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Our founder, Dr. Maurice Robbins, wrote that his mentor, Warren King Moorehead, once warned him, “Don’t write until you have something to say about something new or something new to say about something old.” (Robbins 1978:17) The four articles in this issue of the Bulletin of the Massachusetts Archaeological Society certainly fulfill the latter condition; all of them are new evaluations of archaeological work most of which was done over 60 years ago! It was not my intention to produce a special issue of the Bulletin devoted to this topic, but the articles simply came together around that theme.

Lucianne Lavin’s report on the Perry’s Shell Heap site on Cape Cod was originally presented as a paper at the 2012 MAS Annual Meeting. The wealth of bone tools and faunal remains at that site, excavated from 1936-1941, is remarkable, and it is indeed surprising how much information Luci was able to extract from this old collection.

Likewise, Mary Ellen Lepionka’s survey of Cape Ann archaeology focuses on the work of a major collector from the early 1940s who took surprisingly detailed notes on his excavations. This area of Massachusetts has seen very little archaeological attention paid to it since Mr. Phillips’ time, aside from a few cultural resource management surveys, so it is a welcome addition to our knowledge, especially since one of the surviving collections is housed at the Robbins Museum. It should be kept in mind, as you read these two articles, that the original excavators were products of their time; their overwhelming enthusiasm was at times coupled with a distinct lack of what we would today consider respectful attitudes toward the descendants of the people whose remains and artifacts they were unearthing.

Bill Taylor is a familiar name to anyone who has followed the Bulletin over the past 15 years. His most recent article on mullers reports on finds he made, mostly in the Titicut district, and mostly during the 1940s and 1950s. I have added to it a note about the only recently recovered artifact reported in this issue, a muller from the 2013 field season at the Middleborough Little League Site.

Finally, Bernie Otto, also a frequent contributor to the Bulletin, has provided his reminiscences of several copper cut-out points he saw as a 12-year old boy which came from the North Plymouth area. This article is the only one which I actually solicited for this issue, in response to his comments to me on Joe Bagley’s article (2013:16-20) on a copper cut-out point from a collection in the last issue of the Bulletin. Since Bernie is now 94 years old, this study certainly fits into the category of recherche du temps perdu!

Finally, on a sad note: the Pow-Wow Oak in Lowell, Massachusetts, on which Eugene Winter reported so eloquently in the last issue of the Bulletin, was tragically demolished by an unthinking construction crew shortly after the issue was published, despite the fact that it was in a clearly delineated preservation district supported by an active preservation society. This should serve as a cautionary tale: the preservation of the past is everyone’s business, and it is only by maintaining vigilance that we will be able to succeed in it.

October 2013
Ashland MA
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Introduction

Perry’s Shell Heap was an extensive shell midden site overlooking a freshwater pond in a kettle hole near Corn Hill in North Truro, Massachusetts (Figure 1). It has also been referred to as the Railroad site, since the tracks of the Provincetown branch of the New Haven Railroad ran through it. In the early 1900s, staff from Phillips Academy at Andover, Massachusetts excavated the site west of the tracks and gave it the site number M-38-2.

Edward Rogers

The site had been explored by a number of persons during the early 20th century -- and probably earlier -- but it was excavated most extensively by Edward Rogers, a well-known and well-respected amateur archaeologist. The Edward H. Rogers Collection included artifacts from all over the United States, but the majority were from southern New England.

Rogers was a former resident of Truro. His family owned a farm in the town. After graduating from New York University in 1914 he moved to Connecticut, where he lived until his death in 1972. Rogers frequently vacationed on the Cape, however. During those times he explored local farms, searching for Native American archaeological sites.

Perry’s Shell Heap

One of those sites was Perry’s Shell Heap. Rogers excavated the eastern portion of the site from 1936 to 1941. He referred to the site as Perry’s Shell Heap and Perry’s Kettle Hole site, since it was located on the farm of John Perry. In 1971, Rogers arranged for the sale of his extensive archaeological collection, with notes, to the American Indian Archaeological Institute – now the Institute for American Indian Studies (IAIS) in Washington, Connecticut, where they are presently housed. The collection consists of over 7,000 artifacts. They include over 450 tools and several hundred pottery sherds from Perry’s Shell Heap.

Rogers excavated over 8,000 square feet of the site. Figure 2 is a portion of his original plan of the site, which was drawn to scale. It shows the main block of excavations, which he had divided into sixteen sections. Each small square on the graph paper equals one square foot. So we are looking at a 120 foot by 90 foot portion of his excavations, showing numerous cultural features as well as the location of what he considered to be significant artifacts.

Rogers reported that the site was stratified and that in some areas it extended four to five feet below the surface (Figure 3). He included drawings of the site profile and site plan in his unpublished field notebook. The notebook contained 48 typewritten pages of notes that detailed the excavation of each section, its stratigraphy, and cultural contents, as exemplified by the page shown in Figure 4.

Rogers located 67 pit features at the site, which he described in detail and plotted on his plan. Most appear to have been shell-filled refuse pits, but fire pits and a few large “ash” features were also recorded. He reported finding only 3 post molds. The large oval/oblong ash features he described may have represented house floors.
The major attractions of the site appear to have been the perennial availability of fresh water at the bottom of the kettle hole and the site's proximity to Cape Cod Bay. But how long did the kettle hole contain a pond? Taking into consideration the slope of the kettle, size of the pond, and sea level curves for the region (Ziegler et al. nd), it has been estimated that fresh water first appeared about 2,500 years ago (Anonymous nd).

