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I was saddened to learn of the passing of Tom Lux over a year ago while attending the Theoretical Archaeology Group 2010 at Brown University. Though it had been more than a decade since I had seen Tom, he held a special place for me because he was my first mentor and the one who inspired me to become an archaeologist. In the fall of 1973 I enrolled as a freshman at Providence College where Tom was an instructor. I took my first course with Tom the following fall. This required course, entitled “Early Man and Race,” was essentially an introduction to archaeology and physical anthropology. I don’t recall having a textbook, but I do remember Tom editing information from Science News and other sources on the newest discoveries in paleoanthropology and typing it onto mimeographed paper that he distributed to us. I also took Tom’s course on kinship and social organization before I graduated in 1977.

As the lone member of the Anthropology Department faculty at PC with an interest in archaeology, Tom did the best he could to expose his students to the field, despite his lack of professional credentials. He was, after all, a cultural anthropologist. Yet Tom believed in experiential learning and was willing to allow students to literally work in the field in lieu of sitting in the classroom. His pedagogical techniques surely made an impression on me. On a crisp autumn day in my sophomore year, he invited me and other members of the class to meet him in Swansea, Massachusetts at the Read Farm site. There, squeezed between two state highways, was a small patch of gravelly land where he had been working with Carol Barnes from Rhode Island College in conjunction with the Massachusetts Archaeological Society. I don’t remember anyone else on the site over the several weekends that I worked there. My focus was a 5-foot square excavation unit in which I troweled in 3-inch levels to recover and record quartz chipping debris from the vicinity of a small hearth or pit feature associated with charcoal. I can still remember Tom trusting me to section that hearth and being mesmerized when I found a grooved stone that was described as a net sinker made and lost or abandoned by a fishing society sometime in the Late Archaic period, over 3,000 years ago! In a short time I caught the archaeology bug, and never recuperated.

It was either later that fall or the following spring when Tom took me to the Wapanucket 8 site to quench my archaeological thirst. There I met the famous Doc Robbins and several long-time MAS members. The long coffee and lunch breaks that the group enjoyed puzzled me; I wondered why they didn’t spend more time excavating and less time chatting. I was blind with the impatience of my youth.

In my junior year I travelled to the University of Fribourg, Switzerland with the Providence-in-Europe study abroad program with Tom’s blessing. When I returned, I remember Tom inviting Professor Barnes to lecture on the great Middle Mississippian site of Cahokia. I had never heard of nor seen any of the earthen mounds of ancient America, and vowed to learn more about that chapter in American history. I later lived at the base of Monk’s Mound, where I directed the excavations at Cahokia in advance of the interpretive center planned for this World Heritage site. But that was not to happen until after Tom recommended me to work on a small dig in southwest New Hampshire along the Ashuelot River where a UMass doctoral student was investigating a 10,000 year old Paleoindian site, complete with fluted points, exotic cherts, and calcined pieces of barren ground caribou bone. (Editor’s note: that would be the Whipple site, excavated by Mary Lou Curran.) Tom fostered my interest in archaeology and pointed me in positive directions as I aimed to find my way in the strange but deeply captivating world of past relics and the people who made them. I’ll always be grateful to Tom for illuminating that path.

During my first sabbatical leave from my professorship at Western Michigan University, I wandered back to my native Rhode Island in 1999 to study seventeenth-century gender roles in Native society. Among my many stops in various museums, repositories, and archives throughout the region was my visit to the Robbins Museum, where I
found Tom working diligently on some cataloging project. He graciously took me to lunch and afforded me the opportunity to bring him up to date on the wonderful archaeology I had conducted since my first exposure to a trowel 25 years earlier under his tutelage. He beamed as only a proud father could of the accomplishments of a son. I’m so glad we had that chance to talk and I’m so pleased that I fell under the sway of Mr. Lux, as I referred to him for the first decade of our association.

**Janice Mabel Weeks -- an Obituary**

David “Bud” Driver

Our friend Janice Weeks died February 27, 2011 at the age of 86, following a period of declining health. Janice is best known to members of the MAS as a founding member and past president of Norwottuck Chapter of the Society, to which she belonged for nearly forty years.

Few people thought about archaeology when Janice was growing up, and she followed a different path herself. In 1946, she earned a B.S. degree in Home Economics from Nisson College, then returned home to Greenfield where she worked at the family’s appliance store for many years. Looking for a change, Janice completed her M.S. degree in Nutrition at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, in 1971. For the next seventeen years, Janice inspired a steady stream of students, girls and boys alike, as a Home Economics teacher at Mohawk Regional High School in Shelburne Falls, Massachusetts.

Janice had an insatiable desire to know more about a broad range of subjects. In 1951, she embarked alone on a journey across Europe from hostel to hostel. In time Janice became a true world traveler, and cultivated life-long friends across the globe. Reading was also a passion. She subscribed to numerous publications and was constantly on the lookout for new discoveries. Fascinated by the past, Janice developed an avid interest in archaeology and what it could tell us about ancient cultures.

Janice was at the fore of the organizational efforts to establish the Norwottuck Chapter of the MAS. She was elected its first president in October 1969, and went to work recruiting members and speakers. With UMass being located nearby, Janice began to draw on faculty members and the few trained archaeologists working in New England at the time. They gave talks on their areas of interest, ranging from the Connecticut Valley to Peru and the American Southwest. The relationships that developed between MAS members and UMass faculty and students spearheaded by Janice would last for decades.

The late 1960s to the mid 1970s marked the high point of the Norwottuck Chapter’s involvement in archaeological fieldwork. Janice and other chapter members focused on what would become recognized as one of the most significant archaeological areas in New England - the Great Falls on the Connecticut River between Gill and Turners Falls, Massachusetts. As we know them today, all time periods, from Paleoindian to Late Woodland, are
represented at sites in close proximity to the falls: Riverside, Peskeompscut, Factory Hollow, Mackin’s Sand Bank, Casley, Stemple, etc.

About a dozen chapter members began excavating in a garden plot on a small knoll on the Gill side of the river during the Spring and Summer of 1969. The Casleys, for whom the site area was named, owned a small house lot on what was locally known as Fort Hill. A small assemblage of Late Archaic and Woodland artifacts and a few human bones were recovered. Materials were reviewed at the October meeting by Howard Sargent, one of the very few trained archaeologists working in the Connecticut Valley at this time, and excavation rules were officially adopted. Janice pulled the information together during the next few months, and submitted a summary report on the Casley Site as a term paper for an upper level course in archaeology that she took at UMass in the spring of 1970. This was subsequently filed with the MHC. The presence of steatite temper in fragments of Vinitte I pottery at the site led Janice to publish a brief article on “Steatite-Tempered Pottery in New England” in Man in the Northeast (1971(2):103-104).

The Norwottuck Chapter shifted its efforts to an adjacent part of the Fort Hill during the summers of 1970 and 1971, where the Stemple Site was partially excavated. Collections of Archaic and Woodland Period artifacts, several burials, and accompanying records, were subsequently taken to the Anthropology Department at UMass for analysis when it became evident the group itself lacked the expertise to undertake such study. In the Fall of 1971 and Summer of 1972, the Western Mass Electric Company provided a small grant to the Department of Anthropology at UMass for an archaeological evaluation of a small lot it owned along the Connecticut River, about 500 yards west of the Casley and Stemple Sites. Peter Thomas, then a graduate student in the department, was appointed as field director. Janice organized the chapter members into a dedicated team of excavators. Not only were long hours spent in the field, an even longer commitment was required to wash and catalog the recovered artifacts, which Janice and others graciously provided. The WMECO Site produced a stratified sequence of midden deposits relating to a major fishing site that extended back more than 8,000 years. This relationship with Peter Thomas continued, and chapter members assisted him with excavations of a fortified Indian village site in Hinsdale, NH during the Fall of 1973, and with lab work over the following winter.

Due to a number of circumstances, the opportunities for Janice and chapter members to actively participate in field projects substantially lessened in later years. But they did ably marshal volunteer assistance when sites were threatened, and continued with an active speaker program. The nascent field of CRM was just developing in response to the growing demands of governmental agencies and the emergence of commercial companies to conduct federally funded licensed projects. Such studies demanded that work be done in very short time frames and with professionally trained teams. Janice was ready to try her hand in this new area.

In the summer of 1971, she was awarded a contract to conduct a preliminary archaeological survey of a proposed construction corridor for a new alignment of Route 2. Her work consisted of a walkover survey of a roughly four-mile corridor north of the Connecticut River in Gill, and a background study of what could be learned about the intensity of former Indian occupations in the project area from local archaeological collections and recent excavations. With editing assistance from Dr. Dena Dincauze, who had recently arrived at UMass, Janice submitted her study, “Report of the Archaeological Survey between the French King Bridge and the Western End of the Proposed Route 2 Extension” to the engineering firm and to the newly appointed State Archaeologist, Maurice Robbins. This is one of the earliest such CRM reports completed in Massachusetts, at a time when virtually no formal guidance existed as to how such studies should be conducted. Janice subsequently completed a nomination of the Riverside Archaeology District, which encompasses more than a third of the area traversed by the proposed Route 2 extension, to the National Register of Historic Places.

In 1980, Janice was named to the MAS Board of Trustees to fill a vacancy when another Board member moved up to an officer position. She was later elected to a full term on the Board, and then was elected Second Vice-President in 1982, a position which she held until 1990. In this capacity, she served as Program Chair for the MAS Annual
and Semi-Annual meetings. She graciously hosted the summertime meetings of the MAS Board in her back yard in Greenfield.

The world of archaeology has changed a great deal since the early 1970s. But we should not lose track of the pioneers. Janice was one of them. She drew attention to the fact that significant archaeological sites not only existed in foreign lands, but in our own back yard as well. Her efforts to summarize what was then known about the significant archaeological sites along the Connecticut River in her survey report for Route 2 through Gill, and her successful nomination of the Riverside Archaeology District to the National Register, leave us a lasting legacy. Significant sites that would have been destroyed by the new highway are still there. To those who knew her, she also leaves fond memories of an indomitable spirit, a thirst for knowledge, an amazing positive attitude, and a robust amount of good cheer.

I would like to thank Peter Thomas and Susan Weeks, whose aid I enlisted in writing this article.

Titicut Greene Points
William B. Taylor

Introduction:

Greene points (ca 400 AD – 800 AD) have lanceolate to ovate blades, with contracting stems. Bases are convex or straight and are often thinned. The widest section is just above the midpoint. Some points are large in size, reaching up to 4” (10.2 cm) for Greene knives (Boudreau 2008). Most examples are fairly thick, reaching 3/8” (0.95 cm) in the center. Greene points are usually well made and are symmetrical in shape (Funk 1976).

Materials:

Most Greene points are made of local felsites. However, a smaller percentage (about 25%) are made from exotic materials. Figure 2 shows two examples (Numbers 9 and 10) made of Pennsylvania brown jasper. Number 2 is made of Munson dark red chert and number 4 is made of Normanskill black chert, found at Taylor Farm (19-PL-165). Number 1 and number 5 are made from Hingham red and white mottled rhyolite.

