the land, he died of an unknown illness (Humes 1952:33; Schenck 1889:1, 211).

In 1681, the executors to the will of John Wampas (see below), engaged Mr. Richard Thayre, a lawyer of Milford (Connecticut), to apply to the Connecticut General Assembly in an attempt to recover the Fairfield property. His efforts were met with opposition from all sectors. Thayre approached William Hill, the town recorder for information pertaining to the Wampas claim. Hill "said he had the evidences in his custody but would not deliver them or copies thereof without advice of Major Gould." Hill consulted with Gould, who said he could not, and would not, comply with Thayre's wishes (Humes 1952:39; Schenck 1889:1, 218-219).

On July 22, Hill and Gould were summoned by Thayre to appear in court to present whatever evidence they had in their possession and give testimony in the case, which they defiantly refused to do. With regard to the Wampas claim, Gould said that under no circumstances would he consider "the evidence and testimony of an Indian." Several days after the court session Thayre was asked to attend a meeting of the townspeople who "forewarned" him about "stretching any Line within their township" without first giving them satisfactory reason. Thayre stated that he "neither measured any Lands nor offered them any affront" (Humes 1952:39; Schenck 1889:1, 218-219).

Thayre sent a letter of protest to Connecticut Governor William Leete on July 21, 1681, asking "for an order for measuring the land and doing all lawful acts for discovering the truth." The governor and his advisors replied that "they would allow all lawful acts in this as in other cases, such as to grant copies of records, take testimony and the like 'but for to suffer strangers to draw lines within townships without order or consent of the town we think not safe to encourage.'" This seems to have ended the pursuance of the claim to the Aspetuck lands by the executors, as no further record of the dispute can be found. Humes says in his ending remarks that there is evidence to indicate that some adjustment of this claim was made, but "we have found no record which tells just what the settlement was, and we doubt whether any such record exists" (Humes 1952:39-40; Schenck 1889:1, 218-219; CA 1681:1, 196-197).
While living in England, Wampas continued to dispose of additional parcels within the colony of Massachusetts despite orders to refrain from doing so. On July 19, 1679, he deeded a tract of land eight miles square to Edward Pratt of London for 50 pounds. The land is described as "Scittuate, lyng and being neere Quomsuccomake pond within the Nepnouc Country." Strangely enough, it states on the deed that Wampas was the "Sachem" of "Asanamiscock [Hassanamesit] in the Nipmuck Country in New England," who was then residing in the city of London (Humes 1952:33; MCD 1679:7,157-160).

Late in the summer of 1679 John Wampas was stricken with a serious illness. On September 5, he made his last will and testament at which time he was reportedly "sick and weak in body." Shortly after the will was executed, Wampas passed away. The document was probated in London on October 1, 1679. According to the articles of the will, the land in the Nipmuck country Wampas claimed as his inheritance was to be divided three ways. First, he "gave to three of his Indian kinsmen John a Wonsamock [Awassamug?], Pomhamell and Norwarunnt his estate in New England known as 'Assenham East-stock' [Hassanamesit]." The three individuals, it is stated, were credited with "offering, performing, fulfilling, and keeping all such Articles and conditions as my Father and I have or ought to have observed, performed, fulfilled and kept." Humes says that this language clearly indicates that Wampas and the father held the territory of Hassanamesit on some sort of trust the nature of which these devisees well understood (Humes 1952: 26-27, 34).

Secondly, he gave to George Owen, a surgeon from London, 400 acres of land in Bedford in New England. This was the second piece of real estate Wampas sold that was located in Bedford. Owen may have been the doctor that treated him during his illness. All the remaining lands included in his estate went to Edward Pratt of London, and John Blake of Plymouth Colony in New England. Pratt and Blake are designated as joint executors of the will (Humes 1952:26-27, 34).