**Stone and Clay Artifacts**

The archaeological evidence from Perry’s Shell Heap supports this date. There is little evidence for an Archaic presence. A minor Terminal Archaic component is represented by one Normanskill point and relatively few Broadspess points. The Early and Middle Woodland periods are represented by relatively larger numbers of points – Ross-villes, Lagoon and Adena, Fox Creek Stemmed and Lanceolate, Jack's Reef Corner-notched. The most frequent point type, however, is the Late Woodland Levanna Triangle (Figure 5).

The clay potsherds from the site represent all three Woodland periods, but the most prevalent styles date to the Late Middle Woodland and Early Late Woodland. A few cord-marked interior sherds suggest the early Woodland type Vinette Interior Cord-Marked. A few dentate stamped sherds indicate Early Middle Woodland pottery styles. The majority of the sherds, however, exhibit traits attributed to a later time frame. They include brushed interior surfaces; brushed or combed exterior surfaces; shell-stamped decoration; cord-wrapped-stick stamping; punctuation; incised decoration. All of the rim sherds in Figure 6 represent Late Middle Woodland to Late Woodland scallop shell stamped, punctated, and cord-wrapped stick stamped styles, save possibly three -- the rim sherd in the lower right corner exhibits an Early Middle Woodland dentate-stamped design; the large rim above it and the center rim in row two each exhibit a stamp and drag design that may have been produced with either a dentate stamp or a scallop shell. Like the projectile point styles, the pottery suggests that the main occupation of the site occurred during the Late Middle Woodland and Late Woodland periods, from about AD 700 to about AD 1200 (Rouse 1947; Smith 1950; Lavin 1984, 1998, 2002, 2013; Lavin and Miroff 1992).

As noted above, the Rogers collection at the Institute for American Indian Studies consists of over 450 tools and several hundred pottery sherds. We know he recovered more objects because in his field notes he mentioned excavating certain functional types that are missing from our site assemblage (e.g., a sinew stone, whelk shell cups, a two-holed pendant). The majority of the tools are chipped stone points, knives, and preforms in various stages of manufacture. Virtually no other chipped stone functional categories are represented save for two or three twist drills and one scraper (Figure 7). Ground stone tools are rare; four small celts, one grooved axe, one axe preform and one adz preform were found. Other stone artifacts included a large stemmed biface representing either a chopper or a spade for digging the pits, several hammerstones, stone mortars, an abrading stone, two grooved stone net sinkers, geode paint cups and graphite fragments.

**Bone and Antler Tools**

The site’s major significance, however, lies in its large collection of perishable objects, preserved by the alkaline soil conditions created by the deteriorating shell. The awls, harpoons, weaving needles and other bone and antler objects from the site, many of them complete, are rarely recovered from our normally acidic New England soils. They help provide a fuller picture of the technology and economy of indigenous coastal communities.

The antler industry included antler projectile points, antler pestles, antler flakers and batons for stone tool manufacture; and cut and worked tines that were preforms for tools and tool handles (Figures 8, 12). The bone industry included a large number of partly worked and cut bones – they were the raw material and “blanks” for various bone tools (Figure 9). It also included numerous bone awls in various stages of manufacture and use (Figure 10). Their traditional function is punching holes in leather, but they may also have been used to punch holes in shellfish for threading and drying over a fire (Cantwell 1980: 25-26).
Bone weaving needles were also recovered (Winters 1969: Plate 26); these were likely used as shuttles to weave fish nets from dogbane and other plant fibers, and mats made from cattail leaves and sea grasses (Figure 11). Also recovered were miniature bone and antler pestles (Figure 12); bone harpoons (Figure 13); bone arrowheads; a bi-pointed bone gorge; bone knives; bone beamers, a bone scraper; incised bone fragments – possibly fragments from a bone whistle or flute, and bone beads and worked swordfish bills (Figure 14). Other perishable technologies were represented by beaver-tooth chisels, five worked whelk shell cups, and broken turtle shell dishes.

**Food Remains**

In the field notes from his first excavation in 1936, Rogers reported that “animal bones are scattered throughout the heap in large quantities. We saved the majority of the bones which nearly filled a bushel basket. These constitute a large variety of animal and fish bones (Rogers nd: 2).” He continued to report finding numerous faunal materials throughout the dig years. Rogers reported that numerous pit features contained shells of oyster, blue mussel, hard shell and soft shell clam, scallop and razor clam, charred fish remains including those of sturgeon; fragments of whale bones, bones of white tailed deer, raccoon, dog, a large dog or wolf, geese, ducks, claws from a hawk or eagle; a sea lion’s tusk, and bear teeth (Figure 15).