Fort Hill Bluff Site (19-PL-163)

This North Middleborough site is one of the best multi-component sites within the Titicut area. In the years 1985-1987, this eight acre tract of woods was cut off, cleared and bulldozed, before planting to hay fields. Since then, this site has only been plowed three times between plantings of corn or hay. Through the years, my father, William H. Taylor, and I recovered over 500 whole artifacts from this field.

During the Late Paleo Period (9500-9000 B.P.) early hunters explored the Taunton River basin. Left behind were three Agate Basin related points, which superficially resemble Greene points in shape, but are easily distinguished by manufacturing technology. During the Early and Middle Archaic Periods (9000-6000 B.P.) the site was used at least seasonally, while during the Late Archaic Period (6000-2700 B.P.) it was more permanently occupied. During the Woodland Period (2700-400 B.P.) the Titicut area was permanently occupied. During the Contact Period around 1600 A.D., a fort was erected on the Fort Hill Bluff Site by local Indians as a defense against Narragansett raiding parties (Weston 1906). Volume 14(2) of the Bulletin of the Massachusetts Archaeological Society contains a preliminary report of the fort excavation by Karl S. Dodge (1953). In 1976 a final report of the Bluff Site and a map of the fort was presented in Volume 38(1 & 2) of the Bulletin of the Massachusetts Archaeological Society (Taylor 1976).

After the Cohannet Chapter of the MAS dug at the fort in 1952, my father and I continued to excavate periodically in the pine grove behind the fort. In 1963 my father found a cache of eleven Greene
Points. This cache was a mix of finished points, along with some preforms, scrapers and knives. This recovery should more properly be called a Greene tool kit. No pit feature was associated with this find (see Figure 1).

Several other Greene points from the Bluff Site are shown in Figure 2 (Numbers 3, 6, 7, and 8). Another Greene point (Number 4) from the Taylor Farm (19-PL-165) is shown.

Other Related Middle Woodland Types

Within the Titicut area, several sites have examples of Fox Creek Stemmed and Fox Creek Lanceolate points, but not in large numbers from any one site. These types are often associated with Greene points (Ritchie 1961 rev. 1971, Boudreau 2008). Fox Creek Stemmed points have long lanceolate blades, with weak shoulders. Stem edges are almost straight to slightly concave and have concave bases. Examples shown in Figure 3 are numbers 7, 8, and 9.

Fox Creek Lanceolate points have lanceolate blades, with slightly concave bases. Some forms are almost pentagonal from extreme resharpening (Boudreau 2008, Ritchie 1961 rev. 1971). Nipple-like tips are not uncommon and could have been used to start drill holes in flat gorgets or pendants. These points are usually found at coastal or riverine sites such as Titicut. Examples shown in Figure 3 are numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. There have not been many Fox Creek points found in the Titicut area, but some fine examples have been recovered.

Conclusions

A similar Greene cache was found at the Pringle Site in Tewksbury, Massachusetts (19-MD-18). Eugene Winter (2003) reported on this find, which was located on a small terrace along the east side of the Shawsheen River. Here, five felsite points were discovered in a cache, placed tightly together, but not located in any recognizable feature. Some of these points look more like preforms than finished projectile points. Although Greene points are not plentiful, there have been enough examples in the Titicut area to fairly represent the Middle Woodland Period.
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Figure 1. Eleven Greene Points from a Cache Found at the Fort Hill Bluff Site in 1963. Photo Credit: Jeffrey Boudreau.

Figure 2. Ten Greene Points, Nine from Fort Hill Bluff Site. No. 4 comes from Taylor Farm. Photo Credit: Jeffrey Boudreau.
Figure 3. Six Fox Creek Lanceolate Points (nos, 1 – 6) and Three Fox Creek Stemmed Points (nos. 7 - 9), All from the Titicut Area. Photo Credit: Jeffrey Boudreau.

Titicut During the Contact Period
William B. Taylor

The Indian meaning of Titicut is “the place of a great river.” It is situated in the northwest portion of Middleborough. This area was an old Indian reservation which was officially deeded to the Indians on June 9, 1664, by Josias Wampatuck, the son of Chickataubut. This deed covered a three mile long parcel of land along the Taunton River called Cotunicut.

The earliest map of Titicut was found in the Archives Division of the State House, Boston, Massachusetts. It appears in volume 113, on page 653, and reads as follows:

“Taunton and Middleborough March 30th 1724 we ye subscribers in observance of an order from His Majesties Judges of the Superior Court of judicature held at Plymouth for the County of Plymouth Barnstable and Dukes County on the last Tuesday of April 1722 for the renewing and runing the ancient bounds of Ketiticut plantation according to the order of said Court — we proceeded as followeth cccc [sic!] first we begun next to Middleborough at a great horn pine tree on ye bank of Ketiticut River thence ranging south sixteen degrees west about three miles to a heap of stones and a stake on a plain thence south nine degrees west to an old white oak tree at baiting brook thence north about three degrees and a half westerly about three miles to a heap of stones near Trout Brook thence the said brook to be the bounds to run
to Ketitcut river.”

Figure 1. 1724 Map of the Ancient Bounds of Ketiticut Plantation

This description of the ancient bounds of Ketitcut plantation plus a roughly sketched map led to several land disputes, because of the indefinite boundary markers. See Figure 1 (Taylor 1969a). In 1853 the legislature incorporated the southern portion of the Indian reservation between Poquoy (Trout) Brook and Baiting Brook with the Sixteen Shilling Purchase, under the name of Lakeville (Weston 1906). Baiting Brook is located at the East Taunton - Lakeville line on Route 79 on Rhode Island Road. The brook runs north into Big Bear Hole Pond in Massasoit State Park.

The controversy over Bridgewater and Middleborough boundaries was finally settled in 1681, with the Taunton River becoming the town boundary.

The Taunton River has always been the boundary between Raynham and Middleborough, and also separates Bristol and Plymouth counties.

“The Titicut Purchase was made April 20, 1675, from Owen, alias Thomas Hanter, and Popennohoc, alias Peter. Consideration was twelve pounds. They sold a tract from Pachusett (Purchade) Brook on the east, where it runs into Titicut or Great River, to the lands before purchased; and from the mouth of the brook westward, abutting upon the river, one mile, till it meets with certain trees by the side of the river, and thence to the Taunton bounds at the highway to Taunton and Rhode Island, where a brook runs through it.” (Weston 1906).

Other small tracts of land appear to have been sold by the Indians from the Titicut Plantation, especially along the southeastern boundaries. Weston’s History of Middleboro notes a revised and considerably smaller Indian reservation:

“The southern boundary (after 1853) is located at a point where the present boundaries of Middleboro, Lakeville and East Taunton meet. This point is on Poquoy Brook, just east of Vernon Street. From this point northeast, to an old oak tree on the south side of Center Street, 30 rods west of Pleasant Street; thence easterly by a black oak tree to what was known as the old English line; thence to the river.” (Weston 1906).

This point is very vague and open to interpretation. However, this eastern boundary appears to be east of the Titicut Street (Alden's) bridge and west of where Purchade Brook empties into the Taunton River. This reservation also included the southern portions of Bridgewater, although these limits are not defined. One can assume this to mean approximately one half mile north of the Taunton River, as an average. The exceptions are Vernon and South Streets, where known Indian sites extend up to a mile. This assumption is based on sixty five years of collecting Indian artifacts in these areas (Taylor 1969b). By 1770 most Indians from the Titicut reservation had died.
The Titicut Path

(from Weston's History of Middleboro, p 504)

"The Titicut Path commenced at the fording place a little below Pratt's Bridge on the Taunton River, passing Fort Hill not far from the banks of the river, then in an easterly direction a little south of the Congregational Church. It entered what is now Plymouth Street, and following this to the wading place across the Nemasket River, a little below the Star Mills, it is there connected with the paths from that place to Plymouth. This was the path which Winslow and Hopkins followed on their first visit to Massasoit, spending the night at Fort Hill. Edward Winslow describes the June 1621 trip as follows:

'The head of the river is reported to be not far from the place of our abode; upon it are, and have been many towns, it being a good length. The ground is very good on both sides of the river, it being for the most part cleared. Thousands of men have lived there, which died in a great plague not long since; and a pity it was and is to see, so many goodly fields, and so well seated, without men to dress and manure the same. Upon this river dwell-eth Massasoit; it cometh into the sea at the Narragansett Bay where the Frenchmen so much use. A ship may go miles up it, as the savages report, and a shallop to the head of it; but so far as we saw, we are sure a shallop may.' (Emery 1876)

"There were two other trails leading out of the Titicut path; one to the north, beginning not far from the house of Lysander Richmond, thence a little south of the barn of Seth Alden, continuing to Lyon's Neck, and there fording the river, it passed into Bridgewater; the other went from the fording place a little below Pratt's bridge along substantially what is now Vernon Street across the bridge over Poquoy or Trout Brook. There were doubtless other paths of less significance.

"There was a wading place a little below Pratt's Bridge near Fort Hill, and another just below where the Richmond town brook enters the Taunton River. There was probably another about 1/8 mile down the river from Pratt's Bridge just beyond the land near the old shipyard."

Praying Indians of Titicut

"Chickataubut (Thankful Fire) was one of the 'Great Sachems' among the Massachusetts Indians. His territory extended from Nishamagoguanett, near Duxbury Mill to Titicut, to Nunkatateset Pond; from there to Wanamampuke, which is the head of the Charles River. His favorite resort was at Titicut, where he maintained a wigwam, and his land comprised three miles on each side of the Taunton River. He and his wife seemed to accept English customs and trappings [sic!] of Christianity. After his death of smallpox in November 1633, the Titicut Indians divided into two bands, separated by the Taunton River." (Weston 1906)

I interpret this statement as meaning that the Massachusetts Indians stayed on the Bridgewater side of the Taunton River, while the Nemasket Indians (Wampanoags) moved to the North Middleboro side. To continue with Weston's account,

"His son Josias (or Josiah) Wampatuck (White Deer) resided at Neponset, where he was raised by his uncle Kit-chamkin. At one time he professed to be one of the 'Praying Indians', but afterwards turned apostate and separated from them, although he remained friendly with the whites. On June 9,
1664 Wampatuck deeded a three mile long parcel of land along the Taunton River called Cotunicut to the Titicut Indians, having succeeded his father in his rule. In 1669 Wampatuck joined in the war between the New England Indians and the Mohawk Indians, as the chief sachem. Here he lost his life. His son Charles Josiah became sachem in 1671.” (Weston 1906)

A complete genealogy of the Massachusetts sachem Chickataubut is detailed by Russell Gardner (1996) in Volume 57(1) of the *Bulletin of the Massachusetts Archaeological Society*, in which 10 generations are listed. Gardner traces Chickataubut's descendants from 1633 to William Carl Hyatt's birth in 1925, who was the last of the “Royal” Dynasty. Who Chickataubut's father was is not known, and how he obtained his rule has not come down to us (Weston 1906).