John Wampas gave or sold numerous parcels of land in Massachusetts that he obviously did not have the right to dispose of under Indian law. He genuinely believed, however, that he was entitled to a share of the Nipmuck lands as part of his inheritance from his father's estate. As a part owner, he wanted to come to an agreement with the other members of the clan to divide the property in a fair and equitable manner so that he could take possession and do with it as he pleased. In this instance he was thinking like an Englishman, a direct result of his upbringing. His Indian relatives, adhering to traditional Indian community values, would not allow this to happen. When they refused to settle, he decided to defy them and dispose of the land anyway. He sold the choice parcels of the Nipmuck lands and left it up to the courts to disentangle the legal mess that inevitably transpired.

There are several aspects to this whole affair that are most puzzling. If Wampas' claim to the Massachusetts lands was a valid one as he believed, why is it he did not file a motion to enforce the favorable judgment previously rendered by the King's Council (1676) when he went before that body seeking redress from the Fairfield authorities? At that time, he could have submitted a "writ of partition," a common law procedure, which would have given him the power to force the joint tenants to divide the land among themselves. Why is it also that while in England he never sold any of the land at Aspetuck in Connecticut? He had in his possession the letter from the King's Council that would almost certainly assure that the title to his wife's estate would be restored in the courts had he returned to America. Lastly, Wampas
sold land in "Bedford" on two occasions, yet we find no record that such a place existed in the 1670s.

**Land Claims and Hassanamesit Praying Town**

After the death of Wampas, Edward Pratt immigrated to America. He "sold a fractional interest in his 40,000 acre purchase [the eight miles square deeded to him by Wampas on July 19, 1679] to each of eight or nine others." Included in the group was Joshua Hughes, the same person that took possession of Wampas' property on Boston Common in 1677 (Humes 1952:36).

In 1684, Pratt and the other partners petitioned the Massachusetts General Court to ratify the deed from Wampas and confirm their title. On May 14, the magistrates issued the following decision:

> The Court knows not of any land that Wampas, Indian, had any true or legal right unto, he being no sachem but a common person: if the persons can find any land that was his and with held from them, the law is open where they may obteine their right if they can make any such appear.

This finding was based on testimony presented before the court of inquiry convened by Daniel Gookin and John Eliot at Natick in 1681 (Humes 1952: 36; MCR 1854:V, 442; MA 1681:XXX, 260a).

The several titles created by Wampas resulted in numerous legal problems in the courts and prevented all parties from obtaining a clear title to their claims. To end the controversy and confusion, the Indian and English claimants agreed to come to a compromise and make an out of court settlement. Several articles of agreement were drawn up and signed by representatives for both sides on August 25, 1686. Edward Pratt of Mendon, and John Blake of Wrentham, are listed on the document as "Executors," with eight others as "partners." Listed are nine Indian claimants, followed by the statement, "together with the said Wampus their Chiefe and principal in certain lands lying att Assanamescock in the Nipmugg country in New England aforesaid." Why, at this time, would the Indians perjure themselves and admit in writing that Wampas was a "Chiefe?" Was it a move made to legally expedite the matter (Humes 1952:36-37; SCD 1686:16,89-91)?

By this agreement, the two groups were to divide up most of the unclaimed lands between the Blackstone River on the west and the Indian town of Natick on the east. The Indians would retain the four miles square granted to them by the general court in 1654 for the praying town of Hassanamesit. Pratt and the others were to receive the land contained in "two Miles Square on each and every side of the four Miles square." Both parcels combined were the equivalent of a tract eight miles square, with the Hassanamesit lands located in the exact center (Figure 1: Map of the Eight Miles Square & Hassanamisco, 1686).