He also mentioned uncovering a fully articulated dog skeleton that was missing its skull. This latter description is similar to another reported dog burial from the College Point site in New York City (Lopez and Wisniewski 1958). At that site, the dog was missing its head and was buried in obvious ceremony, with a decapitated fisher (aka fisher cat, an animal of the weasel family) beside it and a ceremonial fire directly above them. At the periphery of the grave four large stones marked the four directions. In traditional Native American thought, each direction is associated with a spirit being (Lavin 2013:278-81; Fawcett 2000:32; see also Tantaquidgeon and Fawcett 1987, and McMullen and Handsman 1987), so the College Point dog burial was laden with spiritual meaning. A possible reason for the dog decapitations was their ritual use in warfare. As Alvin Morrison reported in a paper presented at the 1982 Canadian Ethnology Society Annual Meeting:

“The Wabanaki [peoples of northern New England] held a Dog Feast in preparation for warfare. They believed that the flesh of the dog would give the warriors courage. The head of one of the dogs was removed and singed in the fire. Then it was taken in the hands of the war chief who sang to it, telling the dog spirit who and where the war party would attack. He passed the skull to each of his fellow warriors. Those who accepted the skull and sang to it signified that they would join the attack (Morrison 1982, as cited in Strong 1985:36).”

**Summary**

In summary, Rogers excavated Perry’s Shell Heap 75 years ago, yet his detailed field notes and the cultural remains are still revealing pertinent information about Native American lifeways. They demonstrate sequential occupations of the site for over 2,500 years. It was most intensively occupied during the Late Middle Woodland and Early Late Woodland periods. The artifacts show a number of occupant activities: hunting, onshore and offshore fishing, shellfish collecting, food processing and cooking, tool manufacture and maintenance, woodworking, paint pigment manufacture, and textile manufacture of nets and/or mats. The bone beads and pendant reflect body decoration. The presence of the headless dog skeleton suggests ritual. All these activities indicate that at least some of the components represent more than temporary or special purpose shellfish collecting camps. More likely they were longer term seasonal or multi-seasonal settlements. Most significantly, the relatively extensive assemblage of perishable items provides insight into the complexity and sophistication of early Native American bone, antler and shell industries in southern New England. They help confirm that indigenous communities were never simple or primitive, even 2,000 years ago.
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Figure 1. Map of Eastern Massachusetts Showing the Location of North Truro and the Perry’s Shell Heap Site (courtesy of Matthew Barr).
Figure 2. Portion of Rogers’ Plan Drawing of the Perry’s Shell Heap Site.

Figure 3. Rogers’ Original 1936 Drawing of the Site’s Stratigraphic Profile.
Figure 4. Unnumbered Page from Rogers’ Field Notebook of His Excavations at Perry’s Shell Heap.
Figure 5. Sampling of Projectile Points and Knives from Perry’s Shell Heap Site. upper two rows and leftmost on third row: Levanna Triangles; third row: Jack’s Reef Corner-notched, Fox Creek Lanceolates, Fox Creek Stemmed; fourth row: Rossville, Adena, and Lagoon points; fifth row: Broadspears, Normanskill, Orient Fish-tail; bottom row: ovoid and stemmed knives.

Figure 6. Sampling of Clay Rim Sherds from Perry’s Shell Heap Site. Top row: punctated rim, two unidentified stamp and drag rims; middle row: two cord-wrapped-stick stamped rims, scallop shell stamped rim; bottom row: scallop shell stamped rim, dentate stamped rim.

Figure 7. Chipped, Ground and Rough Stone Tools Mentioned in the Text from Perry’s Shell Heap. upper row: graphite pigment stones, hematite pigment stone and paint cup, small celt; second row: mortar fragment, grooved net sinkers, twist drills/perforators, small celt; third row: grinding stone, hammerstones, quartz endscraper; fourth row: stemmed biface (chopper or spade), grinding stone, adz preform; Fifth row: grooved axe and axe preform.

Figure 8. Some Antler Blanks (left) and Tools (right, top to bottom: point tip, drill/perforator (phallic), pestles) from Perry’s Shell Heap.
Figure 9. Cut and/or Worked Bone Items from Perry’s Shell Heap.

Figure 10. Some Long Bone Awls from Perry’s Shell Heap.

Figure 11. Two Bone Weaving Needles from Perry’s Shell Heap.

Figure 12. Cut and Ground Antler from Perry’s Shell Heap; some appear to have been used as pestles.
Figure 13. Bone Harpoons from Perry’s Shell Heap

Figure 14. Knife or Spear Point made from a Swordfish Bill from Perry’s Shell Heap.

Figure 15. Some Faunal Remains Recovered from Perry’s Shell Heap, and mentioned in the text.
Unpublished Papers on Cape Ann Prehistory

Mary Ellen Lepionka

Introduction

N. Carleton Phillips (1879-1952) was president and general manager of the Russia Cement Company, which made LePage's Glue in a West Gloucester factory, and was an avid amateur archaeologist and collector. In the winter of 2013, I examined unpublished drafts of talks that Phillips gave in Gloucester in 1940 and 1941 on archaeological sites he excavated on Cape Ann. Those papers (970.1) were in the library of the Cape Ann Museum in Gloucester in a manila folder marked “Ethnic Groups – Native Americans”. This is a report on the information contained in those documents and in related correspondences in that folder, such as drafts of papers later published by Marshall Saville and Frank Speck and an analysis in 1941 and 1942 of human skeletal material Phillips sent out, by Alice Brues and Ernest Hooton at Harvard University’s Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnography.