Prior to the plague of 1617, the number of inhabitants in southeastern Massachusetts and Rhode Island is estimated to have been around 21,200 (Snow 1980:33). After the pestilence swept through the area, only a few hundred (500?) were left alive (Gardner 1996). Smaller tribes of Indians around Boston, the Cape and Plymouth County embraced Christianity at an early date. By 1674 there were 497 Praying Indians in Plymouth County, of whom 72 could write and 142 could read the Indian language, as it had been reduced to writing by John Eliot (Natick), a missionary to the Indians. In addition to this number, there were about 100 children, who were being taught to speak English and to read and write (Weston 1906).

There were three Indian churches locally: one at Nemasket, one at Titicut and one at Assawompsett. Each had a membership of ±35. The site of the Titicut church was on Pleasant Street, about ¼ mile from the village green. This church continued until after 1755, then was disbanded and the few remaining Indians united with the Congregational Church. John Simons was the minister of the Titicut Indian church for nearly ten years, at the end of which, by 1760, many Indians had died out or disappeared (Weston 1906).

John Sassamon, a Ponkapoag Indian, was consid-
ered the best of the Indian preachers trained by John Eliot. He served as teacher at the Nemasket Indian church and also preached at the Titicut and Assawompsett churches.

Early Land Purchases Near Titicut

Several early inland land purchases by the white man influenced the Titicut area. One of the first acquisitions was the Poole Purchase, west of the Titicut reservation:

“In 1637 a settlement was made at Titicut, bordering on the westerly side of Middleboro, by Miss Elizabeth Poole and her associates. She was the daughter of Sir William Poole, a knight of Colcombe, in the parish of Coliton, Devon, England. The records of the parish say that she was baptized there on August 25, 1588. This land was sometimes called the Titicut Purchase, not because it was bought of the Indians residing there, but from the fact that it was within the original Indian reservation, which had been conveyed to her and her associates before it had been reserved for the exclusive use of the Indians. Her purchase was within the bounds of Cohanett (the former name of Taunton) and the Titicut weir above Pratt’s Bridge and bordered upon what subsequently became the western boundary line of Middleboro between Poquoy Brook and Baiting Brook. Those who settled here about the time of Miss Poole’s purchase were her brother, William Poole, Mr. John Gilbert, Sr., Mr. Henry Andrews, John Strong, John Dean, Walter Dean, and Edward Case, who, the next year, were made freemen in Plymouth Colony. The territory which she purchased was known for some time as Littleworth farm and Shute farm and the records state that it was here Miss Poole lost many cattle. The original purchase of Miss Poole ultimately
became a portion of Taunton, and other farms purchased by her and her associates were often referred to in early records as Meerneed, Bareneed, Cotley, and Pondsbrook, in accordance with the English custom. Bareneed was given to the farm of Edward Case and Pondsbrook to that of John Gilbert.” (Weston 1906)

She came here for the purpose of forming a settlement and the conversion of the Indians to Christianity. Miss Poole is credited with being one of the chief promoters of Taunton and of its incorporation on September 3, 1639. Most of her original purchase eventually became a part of Taunton (Taylor 1969a).

Deed for the Purchase of Old Bridgewater

On March 23, 1649 Miles Standish, Samuel Nash and Constant Southworth purchased from Chief Ousamequin (Massasoit) a tract of land seven miles each way from the center of Wonnocoate. This spot is located at Sachem Rock beside the weir on the Satucket River in East Bridgewater. Across the river lies the Carver Cotton Gin Mill and a complex of old mill buildings. This 31 acre tract comprises Sachem Rock Farm, which is listed on the National Register of Historical Places. This sacred Wampanoag spot is today used for picnics, scout encampments and occasional Civil War reenactments (Boston Globe, cited by the Old Bridgewater Historical Society 2007).

This fourteen mile square of land included most of Bridgewater and East Bridgewater, as well as parts of West Bridgewater, Brockton and Whitman. A copy of the original deed reads as follows;

Witness these presents that I, Ousamequin Sachem, of the county of Poconocket, have given grant ed enfeoffed and sold unto Miles Standish of Duxbury, Samuel Nash and Constant Southworth of Duxbury aforesaid in behalf of all the townsmen of Duxbury aforesaid; a tract of land usually called Satucket, extending in the length and breadth thereof as followeth, that is to say, from the wear (weir) at Satucket, seven miles due east, and from said wear seven miles due west, and from the said wear seven miles due north, and from the said wear seven miles due south. The which tract the said Ousamequin hath given granted enfeoffed and sold unto the said Miles Standish, Samuel Nash and Constant Southworth in behalf of all the townsmen of Duxbury with all the immunities, privileges and profits whatsoever belonging to the said tract of land, with all and singular al woods, underwoods lands meadows rivers brooks rivulets ect. [sic!] to have and hold to the said Miles Standish Samuel Nash and Constant Southworth in behalf of all townsmen of the town of Duxbury to them and their heirs forever. In witness whereof I the said Ousamequin have hereunto set my hand this 23d of March 1649. In consideration of the aforesaid bargain and sale we the said Miles Standish Samuel Nash and Constant Southworth do bind ourselves to pay unto the said Ousamequin for and in consideration of the said tract of land as followeth; 7 coats a yard and a half to a coat, 9 hatchets, 8 hoes, 20 knives, 4 moose skins, 10 yards and a half of cotton. Miles Standish. Samuel Nash. Constant Southworth.

Translation by Stella J. Snow (Old Bridgewater Historical Society 1956).

These were typical goods used to buy land during the early 1600’s.

Indian Land Gifts in Titicut

In 1744 the Titicut area became a distinct parish and included a part of Bridgewater, to the “Four Mile Line”. In 1746 a Praying Indian, James Thomas, gave five acres of land to Titicut Parish. This gift was part of a donation by three Praying Indi-
ans, specifically giving 38 ¾ acres of land to Titicu-
tcut Parish for a meeting house (church), burying
place (old section of the cemetery), training field
(green), parsonage and including land later used
for Pratt Free School and several nearby houses.
Grants for this property were duly confirmed by
the General Court in 1750. This donation was as
follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Thomas</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen David</td>
<td>18 ¾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Ahanton</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total grant</td>
<td>38 ¾</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At least one of these Praying Indians (James
Thomas) was buried in the old section of Titicut
Parish Cemetery. A six foot obelisk was erected
many years later by members of the church (ca
1887), to commemorate their gift to encourage the
settlement of a Gospel Ministry. (See Figure 2).

This first church was completed between the years
1747 to 1749. It was a simple barn-like structure
with no spire, tower or bell; a plain place of wor-
ship. After the Indian church disbanded in 1755,
the few remaining Indians united with the new
church. The Indians had to sit in a distinct pew
high over the stairs, in an area set aside for Indi-
ans and Negroes, as was the custom of the times
(Emery 1876).

A copy of James Thomas' deed to inhabitants of
Titicut Precinct follows. The other two deeds are
in the exact terms of the James Thomas deed, only
Job Ahanton donates 15 acres for the use of a Gos-
pel ministry. The other, by Stephen David, don-
ates 18 ¾ acres for encouragement of settling and
maintaining the Gospel ministry in said precinct.

James Thomas to Inhabitants of Titi-
cut Precinct
Plymouth Registry of Deeds Book
44: pages 98 & 99

Know all Men by these Presents,
that I, James Thomas of Titicut, in
the Township of Middleborough
in the County of Plymouth, in the
Province of the Massachusetts Bay in
New England Indian, Man, Yeoman,
Minding to encourage the Interest
and Prosperity of Titicut Precinct,
(so called) which consists partly of

said Middleboro and partly of Bridge-
water, in said County, by giving a
certain piece of Land to said Precinct
for a Meeting House to Stand on, for
a Burying Place, and for a training
Field, And having obtained Liberty
and Power of the great and genl. (gen-
eral) Court of said Province therefo-
Have therefore, by Virtue of said
Power and by the Consent and Ad-
vice of my guardians hereto testified,
given grantd, and by these Presents
do fully, freely, clearly and absolutely
give and grant unto the Inhabitants
of said Precinct forever, Five acres
of Land in said Titicut, wheron the
Meeting House now stands bounded
as followeth; Beginning at a Stake &
Stones, about eight or nine rods from
the north west Corner of said Meet-
ing House, From thence running
south seventeen Degrees east, forty

Figure 2  Six-Foot Obelisk Commemorating Three
Praying Indians Who Gave Land in 1746 to Be
Used to Establish a Gospel Ministry.
Contact Period Indian Burials

In October 1957, while digging the well for my house on Vernon Street, six skeletons were unearthed. These included five adults and one child, with no artifacts present. The discovery of copper shroud pins and nails point to the late 1600's as the probable burial date. It was the custom of this late period to wrap bodies, in an extended position, in heavy bark and to secure the wrappings with pins or nails.

Lack of grave goods and the manner of burial leads me to believe that these Indians were members of the Praying Indians of Titicut. Although some of them finally consented to burial in white man's cemeteries, most Indians still preferred to be buried in their old burial grounds. During April of 1958, while excavating the foundation for my house by bulldozer, ten more graves were uncovered, bringing the total to sixteen skeletons from the same era of Contact burials. All bones were gathered together from the backfill and reinterred. One interesting observation was the size of one skeleton. Both arm and leg bones were over two inches longer than my own. This Indian must have been an exceptionally large man, well over 6' 6" in height (Taylor 1969a). By 1770, most Praying Indians had faded into history.

In November 1967, the Fernandes Construction Company uncovered eight skeletons on Fiske Drive, off South Street, Bridgewater. This spot is within ½ mile of the Taunton River and one mile from the Titicut Site. A later report lists 15 total skeletons from the project (Kenneth Alves, personal communication).

The manner of burial leads us to believe these Indians, too, were members of the Praying Indian Church, approximately one mile away in North Middleboro (Independent 1967).

In 2006, all Indian skeletons and calcined bone fragments from Titicut graves were returned to Ken Alves, the repatriation officer for the Wampanoag Confederacy, via the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology at Harvard University. A burial ceremony was held in August of that year for 29 sets of remains. Two grave lots were given to the Wampanoags by Titicut Parish Cemetery in May 2006. It seemed only fitting to give the burial lots back to Indians, who had originally given land in 1746 to start this cemetery. A quartz Godstone was placed in these lots to mark the graves.

During the years 1957-1967, approximately 31 Contact Burials were exposed during housing construction within the Titicut area. This seems
to cover the remains of most Contact Indians who attended the Indian church in North Middleboro.

Early Colonial Industries at Titicut

In April 1707, Native residents David Charles, Isaac Wanno, his wife Amey, Anthony Wolnum and wife Martha, Samuel Robbin and wife Rebecca, Joseph Peter and wife Bethia, children and heirs of Charles Ahas of Titicut, with the consent of their mother, Martha Ahas, leased land to set up an iron works at Sturtevant’s Pond for 25 shillings, yearly. Permission to build a dam and pond on their land (South Street in Bridgewater) was granted to be done in the near future. This land was used until in 1725, the iron works were established and a company was formed for the manufacture of hollow ware, pots, kettles, pails, skillets and stoves (Emery 1876).