At intervals for a period of twenty years, Humes says, Pratt and his partners sought ratification of their title without success. This abruptly changed when Paul Dudley, a Boston lawyer and son of the governor of Massachusetts, was made an equal partner. And then, miraculously, all obstacles to ratification quickly disappeared. Finally, on March 21, 1703/04, the general assembly issued an order confirming to the executors the right and title to a "certain tract of Land" eight miles square "called Hassanamisco." Not only was the title allowed, they were awarded a grant for a full eight miles square or 40,960 acres, double the amount of land agreed upon in the settlement with the Indians. The title was ratified by the legislature on May 15, 1704, "for a township the same to be called Sutton" (Figure 2: Map of Sutton Township, 1715) (Humes 1952:36-37; Acts and Resolves 1922:XXI, 729; MA 1715:IV, 11, 22; VI, 8).
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Connole: Conflict in English and Indian Attitudes Regarding Land Ownership: The Story of John Wampas
The original agreement called for a tract with the Indian lands located in the middle. When the grant was finally surveyed and plotted, Hassanamesit was located near the northeast corner. The position of the four miles square had remained relatively unchanged, but the "remainder of the 8-mile tract," Humes says, was moved about two miles to the westward and about two miles to the southward (Humes 1952: 36-37).

**Conclusion**

The story of John Wampas is an unusual one. As Humes so aptly puts it, no other Nipmuck has left behind him "more footprints in the sands of time." Testimony presented by several of the ruling and other principal Indians of the Nipmuck country, including his uncles, Anthony and Thomas Tray, proves conclusively that John Wampas was no sachem. Therefore, he was correctly labeled a "comon person." Humes is quick to point out however, that in the true sense of the word, he was far from being just a common Indian. During the course of his eventful lifetime, as his biography shows, the path Wampas followed took some extraordinary twists and turns (Humes 1952:35).

Wampas' acquired English attitudes towards land ownership brought him into direct conflict with the traditional communal land values of his Nipmuck relatives. Against their wishes he insisted on dispensing land as he alone saw fit. Consequently, in the eyes of his family and fellow countrymen, Wampas' reprehensible behavior and disreputable actions brought shame and dishonor to his good name, as well as to the other members of the clan. He was rejected by his own people and became an outcast. At the time of his death, Wampas had only a few close "friends," and those were questionable. These individuals may have befriended him because they thought, or he fooled them into believing, he was a land-rich Indian leader from the colonies. It is nothing more than speculation, but could greed have in any way caused these so-called friends to hasten his departure from this world? The man lived, and in the end died, in abject poverty thousands of miles from his homeland. Wampas was buried in a foreign land, and according to Indian custom, would not be reunited with his ancestors in death. In short, it is a sad ending to a very remarkable story.

**ENDNOTES**

1. Much of the information used in this article comes from the excellent biographical sketch of Wampas by John F. Humes cited in the bibliography. Included is some additional material about the man that I uncovered while doing research for the piece. Considering the thoroughness of Humes' work, it seems unlikely that he could have overlooked these sources (see MA 1681:XXX, 259a, 260a, 262a). It is possible that they may not have been available to him at the time. Also included is some additional information about Wampas' dealings with Fairfield, Connecticut, authorities concerning his claim to a tract of land located within the bounds of that township.

2. There is some controversy as to the age of Wampas at the time of his death. The transcript of the hearings at Natick on September 14, 1681, states that "John Woampas, Decesed," was "Aged 60 yeares [illegible] fifty eight or there abouts" (MA 1681:XXX, 260a). If this information is accurate, which is doubtful, there is a discrepancy as to the age of young Wampas when he was delivered by the father to the home of Eliot's assistant in 1646. Eliot says that John was one of the four "children" brought to the house of the clergyman and listed their ages as between four and nine. If Wampas was nine at the time, he could not have been more than forty-one or forty-two when he died in 1679. Humes says that he was "about 41." There were two other Indians, described as "young lusty men," who volunteered to be trained by the English at the same time. Could it be that Eliot was in error, and that one of these two individuals was the son? This would mean that the two had to be around twenty-eight years of age, which is possible, but does not seem likely.
3. This is the first time the name “Hassanamisco” had ever appeared in the historical records (see Acts and Resolves 1922:XXI,729, see also 403). Similar names can be found on the Wampas deed of July 19, 1679, “Asanemiscock,” and the will of Wampas, dated September 5, 1679, “Asenham East-stock” (Humes 1952:26-27). There are also similar spellings of the name in “James Quannapohit’s Relation” of January 24, 1675/76, “Hassannmiske,” “Hassaneshe,” “Hassunnamesuke,” and “Hassanamesho” (Temple 1887:113-115). See also, "Report of Ephraim Curtis," July 16, 1675, "Esenemisco" (MA 1675:215). These are several good examples of the degree of variation in the spelling of the name Hassanamesit that can be found in the colonial records and other writings of the period.