Some of the artifacts Phillips removed from Gloucester sites are collected under his name and stored at the Cape Ann Museum in Gloucester, and others are in storage at the Robbins Museum of Archaeology in Middleborough under the name of the Chadwick Collection. Phillips had donated artifacts to previous incarnations of the Cape Ann Museum during his lifetime. Then, after his death “a committee of ladies” from the Cape Ann Historical Society selected some other items. Later, Phillips’ widow advertised to get rid of the remainder. A Benjamin Chadwick of Wakefield and Marblehead obliged, saving them from the dustbin and later donating them to the Bronson Museum in Attleboro, which is how part of the legacy of Cape Ann ended up in the basement of the Massachusetts Archaeological Society in Middleborough (Chadwick 1986).

In an undated partial draft, Phillips describes his first finds:

I first became interested in the Indians and Indian life on Cape Ann about fifty years ago, when, as a boy. I began collecting Indian relics from finds on the cape. I had picked up arrowheads and flakes at Stage Fort Park, and the opportune time for these finds seemed to be when the circus came to town. To put up their tents and provide for their shows the workmen always had to turn up a certain amount of turf to make this….and considerable digging. It was at such times that traces of the Indians, who once had a village at the park, would come to light. The artifacts which I found at such times have been carefully preserved and are included in my collection. (n.d., p. 12).

Unfortunately, he does not identify the artifacts from Stage Fort Park. Finds on Cape Ann clearly were adventitious:

For time to time, workmen, in excavating for cellars, water and sewer pipes, have uncovered relics of the Indians in various sections of the cape, and a number of these have been preserved. There is the story of an old Indian cemetery in Annisquam where several skulls and a pipe were dug up. Finds have been made at Wheeler’s Point, Lanesville, Rockport, West Gloucester, and in fact, in every section of Cape Ann. (n.d. p. 12)

Between 1939 and 1941, however, Phillips followed up on an archaeological survey of Cape Ann originally conducted by Frank G. Speck (1881-1950) and Frederick Johnson (1904-1994). Speck was an ethnologist specializing in the languages and cultures of coastal Algonquians from Delaware to the Canadian Maritimes. He had a summer home in Riverview in Gloucester and a direct interest in Cape Ann prehistory (Blankenship 2013; Dodge 1991).
Speck believed that the Algonquians and especially the Abenaki had greater antiquity in the Northeast than even the Lenape of the Chesapeake, and cited cultural practices such as cradle-boarding and shared mythologies and ceremonies as proof that the Algonquians of the Northeast had ancient ties to the mound-builders to their southwest (Speck 1923). Speck, whose papers are at the University of Pennsylvania and the American Philosophical Society, was also an early advocate of the view that the coastal Algonquians had family-based band organization rather than clans and that their settlement and land use patterns were tied to assigned riverine or estuarine family subsistence areas (Speck 1915; 1935). Johnson, a Canadian by birth, was Speck’s student and began his career as an ethnologist among the Micmac of Nova Scotia (Medoff 1991; Johnson 1943).

Both Speck and Johnson knew Marshall Saville, a Harvard archaeologist born and raised in Rockport, MA, with connections to the Heye Foundation, later the National Museum of the American Indian in New York (Saville 1919; 1920). Saville had participated in the excavation of Pueblo Bonito in Chaco Canyon in New Mexico on the 1898-1900 Hyde Expedition under F. W. Putnam of the American Museum of Natural History. Putnam had been the first to publish on the archaeology of eastern Essex County, e.g., in Ipswich and Newbury, but his work had not extended to Cape Ann (Putnam 1867; 1869). Saville’s personal collection of Cape Ann artifacts, the subject of another paper, is in the basement of the Sandy Bay Historical Society in Rockport.

N. Carleton Phillips was a personal friend of Foster Saville, Marshall’s younger brother, with whom he often went horseback riding and artifact hunting around Cape Ann (Phillips, 1940). Phillips likely met Fred Johnson in 1939 at Johnson’s excavation of the Boylston Street Fish Weir under the New England Mutual Life Insurance building site in Boston. Johnson was curator of the R.S. Peabody Museum in Andover at the time, which earlier had sponsored work relating to Essex County by Warren K. Moorehead and Charles Willoughby (Moorehead 1910; Willoughby 1935). Phillips was much taken with the fish weir project and wrote that he swapped a reproduction of a celt for a piece of sassafras wood from the weir as a souvenir, which he preserved in a jar of alcohol. A jar of wood in alcohol with Johnson’s name on it is now in the Robbins Museum of Archaeology in Middleborough. It’s not known if this is the same jar or how many souvenir jars of weir wood were made. In any case, this is how all the principals in the story of the archaeology of Cape Ann came together.

Figure 1: Archaeology of Cape Ann Time Line

c. 1867—1910: F.W. Putnam and Warren K. Moorehead describe archaeological finds in Essex County.

c. 1890 – 1925: Marshall Saville collects artifacts in Sandy Bay, endows the Sandy Bay Historical Society in Rockport to house them.

c. 1892 – 1939: N. Carleton Phillips and Foster Saville avocationally hunt for and collect artifacts they pick up around Cape Ann.

1918 – 1925: Frank Speck and Frederick Johnson conduct an archaeological survey of Gloucester and West Gloucester, with plans to send finds to the National Museum of the American Indian/Heye Foundation.

1939 – 1941: Johnson formally files Cape Ann site report cards at the R. S. Peabody Museum in Andover, noting that Phillips will follow up. Phillips somewhat unscientifically excavates sites Johnson and Speck identified and other sites besides and sends bones out for scientific analysis. Phillips gives local talks and demonstrations of artifacts.