In 1740 a dam was erected on South Street to catch water from Snow’s Brook. The Keith foundry began at Sturtevant’s Corner. Hugh Orr, a Scotsman, came to run the mill and became a supplier of weapons. He cast cannon and cannon balls for the Revolution. The Keith family developed a revolutionary process for casting and boring cannon. Other farm equipment soon followed: shovels, anchors, and edged tools: scythes, axes, ploughs, hoes, etc.

After the Revolutionary War, with 90% of the Indians gone, the Titicut area quickly expanded into the Colonial era. Starting in 1800, ship building became the next large industry and was quickly followed by many small businesses, mills and manufacturing trades and factories.

Conclusion

The Indians did not believe that anyone could own the land or water. They thought these things belonged to all humans. When they sold land to the white man, they thought they were selling usage, as in a lease. Indians believed that they could still hunt and fish on ancestral lands, but the white man fenced his property and forbade trespass. Indians soon learned that little of the Titicut Reservation belonged to them. The plagues of 1617 and 1633 wiped out many local Indians. Many others died off by 1770 and the white man emerged owning most of Titicut.
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A Report on the H.C. Wheeler Collection of Native American Artifacts, Concord Museum, Concord, MA, with Reference to the R.S. Peabody Museum’s Collection, Andover, MA
Shirley Blancke

Introduction

In 2002, the Concord Museum accepted a donation of the H.C. Wheeler collection of Native American artifacts from the Museum of Primitive Art and Culture (MPAC) in Peace Dale, RI. It was known from accompanying labels in the boxes that the artifacts had been surface collected from sites near the Concord River in Concord, MA, although most of the sites were unidentified. Although some details of how the collection came to MPAC had been recorded, the full name and background of the collector were unknown. Similarly, the full name of the man who sold the collection for a very small sum in 1917, H.E. Wheeler, was also unknown. He signed himself “H.E. Wheeler” on a letter whose letterhead identified him as a Methodist pastor from Conway, Arkansas. MPAC decided to de-accession the collection for lack of information, but offered it to the Concord Museum in the hope that more could eventually be found out by an institution situated in the town where the collection apparently originated. The collection comprised 725 stone artifacts including axes, gouges, atlatl weights, projectile points, pestles, drills, whetstones, hammerstones, plummets, scrapers, blades, preforms and chipping waste.

In the Spring of 2010, the author, archaeology curator at the Concord Museum, looked at the collection in the course of an on-going computer cataloging project of the museum’s Native American artifacts. A first impression was that the lack of site information did not bode well for the collection’s usefulness for research, since, for the most part, there was only generalized Concord provenience for the material. Several boxes contained notes saying that the artifacts came from village sites along the Concord River in Concord, MA. However, one box of about 90 artifacts contained a note in what appeared to be 19th century handwriting that said, “92 unfinished blades, various stages of workmanship, from large village site, Concord River, near Thoreau’s Farm, Concord, Mass. Collected by H.C. Wheeler” (my emphasis).

This Thoreau Farm was the birthplace of Henry David, now known as the Birthplace Site after the original house was moved further east down Virginia Road. No archaeological site was recorded in the Massachusetts Historical Commission’s site files from the Thoreau birthplace itself, but site 19-MD-472 comprises Pine Hill, a half mile to the east beyond Elm Brook. A mile away from the farm, on the south side of the Great Meadows Wildlife Refuge that is adjacent to the Concord River, are sites 19-MD-86 and -87. Was this close enough to be “near Thoreau’s Farm”? If the provenience of the collection could be established, the author knew that many people, not least the Thoreau Society, would be very interested in this new Thoreau Farm information.

The Wheeler-Merriam house, 477 Virginia Road, that at one time belonged to a Wheeler family of the Sgt. Thomas Wheeler line, is situated a half mile to the east of the Thoreau Birthplace at the foot of Pine Hill. In front of it rests a supposed Indian mortar for corn grinding that is a large boulder with a hollow “basin” on top. Hamilton Algeo, owner of the house in the early 1900s, used a team of oxen to haul it from high up on the west side of Pine Hill. (The original position of the boulder is marked on a map of the collector, Benjamin L. Smith, at the Concord Museum.) It is possible, but in my view not likely, that Henry C.’s artifacts came from Pine Hill. On the plus side, the hill is adjacent to a good stream of running water, Elm Brook, but there are no other known artifacts from this location besides the “mortar,” which is possibly not a mortar. The boulder’s hollow basin on top shows no signs of grinding, and is likely the result of a natural spall.

The first task was to try to identify the collector, H.C. Wheeler, and H.E. Wheeler who sold the collection. Over the summer and into the fall of 2010, with the help of many people knowledgeable about Concord history, archives, and genealogy, it
became possible to establish that the collection was made by Henry C. Wheeler, who lived at the Thoreau Farm in Concord from 1883-1915, when he sold it to Ruth and Caleb Wheeler’s family. Ruth Wheeler was the author of the well-known history of Concord, *Climate for Freedom*. Documentary evidence was found that established that Henry C. collected on his farm as well as from other sites in Concord. In doing this he was one of several Concord men who followed a hobby started by Henry David Thoreau, as far as is known. Another part of his collection is at the Robert S. Peabody Museum in Andover, MA, which, like MPAC, had no information on the collector. It did have the additional data that Wheeler collected from sites along the Concord River in Concord within 5 or 6 miles of his house, as well as from surrounding towns. A half dozen artifacts from the H.C. Wheeler collection are at the Middlesex School in Concord, probably given when their now disbanded Thoreau Museum was started.

Following are sections on the museum history of MPAC’s part of the Henry C. Wheeler collection before its coming to the Concord Museum; the Concord Museum’s research on the genealogy of the relevant Wheelers; an archaeological profile of the Thoreau Farm artifacts in the Concord Museum/MPAC collection; the land comprised by the original Thoreau birthplace with a view to finding an archaeological site; a profile of the R.S. Peabody’s part of the collection; and a description of the few artifacts at the Middlesex School.

Museum Background to the Collection

Sarah Turnbaugh, director of MPAC in 2002, provided as much information to the Concord Museum as that museum had. Her report included when and how the collection came to the museum, and information on its cataloging at MPAC, as well as copies of pages from the early catalog that contained little information about provenience other than that the artifacts came from the town of Concord, MA. In response to a further request from Concord about MPAC’s cataloging history, specifically how numbers were assigned to objects to try to elucidate more about site provenience, she provided an extensive answer to what in itself is a complex subject.

A letter from H.E. Wheeler, whose letterhead identified him as a Methodist pastor in Conway, Arkansas, indicated that he sold the collection for a few dollars to the founder of MPAC, Rowland G. Hazard II, on or about Sept. 12, 1917 (the date of the letter). The letter mentioned that H.E. Wheeler had recently traveled in the Northeast to look at important archaeological and minerals collections, and visited Andover, New Haven, Boston, New York, and Philadelphia. No mention was made of Concord, MA, or how he came by the H.C. Wheeler collection. Turnbaugh researched the extensive Hazard archives at the local historical society but found no further letters. MPAC acquired the collection in 1918, the same year as Hazard’s death. Turnbaugh noted that the signature on the letter did not match the handwriting on paper slips found in boxes containing the artifacts, and concluded that the slips were written by MPAC’s cataloger, Ronald L. Olson from the American Museum of Natural History, or his wife. She also opined that a mistake was made in transcribing the initials of the collector, who was likely H.E. Wheeler, since nothing was known of an H.C. Wheeler.

Wheeler Genealogical Research and Proof of the Collector’s Identity

I wondered not only if H.C. Wheeler and H.E. Wheeler were the same man, but if it might possibly be a woman. While 19th century collectors are thought to have been predominantly male, a biographer of the late 19th/early 20th century Concord collector, Adams Tolman, stated that Tolman’s wife was an equally keen collector of arrowheads and regularly accompanied him to collect in the fields (French 1940:176). Current members of the Wheeler family in Concord, MA, pointed the way to conducting genealogical research on the family. The Wheelers are a very large family of many branches within several genealogical lines that can be traced back to the 17th century. Richard W. Wheeler told me that there was an extensive Wheeler genealogy on the Concord Free Public Library’s website that had been updated by Joseph C. Wheeler, former Chair of the Concord Historical Commission (CFPL 2007). Multiple use of the
name “Henry” and its diminutive “Harry” made knowledge of at least a middle initial crucial, and added to the complexity of the identifications.

Rick Wheeler indicated there were no “Hs” in his part of the family, but kindly wrote to the Wheeler family in Rhode Island, who similarly had no information. On the other hand, Joe Wheeler was able to point to the possible identity of H.C. Wheeler as the Henry C. Wheeler who in 1915 sold the Thoreau Farm to Ruth Wheeler’s father, who gave the property to Joe’s parents, Ruth and Caleb, upon their marriage in 1916. He indicated that these two Wheeler families belonged to different genealogical lines. I subsequently learned that at least five families from three lines, the George, Obadiah, and Sergeant Thomas Wheeler lines, were living in Concord during the 19th and early 20th centuries. Only Henry C.’s family belonged to the Obadiah line, while most of the other Wheelers mentioned in this text are descended from George Wheeler. Joe grew up on the Thoreau Farm, and owns a projectile point he and a brother think their father found on the farm. Since he knew of no other artifacts, he doubted if Henry C. Wheeler could possibly have found a site with 90 artifacts on his property.

Joe Wheeler had added a note about Henry C. to the Wheeler genealogy on the Concord Free Public Library website, but had no information on his possible children. The next goal then was to trace the identity of H.E. Wheeler of Conway, Arkansas, who sold the collection to the Rhode Island museum in 1917, and who might have been H.C. Wheeler’s son, or another relative. Judith Fichtenbaum of the Concord Museum took on the challenge of consulting U.S. and State Censuses and town vital statistics to find the genealogical links we needed that were not in the Concord Library’s Wheeler genealogy (Figure 1). Figure 2 is derived from the wealth of information she provided about H.C. and H.E. Wheeler, their families and ancestors, presented in diagrammatic form.

Genealogical research established the seller of the collection, H.E. Wheeler, as the Rev. Harry E. Wheeler of Conway, Arkansas, a very distant cousin of Henry C Wheeler. H.C. and H.E. Wheeler belonged to different Wheeler lines, but both families lived in Concord in the 19th century. We have not been able to find a documented connection between them, but the genealogical research suggests that Henry C. and Harry E.’s father, Henry Lincoln, who was sixteen years older than Henry C., would have known each other in Concord. Henry C., whose family origins were in Acton and Carlisle, came to Concord in the 1870s after marrying in 1871, and lived with his wife’s family, the Tibbetts, on the Thoreau farm, acquiring ownership in 1883. Harry E.’s father, Henry Lincoln, was born in Concord and is recorded as living there in 1865, but fifteen years later he is found in Birmingham, Alabama, with a six-year-old son, Harry E. He survived only six years, dying in 1886. Harry E. was the same age as Henry C.’s presumed daughter, Laura1, both being born in 1874, but no evidence was found of Henry C. having a son. Henry C.’s death was recorded in Lexington in 1925 by Laura H. Litchfield, and he is buried in Concord’s Sleepy Hollow Cemetery with his wife, Sarah J., who died in 1899 (see Figure 3). A third individual in the grave, not noted on the headstone but in the cemetery records, is Harry W. Wheeler, who we discovered was a distant cousin2. Additional historical details about these families are in notes in Figure 2.