ABBREVIATIONS

CA Connecticut State Archives
MA Massachusetts State Archives
MCD Middlesex County Registry of Deeds, Grantee Indexes
MCR Nathaniel B. Shurtleff, ed., Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England
MHHC Massachusetts Historical Society Collections
SCD Suffolk County Registry of Deeds, Grantee Indexes

Note: Reference citations for quotations taken from deeds include the year of the deed and the book and page number(s) from the Grantee Indexes, i.e. (MCD 1677:6, 84-86).
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UNIQUE BIRDBONE ARTIFACT FROM MIDDLETOWN, MASSACHUSETTS

By Philip Brady

In the fall of 1981 I visited a friend who lived in Middleton, Massachusetts. Knowing my interest in archaeology, he took me to visit a small rock shelter, situated on a now dry brook. A Colonial-era dam and mill had once occupied the spot and a few traces of the dam remain.

The shelter was some 15 ft (4.574 m) above the brook bed and was just large enough for me to sit inside, facing out. I had my onion hoe with me and I started to scratch in the small amount of soil. Within seconds I uncovered a small bone object (see Figure 1) which I brushed clean. The artifact measured approximately 1 1/4 in (38.1 mm) in length. (Exact measurements are not now available.)

The artifact was placed on display in the Massachusetts Archaeological Society's Robbins Museum, in a case with other rare objects, and has since disappeared. A color print was recently made from a slide, in the possession of the author, and is now on display at the museum.

The artifact was examined under a large industrial microscope at the Bird Manufacturing Company, Walpole, Massachusetts, and many tiny scratch marks are visible around the eye and nose features. These marks are not visible to the naked eye.

What significance the object once had to its maker, or to other tribal members, can only be guessed at.

Figure 1. Birdbone artifact from a rock shelter, Middleton, Massachusetts.
In Memoriam: Lillian E. Harding 1911-1996

By Jacqueline C. Tidman

During her lifetime Mrs. Harding lived on a farm located in close proximity to Boston Hill and Charlestown Meadows in the town of Westborough, Massachusetts. Both of these areas were found to be rich in prehistoric archaeology. It was discovered when the farmland was plowed by her brother, Thomas Luuko, that the artifacts turned up were tools of the long-ago cultures of peoples who had inhabited the lands in this region.

Such a discovery interested Mrs. Harding and she enrolled at Clark University to study these past civilizations. It was at the University that she met Dr. Curtiss Hoffman, the Professor teaching the course. Thus began a long association whereby Mrs. Harding became known as an authority in recognizing and identifying the cultural remains of these Native Americans.

In 1977 Mrs. Harding was appointed a member of the Westborough Historical Commission and immediately assumed the role of consulting archaeologist to the Board. Throughout her tenure she spent hours in the field as well as in the laboratory, cataloging, classifying, and photographing the items found at the many digs around Westborough. Mrs. Harding also gave lectures and slide programs to encourage others to join her and her colleagues in this exciting and rewarding experience. Throughout her life Mrs. Harding was an advocate and pioneer in ensuring that these culturally sensitive areas would be investigated and the relics collected would be preserved. She worked diligently to educate the public about these non-renewable cultural remains that give us insight into the lives, settlements, migrations, and habits of these prehistoric peoples.

Her enthusiasm and dedication enriched the Historical Commission's role as leaders in the field of Archaeology. It was due to her knowledge that Cedar Swamp, under Dr. Hoffman's aegis, was in 1989 designated a National Archaeological Historic District.

Mrs. Harding's contributions to her field have left a legacy for future generations.