1942 – 1952: Johnson does not follow up, reasons unknown. Speck dies in 1950; Phillips retires and dies unpublished in 1952. His collection is divided among museums and private collectors and the remainder is trashed. His documentation (maps, drawings, and photographs) is lost.

1965: A Boston University graduate student excavates a Contact Period site in Wingaersheek (Keller 1965).

1980 – present: Archaeologists working in Gloucester and Rockport on MHC-CRM projects recover prehistoric material, including two sites with Middle Woodland radiocarbon dates. Prehistoric artifacts are found at Coles Island (Raber and Tannenbaum 1980/1981); Chebacco Lake (Leveillee 1988); Castleview, West Gloucester (Dwyer 1995, Edens 1995); Stanwood Point (Chartier 2001); Cogswell’s Grant in Essex (Wheeler and Stachiw 1996); and Castle Neck/Essex River estuary (Macpherson and Ritchie 1999).
As Phillips wrote in 1940 (p. 1):

We have had in this community and Rock-Port until recently, since he passed away a couple of weeks ago, Foster Saville, who was connected with the Museum of the American Indian in New York, and who spent a great deal of his time in Mexico and in various parts of this country making a collection of Indian relics. From him, of course, I have obtained most of my facts. Through him I have been able to establish contacts with Dr. Allen of Harvard, who would examine all the bones that we would find and tell us the animals from which they came; Dr. Johnson of Andover; Dr. Boyles of Harvard; Dr. Hooton of Harvard, and Dr. Brues of Harvard, who knows about the human bones that have been found.

Between 1918 and 1925, in their survey of Gloucester, Speck and Johnson identified five areas for further excavation, marked by large shell middens or large concentrations of lithic or ceramic material (see Figures 2 and 4). The five locations were the Annisquam River islands—Merchant Island (Pearce Island) and Rust Island—Coles Island on Essex Bay in West Gloucester, the southwestern slope of Wingaersheek Beach, and the entire kame between the Annisquam and Mill rivers from Cow Island on the south to Wheeler’s Point on the north, called Riverview, which contained four sites and three enormous shell heaps.

I discovered the Johnson and Speck site report cards in the R. S. Peabody Museum in Andover, including one that refers to N. Carleton Phillips as the person taking responsibility for follow-up excavations (see Figure 3). The R. S. Peabody had no information about the follow-ups, however, other than a newspaper clipping about one of Phillips’ talks (Gloucester Daily Times 1940). That museum also has no artifacts from the vicinity of Cape Ann other than items excavated at Essex Falls by Eugene Winter in 1956 (Accession #93.40) (see Figures 5 - 7). The Winter Collection includes more than 360 items, principally stone points and scrapers (of felsite, argillite, or rhyolite, mostly broken),debitage, ceramic shards from fire pits (including a few incised rims and a piece of glazed-interior redware), and charcoal. Winter also found some graphite, kaolin pipe fragments, hammerstones, quartz flakes and cores, burned rock and fire-split cobbles, and a knife and graver worked in “chert or Pennsylvania jasper (yellow).” They resemble artifacts found on Cape Ann, as do assemblages from Ipswich, especially Clark Pond’s on Great Neck and nearby Eagle Hill River (Bullen and Burtt 1947; Bullen 1949).

After World War II, Johnson was busy with more important postwar projects. He was working for the government to salvage sites in the path of new dams and highways and spearheading the application of new technologies to archaeology, such as radiocarbon dating (Johnson 1982). Thus, over the 70 years since Phillips’ last lecture, his discoveries have gone unpublished and largely unknown. When asked about Indians, local librarians cautioned that they sometimes visited Cape Ann in their wanderings but did not live there. Early lay historians (Thornton 1854; Babson 1860; Adams 1882; Marshall 1888, Pringle 1892) barely mention them, while modern popular accounts tend to focus on local artifact collectors and early explorers (e.g., Waugh 2005). Samuel Champlain met the Pawtucket on Cape Ann in 1604 and 1606 and made a map of Gloucester Harbor ringed with wigwams (Saville 1934; Champlain 1613; see Figure 8). On present-day archaeological maps of New England in publications readily available to the general public, however, Cape Ann is blank.

I found one living first-hand observer of Phillips’ work—Robert Matz of Gloucester, who participated in excavations as a child. Matz said that Phillips was meticulous in mapping, sketching, and photographing sites and artifacts (Matz 2013). All the documentation is said to have been lost, however. Matz believes it was sent to Boston University after Phillips’ death, but B.U. has no record of it and no references to Phillips in the Archaeology Department or any of its libraries. Harvard University, the Cape Ann Museum, the Robbins Museum of Archaeology, the R. S. Peabody, the NMAI in New York, the Smithsonian in Washington, the Peabody Essex in Salem, the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology in Cambridge, and the local historical societies all claim not to have Phillips’ documents. Perhaps they were in his widow’s dustbin. Other than those of his finds that
found their way into collections, therefore, his unpublished lecture notes may be all that remains of his work.