It would appear that Henry C., knowing of Harry E.’s interest in archaeology and mineralogy (indicated by the MPAC letter of 1917), may have asked him to inquire from museums if they would be interested in that part of his collection still in his possession at the time he sold the Thoreau Farm in 1915. He had previously sold the larger part of it to the R.S. Peabody Museum in 1912.

While the genealogical research provided circumstantial evidence that Henry C. Wheeler was the likely collector, this was proved by documentary references provided by Thomas Blanding, the Thoreau scholar. Three quotations from Franklin Sanborn’s weekly articles in The Springfield Republican mention Henry Wheeler’s collection and collecting (Sanborn 1981).

Sanborn lived in Concord, and was the same Franklin Benjamin Sanborn who was a friend of the abolitionist John Brown, and financed Brown as one of his supporters known as the “Secret Six.”

From Aug. 15, 1901, is the following:
A later quote, from May 9, 1912, clarifies the identity of the collector and the farm property:

... there is a living person, on the farm of Capt. Jonas Minott, where Thoreau was born in 1817, Henry Wheeler by name, ... who (has made) a collection of those substantial matters which Thoreau wrote about. . . . (In place of the old Thoreau house), long since removed further up the road toward Lexington, . . . stands a newer farmhouse, in which the unit-ed households of Tibbitts [sic] and Wheeler have met and set up their household goods . . . .

Henry C. Wheeler was married to Sarah Tibbetts.

A quote from Feb. 21, 1907, expands the description of Henry Wheeler’s artifact collection and connects him with the Middlesex School. Sanborn opines:

... H.K. [sic] Wheeler of Concord has been for 10 years or so diligently collecting in Thoreau’s earlier field of research some thousand or two specimens of Indian implements and relics, along with other curios of the white man’s period. These are genuinely aboriginal, of his own finding, and free from that taint of modern manufacture which is sure to come when curios have a market value. I have suggested to him that the proper place for his collection is in the new Thoreau museum of the Middlesex school, by Bateman’s pond in Concord ...

In the oldest accessioned stone artifact collection at the Concord Museum (collector unknown), there is a large, fine blade of black rhyolite, 10 cm long, which is labeled “Virginia road, Concord.” It is made in the Fox Creek Stemmed style that belongs to the Middle Woodland period, and is either a large spearhead or a knife (see Figure 4). Did this come from the Thoreau Farm?

Artifacts from the Thoreau Farm Site in the H.C. Wheeler Collection at the Concord Museum

Only one box of artifacts contains a label identifying the material as coming from a particular site, somewhere near the Thoreau Farm, in Concord. The label specifies 92 artifacts, and an inventory made by the author shows there are 93; the additional artifact perhaps is due to breakage. This close correspondence in number makes it likely that the label is in the right box. Sarah Turnbaugh of MPAC compared the writing with the signature on H.E. Wheeler’s letter and, finding it not the same, concluded that the label was written by the cataloger, Ronald Olson. However, since H.E. Wheeler was not the collector, and the writing appears to be 19th century in style, it seems likely that the label was written by Henry C. himself. All the artifacts in this box have the same MPAC catalog number (H366), and there are three other boxes of artifacts with the same number. At first it was hoped this number might represent one site, but it appears from Turnbaugh’s analysis of the cataloging that the material tended to be cataloged by type of artifact, so that a conclusion about the site cannot be drawn. By today’s standards of typology, not all the artifacts in these boxes are of the same type. The Thoreau Farm label characterized the artifacts in that box as finished and unfinished blades, which I have identified as projectile points and edge tools of various kinds (Figure 5), and the other boxes have similar contents.

When radiocarbon dating is not possible, as with this collection, archaeologists look at types of “projectile points” (dart-heads, spear points, arrowheads), to provide a rough chronology and identify time periods represented at a site. Thirty-one points, a third of the artifacts from the
box containing Thoreau Farm material, cover the Middle and Late Archaic periods as well as the Early and Middle Woodland periods (ca 6,000 B.C. – 1,000 A.D.). What this represents is a relatively few projectile points scattered over a long time span that suggests multiple short-term camps of hunter-gatherer peoples (see Figure 5, first column, Figure 6). Interestingly, there are no points from the latest period, the Late Woodland, which is associated with horticulture and corn cultivation. There is also no evidence of the earliest periods, the Paleoindian and Early Archaic. Many of the projectile points and other artifacts are broken, so Wheeler did not select for whole specimens as collectors often did.

Apart from the projectile points, the great bulk of the remaining artifacts (62) are edge tools, some of them large, and half of which are unfinished (Figure 5, second column). They probably represent knives and a few scrapers, judging by the thickness of the cutting edges (Figure 7). There are leaf-shaped knives and teardrop endscrapers as well as scrapers with graver points, but no typical perforators (Figure 8). In addition, there are five multifaceted cores, some of them worn cores that became used as hammerstones. There are no wood-working tools, atlatl weights, plummets, pestles, whetstones, or chipping waste. It is possible that these were collected but are now in the collection's generalized Concord material.

The overall artifact profile gives the impression of being skewed when compared with material in collections at the Concord Museum from other Concord sites that have a similar number of artifacts but a greater variety of tool types. While the number of large edge tools and their apparent general uniformity suggests this site may have been a manufacturing area for them, it is not possible in fact to connect these tools with the projectile points to give them an approximate date, so it cannot be determined if they belong to one period or many. Only a controlled excavation could do that, comparing the positions of artifacts to each other in the soil, or their associations with organic material such as charcoal that could be radiocarbon dated. The lithics used are typical of the Boston area's gray and black rhyolites of which Concord artifacts are largely made, with a few artifacts of quartzite, one of argillite, and one of the usually common white quartz. One artifact may be of red felsite from Braintree, and one of white and tan felsite from Sally Rock. The Early Woodland Meadowood point appears to be of a New York State gray chert.

The original Thoreau Farm land

One aspect of the research focused on what was known about the land at the original Thoreau Farm that surrounded what is now known as the Birthplace Site, and its condition now, with a view to identifying the possible location of an archaeological site. Criteria for such a site would include closeness to a good water source, and well-drained land for habitation or horticulture, and might include a southern exposure and protection from wind, such as the south side of a hill. The Thoreau Farm land provides many possible locations that fit some of these criteria. Additionally, an archaeological site uncovered in the 19th century was most likely found in a plowed field. The current condition of much of the former farm land, covered in dense scrub, would make an archaeological survey very difficult to conduct. It is also not clear what “near Thoreau’s Farm” really means. The farm is about a mile from the Concord River, so it is possible that the site is not on the farm’s land, and that Henry C. was collecting from sites 19-MD-86 and -87 near the Great Meadows. The artifact profile in Figure 5 would fit the multi-component profile of site 19-MD-86 known from Concord Museum collections. However, the Aug. 15, 1901, quote from Franklin Sanborn indicates that artifacts were indeed found on the farm.

About 1878, during the ownership of the Tibbetts, Henry C. Wheeler’s in-laws, the Thoreau Birth House was moved east down Virginia Road, and replaced with another house, the one acquired by Henry C. Wheeler in 1883. Joseph Wheeler, who was born in that replacement house, and grew up on the 80-acre farm, drew a map in 1999 of what he remembered about land use on the farm, published by the Thoreau Society in the Concord Saunterer (Figure 10; Wheeler 1999). The farm lay to the north and south of Virginia Road, which is on the east side of Concord. The general area of the
farm is almost an island surrounded by swamp or streams: Mill Brook to the west and south, and Elm Brook to the east and north. The Mill Brook appears on maps to start in the area, but when I asked if there were any clear bubbling springs, Joe replied no, and that most of the land was so swampy it was not clear in which direction the water flowed or where the Mill Brook started. The only clear stream is Elm Brook further to the east along Virginia Road, which looks to have been at least partly canalized. Ditches were dug on the north side of the farm, perhaps in the 18th century, which drain water from, or into, a large cattail swamp on the northeast border that is marked “Algeo’s swamp” on Wheeler’s map (Figure 10).

From taking two walking tours, one with J. Walter Brain, a director of the Thoreau Society, I found that currently much of the original farm land is reverting to scrub and is not accessible even on foot. This is particularly the case on the west and south side where meadows and an orchard on the Wheeler map were subdivided for building so that, beyond the present houses and gardens, the land is not maintained. This area could have been plowed formerly, and in my view it is the most likely location for a site. On the eastern side, a cursory look at a former asparagus field did not find evidence of chipping waste or other fragments. This field and the former Breen farm (Figure 10) are cultivated by “Gaining Ground,” a nonprofit farm that raises food for hunger relief with the help of community volunteers (Wheeler 1999).

The northern part of the farm has some intriguing characteristics, and seemed to Joe to be a good location for a Native American site. There was originally a farm road from behind the farmhouse that went north across a ditch to an asparagus field at the top of a hill. As Joe described it, there was a wood of pine trees on the hillside, and at one point two large boulders were on each side of the path to the asparagus field. He said it was known to Thoreau as “Two-Boulder Hill” (Thoreau 1859-60:116), and the boulders are still there (see Figure 9). The farm road is no longer passable, but I gained access via the land cultivated by “Gaining Ground”. Many of the pines have been cut, and the former asparagus field is now a gently sloping mown hay field, but the boulders just below the edge of the field, while hidden in scrub, are over six feet high and are still impressive. To the east is a flat table rock. The area suggests a hill-top “Dancing Field” like the one referred to by the late Wampanoag historian, Russell Gardner, which belonged to his ancestors on Martha’s Vineyard. (Gardner 1998: 57).

R.S. Peabody Museum’s H.C. Wheeler Collection and the Middlesex School Artifacts

The portion of the H.C.Wheeler Collection at the R.S. Peabody Museum in Andover, MA, was originally twice the Concord Museum’s part. When first bought from Henry C. Wheeler in 1912 it contained over 1358 objects, but through de-accessioning, mainly in the 1920s, only 732 artifacts remain, making what is left comparable to the Concord Museum’s collection of 725 (Figure 11). All except 15 of the 732 artifacts come from Concord, MA, and an original note, while not specifying individual sites, stated that the artifacts came from village sites along the Concord River, Concord, MA, within 5 or 6 miles of H.C. Wheeler’s house (my emphasis), i.e. the Thoreau Birthplace. The range of artifact types is also comparable to the Concord Museum’s collection, but more extensive, comprising axes, adzes, gouges, celts and chisels; atlatl weights, projectile points, plummets, sinkers, grooved stones; ceramic and stone bowls, drills, gravers, scrapers, edge tools, an ulu, and bifaces; a hoe, pestles, and a mano; hammerstones, cores, chipping waste, preforms, abrading and polishing stones, and whetstones. In addition there are gorgets, a pendant, a strike-a-light, graphite, and a gaming piece.

Apart from Concord, nine Massachusetts towns in the general vicinity of Concord as well as further afield were originally listed as locations. No site identification was made (except for Arlington). In alphabetical order the towns, or town districts, were: Acton, Bedford, Lexington, Marblehead, Maynard, Mystic Pond in Arlington, North Billerica, North Sudbury, and Sudbury (Figure 11). Of the 15 remaining artifacts, 12 come from Sudbury: an atlatl weight, gouge, stone pipe, a strike-a-light, 4 scrapers, 2 ulus, graphite, and a pebble. Two atlatl weights come from Lexington and the “Wheeler Farm” respectively, and a biface from
Maynard. The “Wheeler Farm,” is a name used by old Concord collectors for a site near White Pond, Concord, MA, generally known as Gardner or Anson Wheeler’s Farm (19-MD-153; his full name was Gardner Anson), and it is assumed this is the site referred to.

The current number of H.C. Wheeler artifacts at the Middlesex School is five, with labels for two more. Most have labels that state “H.C. Wheeler” attached to them and comprise a pestle, a celt-like axe, a mortar, a gouge, a label that says “Arrow Point Concord,” that may belong with an unla- beled Late Woodland Levanna-style projectile point, and two labels that refer to a “Fish-line Sinker”, and a “Spear-head,” which are missing. From Franklin Sanborn’s Feb. 21, 1907 quote in which he urged Henry Wheeler to give his collection to the school’s new Thoreau Museum started in 1906, it appears that Wheeler gave this hand- ful of artifacts. The school also has a quantity of numbered artifacts given by the Concord collector, Adams Tolman, out of his 6,000-artifact collection, the rest of which is in the Concord Mu- seum. Tolman’s catalog mentions that he gave one of those artifacts, a small circular slate pendant with drill hole from Puffer Field in Sudbury (#2041), to the school’s Thoreau Museum in 1908. Tolman’s father, George, was the original compiler of the Concord Free Public Library’s Wheeler genealogy, and, for many years, as Secretary of the Concord Antiquarian Society, he curated its collections that became the Concord Antiquarian Mu- seum, now the Concord Museum. The Middlesex School’s Thoreau Museum was disbanded, but a description of it may be found in an unpublished paper by the late Stephen F. Ells (Ells, no date).

Conclusion

It was possible to discover the identity of H.C. Wheeler as Henry C. Wheeler of the Thoreau Farm (Birthplace) in Concord, MA, through genealogical research from a starting point provided by a current Wheeler family member in Concord, Joseph C. Wheeler. Corroborating evidence was provided by genealogical research into the identity of the man who sold the collection to the Museum of Primitive Art and Culture in Rhode Island in 1917, Harry E. Wheeler. Quotes from Franklin Sanborn about Henry Wheeler collecting Native American artifacts on his farm clinched his identity as a col-lector who found artifacts on his own land. No conclusion was reached about the location of the archaeological site referred to in a box of artifacts labeled “from a large village site, Concord River, near Thoreau’s Farm, Concord, Mass.” There are several possible site locations within the old farm area, as well as three Massachusetts Historical Commission listed sites within a mile where Henry C. Wheeler might have collected.

Endnotes

1 Henry C. Wheeler, together with Laura Litchfield, sold the Thoreau Farm to G. Frederick Robinson, Ruth Wheeler’s father, on December 13, 1915. The deed notes that neither had a spouse, but does not state Laura’s relationship to Henry (Middlesex Registry of Deeds, 1915).

2 Harry W. Wheeler, an engraver in Boston, was born in Concord to Benjamin and Mary (Morse) Wheeler, and died on December 14, 1909, at the age of 42 (NEHGS 1909). He appears to have had an older brother, Frank K. (US Census 1880). His birth certificate listed his father as Benjamin Franklin Wheeler, and the latter’s death certificate named Jotham and Azubah Wheeler as Benjamin’s parents (Concord Vital Statistics 1992). Jotham and Azubah belonged to the Sgt. Thomas Wheeler line (CFPL 2007:# 3202).


4 A search for documents that might show Henry C.’s original signature was unsuccessful.

5 The map and details of the house removal are in Wheeler 1999.

6 The present Thoreau Farm (Birth House), or Wheeler-Minott house, is surrounded by 2 acres and is owned by the Thoreau Farm Trust. The rest of the former Breen land belongs to the town.
“Went to what we called Two-Boulder Hill, behind the house where I was born.” Jan. 31, 1860. (Thoreau 1859-60).
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Henry C. Wheeler:

Concord Library genealogy born: June 1846, Acton, son of Franklin and Susan Collins.

1841-1910 Massachusetts married: 1871, Sarah Tibbets of Concord.

Vital Records living with father-in-law William Tibbets on Virginia Road with Sarah and 6-year-old daughter, Lura (Laura).

1880 US Census head of household along with Laura and several boarders. Sarah’s death is recorded as Dec. 9, 1899 at 51.

1900 US Census Henry C. is 63, Lara (Laura) is 45.


Henry E. Wheeler:

Website: Ancestry.com (US Census) (available at Concord Library).

Henry Lincoln Wheeler (father):

1850 US Census  Henry L., age 20, civil engineer.

1865 MA State Census  Henry L., age 35, civil engineer.

1880 US Census  in Birmingham, Alabama:
Henry L. Wheeler, age 50, civil engineer.
Adda Wheeler, age 36, born in Vermont.
Harry Wheeler, age 6.

Harry E. Wheeler:

1900 US Census  in Jefferson, Alabama:
H.E. Wheeler, Rev., born 1874;
moved Helen G., born 1876;
son, Henry G., born 1900.

1920 US Census  in Arkansas: Harry E. Wheeler.

1925 Arkansas Divorce Index  divorce from Helen, April 3, 1925, Pulaski County.

Figure 1. Judith Fichtenbaum’s Notes on H.C. Wheeler and H.E. Wheeler genealogies
Website: AmericanAncestors.org (records from NEHGS = New England Historical Genealogical Society).

Figure 3. Henry C., and Sarah J. Wheeler gravestone, Pine Ridge Ave, Sleepy Hollow Cemetery, Concord, MA.
Figure 2. Genealogical charts for Henry C. Wheeler and Harry E. Wheeler.

**Henry C. Wheeler**

*Obadiah Wheeler Line*

- #1059* Oliver = Abigail Wood
  - b. 1725
- #1099* Reuben (5) = Hepzibeth Heywood
  - b. 1768
- #1156* Franklin (6) = Susan Collins
  - b. 1802
- (1156)* Henry C. = Sarah J. Tibbetts
  - b. 1846
  - Laura = Litchfield
  - b. 1874

Family lived in Acton or Carlisle before Henry C. moved to Concord in the 1870s.

**Harry E. Wheeler**

*George Wheeler Line*

- #202* Ephraim (5)** = Sarah Heywood
  - b. 1734
- #374* Ephraim (6) = Sarah Parkman
  - b. 1773
- #518* Abiel Heywood = Harriet Lincoln
  - b. 1807
- #571* Henry Lincoln† = Adda
  - b. 1830
  - b. 1844, Vermont
  - Henry E. †† = Helen G.
  - b. 1874
  - b. 1900

Family lived in Concord until Henry Lincoln moved to Alabama c. 1880.

*Numbers refer to individuals in the Concord Free Public Library Wheeler Genealogy.

**Ephraim (5) fought in the Revolutionary War at Concord, Bunker Hill, and White Plains.

† Henry Lincoln fought often in the Civil War beginning in 1861. He was taken prisoner in the Battle of Bull Run, and retired as Captain of the 96th US. Colored Infantry (formerly the 31st Louisiana Native Guards) in 1865. (Massachusetts Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines in the Civil War, Vol. IV, 1932, Norwood Press.)

†† Harry E. was a Methodist minister in Conway, Arkansas, in 1917. In 1900 he is listed as a minister in Jefferson, Arkansas, with a wife and son. In 1925, his wife, Helen, sued him for divorce.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projectile Points:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Archaic Types:</td>
<td>Neville</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ovoid, ovoid-pointed, leaf-shaped, rectangular</td>
<td>L: 4-10 cm</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neville Variant</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stark</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Archaic Types:</td>
<td>Brewerton Eared Notched</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ovoid, trianguloid, teardrop</td>
<td>L: 4-8 cm</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atlantic (cut down)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Susquehanna Broad</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small Triangle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fishtail</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Woodland Types:</td>
<td>Meadowood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>graver points on scrapers</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rossville</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Woodland Types:</td>
<td>Lagoon?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fox Creek Lanceolate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knives:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ovoid, ovoid-pointed, leaf-shaped,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rectangular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L: 4-10 cm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knives, Unfinished:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ovoid, ovoid-pointed, leaf-shaped,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rectangular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L: 4-10 cm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrapers:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ovoid, trianguloid, teardrop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L: 4-8 cm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrapers, Unfinished:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>triangular, ovoid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bifacial Blade Fragments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cores, and Core-Hammerstones:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Artifact Total: 93

Figure 5. Artifact List for the Thoreau Farm Site
Figure 6. Thoreau Farm Site: Projectile Points and Projectile Point Bases.
1, Neville; 2, Neville Variant; 3, Stark; 4, Brewerton Eared-Notched; 5, Atlantic (cut down); 6, Susquehanna Broad; 7, Fishtail; 8, Small Triangle; 9, Meadowood; 10-11, Rossville; 12, Fox Creek Lanceolate.

Figure 7. Thoreau Farm Site: Large Edge Tools (Knives or Scrapers). Courtesy of the Concord Museum: H.C. Wheeler Collection.

Figure 8. Thoreau Farm Site: Edge Tools: 1,4, Scrapers with Graver Points; 2,5, Teardrop End-scrapers; 3,6-9, Knives. Courtesy of the Concord Museum: H.C. Wheeler collection.

Figure 9. The Boulders of Thoreau’s “Two-Boulder Hill,” Old Thoreau Farm, April 2011. (The second boulder is behind scrub to the right by the small fir tree.)
Figure 11.

H. C. Wheeler Collection
Robert S. Peabody Museum of Archaeology


NOTE TO FILE

Information from Accession Ledger

- Collection comprises Catalog numbers 48833-50191 in the museum’s original accession ledger.

- 1358 catalog numbers allotted to the collection. Noted as received from “Department Fund” which means the collection was purchased from H.C. Wheeler.
  
  - 1358 total catalog numbers allotted to the collection. The museum's original accession ledgers consist of consecutively numbered artifacts or artifact lots. The numbers allotted to the Wheeler collection are 48833-50191. Some are single items and others are artifact lots consisting of multiple items. Each catalog number lists an artifact name(s), a site, the donor, collector and a date. Sometimes other notes are written in as well for provenience, associations, de-accessions, etc...

  - At least 226 items removed from the collection. Some representing single artifacts and others group lots. Most appear to have been removed in the 1920’s, but some are undated. Most are stamped with the note “Duplicate authority of trustees to reduce our collections taken out”. Some have a simple note written in as removed. Some artifacts given to museums such as “Peabody” and “Abbe”. Others removed to private collectors such as Parsons in Maine.