Despite defects in his methodology, Phillips’ notes and the physical evidence make unequivocal the seasonal reoccupation of key sites on Cape Ann dating back at least to the Middle Archaic, as well as the presence of Late Woodland three-season mobile farming settlements prior to contact (Chilton 2010; Hart and Reith 2002). Dating and classification are muddled or unstated in Phillips’ notes, however, which focus on the artifacts rather than their archaeological contexts. He describes an atlatl weight and a row of preserved Indian corn hills with equal enthusiasm and detail but without reference to the thousands of years that are now known to separate them in time. Writing in 1940 he also does not appreciate that the atlatl thrower and the maize grower may have represented separate occupations of the area by different populations, both different again from the Paleoindians who preceded them. Those Paleoindians with their Clovis points, who may have hunted mastodons on Jeffrey’s Ledge and caribou at Bull Brook (Eldridge and Vacarro 1952; Robinson 2009)—whose Cape Ann sites are likely all under water now in Ipswich Bay (Riess 1998; Bell 2009; Lynch 2012)—have so captured the popular imagination as to become a reductive stereotype for the region’s entire prehistory.

Phillips was a collector and did not conduct archaeology using modern methods. He was intent only on proving that Native Americans had occupied Cape Ann prior to European contact. Citing a book by Warren K. Moorehead, then of the R. S. Peabody Museum (1866-1939; Phillips refers to him erroneously as Dr. Morehouse), Phillips wrote (1940. p. 2):

...In reading that book I feel that we have just as good things as he has, and he has been twenty years at it. There is a lot more time that we can spend, but it is hard work and I can’t swing a pick or a shovel, so I have a crew that goes out and digs all day long and at night when they come home we go to a room in my garage where I keep these things and we gather around and view the finds of the day. On Saturdays and holidays I go out with them....In digging these shell heaps we start to clear away at the bottom and then dig and let the stuff fall down, and when some of these things drop out, we are just as thrilled as can be (1940, p. 14).

Phillips’ untrained crew, which included individuals known only as Dominick, Dominick’s boy, and the boy scouts Condon and Filfalt, dug up the sites Johnson and Speck identified and several others besides, including a number of burials. Phillips may also have gone on archaeological explorations with Frank Speck and Ralph Dexter, a marine biologist and ecologist specializing in mollusks. According to Speck’s grandson and biographer, Roy Blankenship (2013):

Frank G. Speck knew Phillips and had exchanged information on archaeological sites around Cape Ann including foundation discoveries in and around the Dog Town Common area. Speck began his summer archaeological explorations around Cape Ann in 1915. Phillips may have accompanied Speck and Ralph Dexter on summer explorations of early Native American sites especially the shell heap mounds that Speck uncovered along the Riverview marshes and coves of the Annisquam River inlets in the 1940’s. At least two burial sites were also discovered - one at Curtis Cove and the other in Dog Town. Dexter was most interested in the study of algae, sea weed, and eel grass along the Annisquam but he and Speck excavated a number of artifacts from a few deteriorating foundations in Dog Town from homesteads probably dating from the early 1800’s.

Dexter did not refer to Phillips in his papers relating to Cape Ann (Grieger 2002).

Following is a summary of what Phillips found and where, based on what he wrote in his unpublished papers in the Cape Ann Museum. The discussion moves from west to east across Cape Ann and includes some of my hypotheses regarding significance for understanding prehistoric aggregation, settlement, and resource use patterns on Cape Ann.
Coffin Beach

Phillips refers to a site near the western end of Coffin Beach, “on the “southerly side of ‘The Loaf’ [Two Penny Loaf on old maps] bordering Fisherman’s Creek” [called Chebacco River on old maps], “down where Bert Critchley lives” (1940, p. 11). On John Mason’s 1831 map of Cape Ann, the area seems to include Herrick’s Island. In that area Phillips found a number of shell heaps, the largest measuring 150 sq. ft. (15’ X 10’) to a depth of 2 ½ ft., containing what he calls “hen clams”. These are large surf clams or hard-shelled sea clams, as are quahogs, distinguishing them from the soft-shelled variety dug in the clam flats of the estuaries.

According to Phillips the main midden was covered with about a foot of rich black loam. In the midden he found a skeleton and beneath it, tree stumps, which he took as evidence of a previous forest cut down, perhaps to create a planting ground. He refers to a drawing he made of the stratigraphy—sand dunes, then the shell heap with artifacts and skeleton, then a layer of loam, and finally an old forest floor—but the drawing remains missing.

Did you ever see a dog on game? Well, I said to the others, “Dominick’s on game as sure as can be.” Sure enough, all of a sudden he dug down into the sand, and there was a shell heap, right underneath the sand of the beach, two or three feet deep. From that we got a lot of wonderful things and we got another skeleton. The part of the skeleton that was in the shell heap was preserved, but the part outside was all disintegrated. And underneath that shell heap was about 10 or 12 inches of the most beautiful black loam you ever laid your eyes on. No sand underneath at all. We have been told that Coffin’s Beach was at one time a forest. We found here an Indian hoe, also some sort of an instrument that can be used to turn things up. We found another mandible, and parts of another human skeleton, and we found again the bones of the auk, the beaver, otter, etc, which were all identified by Dr. Allen. (1940, pp. 11-12).

We know the age of these Indians. One was a man of about 45, another was a woman, another a man between 45 and 50 years. They said at Harvard that they would like to have us bring up the whole skeleton to go over the whole thing and perhaps they can give some more information. I hope to do that, for the people up there are most cooperative. Dr. Collins last summer wanted to come up with Dr. Speck to see the collection, and he was very much thrilled over it. I have sent the fish bones to the Smithsonian Institute to be identified, because that is the nearest place. They can identify the animal bones at Harvard, but the fish bones I have to send to Washington (Phillips 1940, p. 13).