  - Currently, 732 items total listed in 4D database from 2001 inventory.

- Collection comprises the following towns in Massachusetts. No further provenience is noted beyond what is listed below.
  
  - Acton
  - Bedford
  - Concord (majority of collection from here)
  - Lexington
  - Marblehead
  - Maynard
  - Mystic Pond, Arlington, MA
  - North Billerica
  - North Sudbury
  - Sudbury
  - Wheeler Farm

- Collection consists of chipped and ground stone items and a small amount of pottery sherds and graphite.
  
  - Note for catalog numbers 49215-50046: “1684 projectile points and knives of various kinds from village sites along the Concord river, Concord, MA. Collected within five or 6 miles of the home of H. C. Wheeler who made this collection. This series embodies all types of chipped objects of the smaller variety and also some larger spear points. It is an interesting study in material and workmanship”.

Moorehead, Accession Files and Site Files

- No information was found about Wheeler’s collection in Moorehead’s files (accession, site files, or papers).
A Recycled Small Cumberland-Barnes Palaeoindian Biface Projectile Point
from Southeastern Connecticut

Mark A. S. McMenamin

Introduction

A small Cumberland-Barnes projectile point dating from the Middle Palaeoindian Phase (12,900 to 10,500 BP), occurring as a surface find from the Norwich and Preston region in southeastern Connecticut, shows the fishtail base with the rounded basal tabs or auricles characteristic of Cumberland type Palaeoindian points. The short lanceolate point with asymmetric base is 41 mm in length, 20 mm wide, 6 mm thick, and has a width/length point ratio of 0.49. The blade curvature (cord height of curve from shoulder to tip, unretouched side) is 4.5 mm. The tip angle (as resharpened) is 75°. This projectile point was fashioned from locally available material as opposed to exotic lithics. The artifact was resharpened by a crude bevel.

This point was purchased from Arthur Godfrey of Poinciana, Florida on October 29, 2009 as part of a lot that included 22 other southeastern Connecticut points. The collection of bifacial points included examples of Squibnocket stemmed, Wading River, Merrimack, and Madison points, all in locally available materials ranging from white to translucent vein quartz, vitreous quartz, micaceous schist, felsite, banded slate, and black porphyry felsite. All are of point types and lithologies that occur in southeastern Connecticut, thus I have no reason to doubt Godfrey’s assertion that the points were recovered as surface finds from cornfields in the Norwich-Preston area of southeastern Connecticut.

The Cumberland-Barnes-Beaver Lake series of projectile points, usually attributed to the Middle Palaeoindian Phase of eastern North America, is a typological grouping of bifacial points distinguished by their distinctive, usually symmetrical fishtail shaped basal region. The type was first recognized in Massachusetts in 1785, and is illustrated in Luigi Castiglione's Viaggio (1790). Castiglione (1790, Plate IV, Figure 7) illustrated a large Cumberland point that was recycled and attached, perhaps for ceremonial purposes by contemporary Native Americans, to a shaft that is too thin to be of much use for more than ornamental use (Figure 1; Marraro, 1950). The exact dimensions of this point are unknown, as are its current whereabouts. The precise locality of the point is also unknown, although it was given to Castiglione by the Rev. Manasseh Cutler, a fellow naturalist who lived in Ipswich, Massachusetts (Gramly, 2007).

Projectile Point Characteristics

The bifacial point reported here is fashioned from locally derived schistose felsite. The rock used for the point is derived from a fine-grained quartzite bed or stringer that constituted part of a schistose metamorphic rock, with some of the original sedimentary bedding retained. The name of geological formation from which the rock was taken is unknown, but it evidently belongs to one of the Paleozoic schistose metamorphic suites that are commonly encountered in southern New England. The rock has a weak cleavage that runs parallel to the faces of the point.

Just to one side of the tip of the point (Figures 2-4) is a crude, slightly curved bevel that represents a resharpening scar. The base of the point has the asymmetrical base known from many smaller Palaeoindian points.

Projectile points identified as “Clovis” points have auricles (Overstreet, 2007) resembling those seen on the point described here. The point considered here is nevertheless a representative of the general Cumberland type, due to its recurving edges and basal morphology. Barnes style basal thinning in the form of a broad arc-shaped chipping scar is visible in Figures 2-4. Beaver Lake Palaeoindian points can also develop asymmetric tails in the course of their use life (Hanna, 2007, p. 14), but the Beaver Lake bifacial point type is characterized by more strongly recurved sides (Overstreet, 2007) than encountered among allied point types.
Discussion

The point considered here belongs to the Cumberland-Barnes Palaeoindian point series. It has flared auricles, and convex edges with a slight waist (Boudreau, 2008). The basal edges do not appear to be ground. Basal thinning scars are present, and one face of the point has an extremely shallow flute, running two thirds the length of the point, that evidently takes advantage of a natural curvature in the rock cleavage.

Overall, the point has a rather flattened profile due to natural rock cleavage. As such, the point resembles a similar Palaeoindian point from the central states (approximately 4.5 cm long) that has a flattened profile and is otherwise similar in overall shape, except that it has a more symmetrical auricle-bearing base (Brown, 1945; upper left illustration panel, second row, third point from left).

The point is most similar to smaller Barnes points from the Parkhill Palaeoindian complex (10,700-10,600 BP), known to occur from eastern Michigan and southern Ontario to western New York state (Ellis and Deller, 2001). The primary alternative interpretation for the point described here would be as a Brewerton Eared Triangle (Boudreau, 2009, Figure 6); however, the overall form of the bifacial point described here much more closely resembles the fish-tailed fluted point discovered at the 6LF21 site in western Connecticut (Moeller, 1980, 1984). The latter point, found broken into two pieces, is approximately 6 cm in length and was the primary piece of evidence for establishing a Palaeoindian presence at the 6LF21 site. A presumed Palaeoindian point from Plymouth County, Massachusetts (Boudreau, 2009, Figure 4A) has its fishtail aspect of the basal edge developed more weakly, but the fishtail morphology can still be detected alongside its shallow flute. This latter point, although now broken, had an approximate original length of 10 cm. All three of these New England bifacial points may represent southeastward extensions of the Parkhill complex (Gramly, 2007).

Citing the exaggerated medial ridge as seen in classic Cumberland points, Boudreau (2008) sees “a superficial resemblance” and “little technological relationship” between Cumberland and Barnes points. R. M. Gramly, however, considers there to be a strong “affinity between Cumberland and Barnes tool kits” (as cited in Boudreau, 2008, p. 5). Gramly (2007) argues that bifacial points of the Cumberland-Barnes-Beaver Lake tradition may have a very ancient origin, dating before the Middle Palaeoindian Phase (12,900 to 10,500 BP) to which these points are usually assigned. Smaller points in this series are less well known (and some of these are probably resharpened or expended points); for example, most of the Barnes points from the Parkhill site in Ontario have original lengths of approximately 5 centimeters or more (Gramly, 2007).

An arcuate resharpening scar distinguishes the bifacial point described here, as seen in Figures 3-4. The scar appears to be an edge retouch in a cruder knapping style than was used to make the point in the first place. This might be expected if the resharpening occurred at some time subsequent to the Palaeoindian phase, and was done by someone belonging to a later cultural period who lacked the finesse of typical Palaeoindian knapping technique. An alternate hypothesis is that the point scar described here may merely represent impact damage. The inferred direction of breakage, however, does not support an accidental breakage interpretation.

If we can assume that there is at least a rough correlation between the length of Palaeoindian points and the body size of intended prey, then the occurrence of small Cumberland Barnes points in New England is in accord with Meltzer’s (1988) inference that the earliest populations in eastern North America may have concentrated on hunting smaller game, as opposed to hunting the Pleistocene megafauna.
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**Figure 1.** Luigi Castiglione’s (1790, Plate IV, Figure 7) Illustration of a Fluted Cumberland Point.

**Figure 2.** Line drawing of Cumberland-Barnes Projectile Point from Norwich and Preston Region, Southeastern Connecticut. Note asymmetrical base.
Introduction:

One of the persistent attractions of field archaeology is the possibility of finding something entirely unexpected, even at a site which has become familiar after prolonged investigation. An excellent example of this occurred during the 2010 field season at the Middleborough Little League Site (19-PL-520), when Donald Drew, a Bridgewater State University student enrolled in the author’s field school, recovered a complete grooved gouge (artifact #11459) from a small pit feature, Feature #179, at the site. The gouge is made of dark grey Brain-tree argillite, and measures 169.9 mm in length, 45.8 mm in maximum width, 32.3 mm in maximum thickness, and weighs 489.8 g. Its groove is 40.9 mm long and is pecked 1.7 mm deep. Its sides are nearly parallel for its entire length, without any flaring at the bit end. The scooped out portion on the ventral surface of the gouge is fairly shallow and does not extend beyond the lower end of the groove on the dorsal surface. At its end is a ridge of stone 8 mm wide and 6 mm high. Its obverse and reverse sides are illustrated in Figure 1.

Site Context

The Little League Site is located on a series of three glacial kame terraces above the north bank of the Nemasket River. These terraces formed as a result of successive draw-downs of glacial Lake Narragansett in late Pleistocene or early Holocene times (Hartshorn 1969). The second terrace has largely
been graded for the construction of baseball fields, and little of its original integrity remains. Extensive investigations on the third, highest terrace during 1996, 1998 – 2002, and 2006 – 2008 (Hoffman 1996, 1997, 2000, 2001, 2004, 2007) established the presence of a multi-component site with components ranging in mean radiocarbon age from ca 8100 – 1100 BP (uncalibrated). Site functions include tool-making, food processing, hide preparation, and a strong presence of gathered stone items related to ceremonialism (paintstones of red hematite, black graphite, yellow limonite; quartz crystals including Herkimer diamonds; highly polished pebbles; one-hole pendants; stone rods) from all periods of occupation (Hoffman 2006). These investigations provided sufficient evidence of the site’s significance to convince the Middleborough Little League to avoid construction of additional ballfields on most of the third terrace.

Excavations on the first, lowest terrace were undertaken from 2009 – 2011 (Hoffman 2009, 2011). This area is intersected by a powerline right-of-way. While there are no immediate threats to this portion of the site, the likelihood that the Town will eventually seek to increase its electrical capacity by burying cables in place of the overhead lines was sufficient incentive to undertake an intensive survey in this portion of the site. A total of 122 fifty centimeter by fifty centimeter excavation units was excavated. The units were arranged at staggered ten meter intervals along transects situated five meters apart, oriented parallel to the axis of the powerline (40° east of magnetic north). In no cases except the one to be discussed below were adjacent units excavated. These transects extended from the northwestern edge of the terrace to the edge of the river floodplain, and effectively established the edges of the main occupation area,
based upon the presence/absence of pit features and the concentrations of recovered pre-Contact cultural material. Approximately 5/8 of the excavation units contained soil anomalies below the plow zone, most of which were determined to be of anthropogenic origin based upon form and contents. These were defined as features and were given successive numbers. Like the third terrace, the artifact assemblage on the first terrace is dominated by items related to ceremonialism. There are also chipped stone tools, and a number of broken pecked and ground stone fragments. The gouge is the only pecked stone tool which is whole.