As for ancient lost forests, the Cape Ann coast has the remains of several, for example at Briar Neck and Little Good Harbor and on up to the coast of Maine. In addition to loss to slash and burn horticulture by Native Americans and both subsistence and commercial exploitation by colonists, these forests were drowned by sea level rise, and the remains of their trunks may still be seen under the dunes or among the stones on the beaches (Snow 1972).

At the Coffin Beach site Phillips found a stone hoe and a stone maul, but the site was not exclusively horticultural. He also found bones identified as belonging to a great auk—a large flightless bird now extinct—beaver, river otter, and “the verte-
brae of a very large sea mammal which has not yet been identified.” (n.d., p. 18). Phillips also took hammerstones, grooved sinkers, and bone tools from the site—including bone awls and scribers for working ceramics, bone arrowheads, bone fish-hooks, and fish bones. It is possible that the bone tools and fish bones donated to and displayed in the Cape Ann Museum came from this site as well as from Wingaersheek and Riverview (see Figure 10). The Chadwick collection in the Robbins also has boxes of animal bones.

Phillips also found two large fire pits equipped with large flat stones that he believed were used for cooking food and firing pottery. Algonquians of the Northeast typically used an open-air firing method, piling wood around a finished and air-dried coil pot in a fire pit and setting the wood afire (Winslow 1624; Gookin 1674). The method would have made for comparatively fragile (depending on the temper used) thin-walled pots, reddish from exposure to oxygen during firing. Phillips does not describe pottery at this site but later does describe the many potsherds he collected from other sites and the fire pits he identified as kilns.

Without elaboration, Phillips names other sites on the estuarine islands in Essex Bay and on both sides of the Essex River to the west, including Hog Island (Choate Island, where ten burials were exhumed), Spit Island, and Cross Island (near Conomo Point), as well as on the southern slope of the Ipswich River. The R. S. Peabody Museum has a felsite biface and some flaked debitage from the southeast shore of Hog Island (Site M-13/26), also reported as containing “many shell heaps” and burials. According to the site report, “at least 10 burials have been removed from drumlin near center of island.” If N. Carlton Phillips followed up with further excavations on Hog Island in 1941, as expected, he did not report it. However, several mounted artifacts in the Phillips Collection in the Cape Ann Museum are identified as coming from Hog Island, marked on the back of the boards (see Figure 9). Hog Island, known today as Choate Island, is in Essex Bay not far from West Gloucester.

The islands of Essex Bay would have been prolific sources of sumac, sassafras, marsh grasses, and wild grape and other berries, as well as suitable campsites for gathering soft-shelled clams. On the southern slope of the Ipswich River south of Castle Hill, Phillips found another burial.

On Indian Hill in Ipswich we got another skeleton. I haven’t put it together yet, but I have all the bones to put together. Just before I went to Florida this year I sent the mandibles I have to Harvard, and in handling them, one of the teeth came out. I looked at it and said, “That’s a funny looking tooth. Who ever saw a molar with only one prong. I thought molars had three prongs.” So I took out another tooth. The same thing was true, and the same here, and here. So I sent them up to Dr. Hooton and he said it was most unusual. He said they had found that condition out in the Pecos of New Mexico. He said, “Those are throwbacks. They indicate a family trait, and it ties the relationship together.” If that is true, we have tied Gloucester with Ipswich. We know the Agawams are of Ipswich, so we can with perfect safety tie up by these little things the Indians of Cape Ann with those of Ipswich, and we can say that the Agawam tribe was the tribe that lived in Gloucester. We know that the Agawams were of the Pennacooks, and the Pennacooks were of the tribe of Algonquin, so there we have them all tied up (1940 pp. 12-13).

In another version of his talk Phillips identifies premolars with two roots as another anomaly in addition to the molars with only one fused root. I don’t know what to think of Dr. Hooton’s interpretation of them.

Coles Island

Just south of the Coffin Beach site, across the creek with its wide banks of marsh, was a more extensive midden on Coles Island in Essex (just over the border from West Gloucester on the western slope of the eastern section of the island), once known as Cole’s Farm. The Cole’s Island midden (Site No. M-14/3) measured 300 square feet (25 X 12) and was 3 feet deep. Phillips’ inventory for this site, on which he offers little elaboration, included the following:
Corn hills (in two rows)  
A rock shelter (on the eastern side)  
A wigwam site  
A grave site (“on the Merrill estate”), with:  
A flexed burial with the head to the north and face to the west  
Many stone flakes

Phillips notes that the corn hills remained visible and distinctive because of the patterns of deposition and erosion around them. The dark loam that overlay them accentuated the hills, while the wind systematically swept away the sandy spaces between the hills. Could they still be visible now, 72 years later?

Unique and certainly one of the most interesting discoveries made to date was the finding of two distinct Indian corn fields on the west slope of the easterly section of Cole’s Island, not far from the point at which the Indian skeleton was unearthed. The row alignment is perfect. The soil which the Indians cultivated is rocky; it would be impossible for the white man to plow the land, yet the Indians made their hills far enough apart so that it was not necessary to disturb the sub-soil, using only the top-soil for the hills. Instead of using the proverbial Indian fertilizer, fish, they used instead, clams, for every hill was full of broken clam shells. After the corn fields were abandoned by the Indians, the hills became covered with turf while the soil in between them had a tendency to wash away, leaving the hills prominently displayed, with much the same appearance today as in the days when the Indians cultivated the fields.... The photograph and drawing illustrate the arrangement and character of the corn fields (n.d. p. 19).