Feature #179 is a medium-sized pit found in unit S29E149, about fifty meters north of and 2.12 meters above the mean elevation of the Nemasket River, on relatively flat ground close to the southeastern edge of the feature concentration (see Figure 2). Two adjacent fifty centimeter by fifty centimeter units were excavated. The feature is at most 82 cm in north-south diameter. Due to the limited excavated area, its east-west diameter is not known, though it is at least 50 cm (see Figure 5). It was first recognized at the base of the plow zone at a depth of 32 cm below surface. It had a maximum depth below junction of 21 cm, and it was asymmetrically bowl-shaped in profile. Its Munsell color was 7.5YR4/4, very strikingly redder than the adjacent subsoil, whose Munsell color was 10YR5/6, and slightly redder than most other features at the site. Profiles of Feature #179 are shown in Figures 3 and 4. In addition to the gouge, which was found resting on its dorsal surface just at junction, the feature contained an arkose chopper, an arkose stem knife, an arkose anvil, a granite hammerstone, a quartz utilized flake, seven paintstones (three hematite, three graphite, one limonite), six flakes (four white quartz, one pink rhyolite, one grey arkose), thirty-two pieces of fire-cracked rock, seven pieces of charcoal, and one charred hazel nutshell fragment (Corylus sp.; author’s identification).

Due to the presence of the gouge, it was desirable to obtain a radiocarbon date from Feature #179. Because the amount of recovered charcoal was very small (< 0.5 g), the sample was processed using the accelerator-mass spectrometer (AMS) method, and this yielded a raw radiocarbon age of 5350+40 B.P. (GX-33566-AMS; δ13C = -26.10/oo). This provides a calibrated date (Stuiver et al. 2011) of cal Year 75.

Figure 2. Contour Map of the First Terrace, Showing Location of Feature #179.
and clearly deliberate placement, perhaps after the fashion of Caddy Park (Mahlstedt and Davis 2002:20-22). However, militating against this hypothesis is the presence of the usual suite of utilitarian stone tools, debitage, and fire-cracked rock within the feature fill. The presence of paintstones indicates little, since these were found in over 75% of the features excavated on the first terrace, in several cases in far greater quantities than in Feature #179.

It seems more likely that this is a storage or dispositional pit, utilized during the late summer or early fall, based on the recovery of the hazelnut shell (Largy 1984:4). The positioning of the gouge may be related to the feature’s proximity to the Nemasket River, which is navigable by canoe for almost all of its length. This is similar to the placement of a gouge found at the Cedar Swamp-4 Site in Westborough, in the unplowed A horizon above a similar shallow pit feature (Feature #1) in association with two bifaces, thirty flakes, and fire-cracked rock (Hoffman 1987:4). This unit was close to the edge of the Sudbury River floodplain. This gouge had similar proportions to the one found at the Little League Site (135 mm in length, 51.5 mm in width, and 24.5 mm in thickness), and while it is more similar to the knobbed type and lacks a well-defined groove, its placement suggested a relationship to the adjacent water resource (Hoffman 1991:302). Its ventral side is illustrated in Figure 6.

bp (6020 – 6079, 6111 – 6155, 6174 – 6209, 6251-6261), in descending order of probability (36.9%, 32.0%, 25.2%, and 5.9%, respectively). Funding for the date was provided by a generous grant from the Center for the Advancement of Research and Teaching at Bridgewater State University.

Function of Feature #179

The function of Feature #179 is currently unknown, but one possibility is that the gouge is some kind of ceremonial deposit, given its fine condition.
Grooved Gouges from the Northeast

Gouges are most likely wood-working tools, associated with the manufacture of dugout canoes (Fowler 1963:9). Gouges were recognized fairly early in the archaeological literature of the Northeast, and from the start a chronological differentiation was made between the channel gouges of the Early to Middle Archaic and the grooved gouges of the Late to Transitional Archaic (Bielski 1964:35; Fowler 1949:38; 1950:76,81; 1953:19-20; 1961:52; 1964:63,69; 1968:54-55; 1972:10; 1975:30; 1976:52; Robbins 1967:55,57; 1980:18, 310; Scothorne 1968: 51; Zariphes 1973:23-24), largely based upon their stratigraphic associations. The discovery of channel gouges associated with Early and Middle Archaic radiocarbon ages in Maine (Petersen and Putnam 1991:39-44; Robinson 1991:100) confirms this early impression, and subsequent work by Bradley (1996:46) supports this conclusion in southern New England.

William S. Fowler defined channel gouges as having:

“either a deep or shallow pecked out lateral area on the back and sides of the stem. This so-called channel is always relatively wide, much more so than the groove found on grooved gouges. Furthermore, it does not have a round-ed trough like the latter. Instead, its trough has a tendency to be wide and flat. As a result of this lateral channel, that which is left of the head projects at the end in a prominent ridge that runs around sides and back. This is intensified by the more or less truncated termination of the head that does not tend to be rounded as in the case of most other gouge types. A prominent characteristic of this gouge consists in the tilt of its sides. They tend to flare moderately to sharply from the lower end of the channel to the bit, in some instances are more or less parallel. The scooped out area of the bit is always deep and well defined extending up the blade and terminating just below the channel. These blades are made from flat pieces of stone for the most...
part, and exhibit uniform pecking and grinding.”

He further defined the grooved gouge as follows:
that extends around the back and part of the two sides of the blade near its head. Usually, there is only one groove, although occasionally, two grooves appear. Their function seems to have been for the purpose of holding things in place that were used in attaching the implement to its handle. The bit usually has only a shallow scooped out area, although at times in certain specimens that may have been imported, the area is more deeply scraped. An important trait determinant is the general contour of the blade as contrasted with most of the plain stem gouges. Blades of grooved gouges have a tendency to avoid a flare at the bit, although at times a slight flare occurs. However, in most instances, their sides tend to converge toward the bit in varying degrees. The grinding of the scooped out area of the bit is usually superficial, and seems to be incidental to other characteristics.” (1953:20)

The gouge from the Little League Site fits this description rather well.

Despite numerous recoveries of grooved gouges at sites throughout southern New England (e.g., Barton 1971:39-31; Boudreau 2009:68; Bowman and Zeoli 1973/4:25-26; Fowler 1949:37; 1950:80; 1952a:2; 1952b:12; 1954:71,74; 1956:12-13; 1961:51; 1971:13; Mahlstedt and Davis 2002:16-17; Martin 1977:64,67; Otto 1988:13; Parker 1973/4:11; Roberts 1980:54; Robbins 1943:20; 1967:55; Sautter 1967:18-19; Scothorne 1968:41,45,47; Zariphes 1970/1:14,16; 1973:23-24), in only one other case that I have found are grooved gouges associated with a radiocarbon date. This is the well-known Feature #206, the LaBrie Complex crematory, at Wapanucket 8, from which a date of 4290±140 B.P. (GX-1104, uncalibrated) (Robbins 1980:328) was recovered, in possible association with eleven grooved gouges (Robbins 1980:233-235).

Wapanucket is only 3.5 km south of the Little League Site, easily accessible by canoe up the Nemasket River to Assawompsett Pond. There are clear connections between its elaborate burial programme and the recoveries from the Little League Site. Arkose slabs found lining the Wapanucket 8 burial features, including Feature #206, can only be quarried in the Nemasket drainage from an outcrop directly adjacent to the Little League Site, and the Wapanucket burials contained red ochre, quartz crystals, and polished pebbles, all of which were collected at the Little League Site (Hoffman 2006:99-100).

The recovery of five Stark (Corner Removed #8/9) projectile points in Feature #206 (Robbins 1980:231) has led to speculation that it might be considerably older than the date, and Brian Robinson (2006) retrieved two additional charcoal samples from the feature which produced dates in the early 8th millennium B.P., so the actual age of the contents of the “LaBrie Complex” is in question. Robbins himself commented on the possibility that the feature might have been disturbed by subsequent excavation and refilling (1980:244), so it is possible that both radiocarbon ages are accurate, but that neither of them is directly associated with the gouges. While gouges were found in five of the twelve deposits of cremated bone as well as on the floor of the feature, Robbins does not indicate precisely from where the radiocarbon sample was taken.

In New York State, William Ritchie claimed early on that gouges (without specifying the type) were part of the Laurentian Tradition, especially of the Brewerton Phase (Ritchie 1965:101), and this has been confirmed by more recent investigations both in New York (Funk 1988:33-35) and southeastern Connecticut (Pfeiffer 1983:52-53), at least in terms of their assignment to the Late Archaic phase, though Funk notes that they are also sometimes associated with the Narrow Point traditions of the same phase. Bruce Bourque’s excavations at Turner Farm in Maine (1995:49,55) only recovered gouges of the grooved or plain types in association with the well-stratified Late and Transitional Archaic components at that site.
Conclusions

The radiocarbon date from Feature #179 places the age of the gouge at the beginning of the Late Archaic period – a time when not very much is known about the region. A recent tabulation of radiocarbon dates from all projects undertaken by the Public Archaeology Laboratory (2010) lists nine dates (out of a total of 585) whose uncalibrated means fall between 5000 and 5500 B.P., a slight increase from most previous 500-year spans but far fewer than the numbers obtained from every half-millennium subsequent to 4500 B.P. An older tabulation by the author (1988) for Massachusetts dates alone provides similar results: eight radiocarbon dates with uncalibrated means between 5000 and 5500 B.P. (out of a total of 284), slightly more than any previous 500-year spans, but far fewer than most subsequent ones. None of these dates are associated with gouges. The major expansion of populations in southern New England into increasingly upland locations (Hoffman 1985:65) had not yet taken place by this time, and most sites of this period were situated in proximity to major watercourses, as is the case with the Little League site.

One might expect Laurentian diagnostics, such as Brewerton, Vosburg, or Otter Creek points, to be associated with sites of this phase; however, none have as yet been retrieved from the first terrace at the Little League site. The only diagnostic artifacts so far retrieved from that terrace are a probable Middle Archaic Snappit point, five Small Stemmed points (Late Archaic through Late Woodland), a Squibnocket Triangle (Late Archaic), the bases of two Atlantic points (Transitional Archaic), and a ceramic bowl fragment of probable Middle Woodland age. Their locations and relationship to Feature #179 are given in Figure 7. One of the Small Stemmed points, #10784, was found in the lower plow zone above a deep pit feature, Feature #159, charcoal from which provided a radiocarbon age of 970±90 B.P. (GX-33565; δ13C = -27.8o/oo), which calibrates (Stuiver et al. 2011) to cal bp (961 – 785) – the youngest date so far retrieved from the entire site, and clearly unrelated to the gouge.

In conclusion, the gouge from Feature #179 provides an important chronological anchor for gouges of the grooved type, long predicted and now confirmed to be of Late Archaic age. It demonstrates the importance of wood-working technology and, by inference, of river transport in the region.
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