Would that we had the photograph and drawing! Phillips did not keep a sample of the dark loam, but most of the sites he explored are known to have pockets of good agricultural soil of the Annisquam-Scituate type (USDA 1984). Noting that the corn hills were full of clams, he speculates that shells were used as fertilizer and to help hold the soil. Certainly the English colonists mined shell middens to lime the soil on their plantations (Russell 1976: 94, 97). Some “fire pits” that Phillips found in clam middens may have been colonial lime kilns rather than Indian cooking or cache pits. Corn rapidly depletes soil of nitrogen, and Cape Ann’s soils tend to be acidic with low pH. Shellfish refuse and shells would help correct both those problems and also would help stabilize soils built up on top of sandy till.

Preserved Native American corn hills have been found here and there in New England (De la Barre 1920; Smith 1989; Petersen and Cowie 2002). I believe one can be observed today in Littleton in the Nashoba valley (Boudillion 2009). The use of rock shelters and siting of wigwams in the lee of rock outcrops is attested in New England archaeology (e.g., Arnold 1969, Blanche and Spiess 2006), but Phillips does not explain the basis for his identification of “a wigwam site” on Cole’s Island. Would there have been postholes and a hearth?

In one draft Phillips laments the lack of a productive shell heap on Cole’s Island. In another draft, however, he presents the Cole’s Island finds a bit differently (1940, pp. 10-11), and the difference may reflect ongoing work at the site:

Over there on Cole’s Island I got a skeleton. This skeleton was buried about 17 inches deep, the head to the North, the face toward the West, and flexed, which is true Indian style. Some men were digging stone for a driveway when they ran into this skeleton....It was right near where we had found this wonderful shell heap that we also found the wigwam site. We began to look around, and by gracious, we ran into an Indian corn field, just as sure as can be. Well, you wonder how an Indian corn field could be preserved for these hundreds of years. I think perhaps I can explain this to you. The Indian didn’t dig very far down into the ground; then after the top soil he would take an area and scoop it up on top. That would leave the field flat underneath. Here the Indians would plant their corn, round, the way you
read in stories. These Indians used clams for fertilizer in their corn hills, and you can dig up the hills and there are broken clamshells. They followed them out in a pretty straight line, stopping at a rock, then going along with another patch and another farther on. This is really something that ought to be preserved, as it is an unusual thing in this locality. It isn’t unusual in other sections, as they are known and recorded. But we have one here on Cole’s Island and I have no doubt but what they would be glad to set aside that land, because it is a real Indian corn field, cultivated a long while ago.

A search of Gloucester’s land titles may precisely locate “the Merrill Estate” on Cole’s Island that Phillips speaks of as the burial site. It appears to be in an area now developed as a residential estate with a private access road. The burials Phillips describes seem traditional in both position (flexed) and alignment with cardinal directions (north and west). Algonquian burials are most often found on north or northeast-facing level ground or ridges in low mounds in sandy or otherwise easily dug soil within sight of a body of water—a river, lake, estuary, or the sea (Savulis et al. 1979). Bodies were placed flexed on the right side and interred, aligned north or northeast, with the feet facing west or southwest (Waller and Leveillee 2001). Some diversity in Algonquian burial practices and symbology is attested in the literature (Bragdon 1996).

Phillips does not report grave goods or other information that may have helped to date the burial, but it was in an intensive horticultural site and therefore most likely Middle or Late Woodland. The question is perennially debated (e.g., Smith 1989; Johannessen and Hastorf 1994), but I believe that corn cultivation initially came to southern New England from the southwest along the southern shores of the Great Lakes and the Susquehanna Valley and that later Woodland people coming into Essex County from the Merrimack Valley from the north may have reintroduced it. The earlier hunter-gatherers of the Archaic period also seem to have occupied Essex County from the north and northeast along rivers such as the Merrimack (Stewart-Smith 1994, 1999).

The Cole’s Island burial may have included one of the three skulls or three mandibles (It is not clear if there were three or six skeletal remains sent for analysis) recovered from shell heaps on Cape Ann that Phillips sent to Ernest Hooton at Harvard for identification in 1941. The report, by Alice Brues, whom Phillips does not acknowledge, identifies them as two males and one female, 35 to 40 years of age, all bearing a distinct genetic marker identifying them as members of the same family. In the 1940 draft Phillips details Hooton’s alleged story about dental throwbacks. That report describes an inherited anomaly in the teeth—the fusion of the second and third molars with a single root—which purportedly shows that the individuals were closely related to each other and also to the population in Ipswich referred to as the Agawams.

In Alice Brues’ report, which Hooton forwarded to Phillips in 1942, she wrote:

The age at death of the three individuals represented by the Gloucester mandibles, as nearly as can be judged from the amount of wear of the teeth, is about 35 or forty years. An exact estimate cannot be made from the mandible alone, since the rapidity with which the teeth wear is affected by extrinsic factors. Two of the mandibles are undoubtedly those of males; the third (that in which ante-mortem tooth loss and displacement of some of the remaining teeth is evident) is perhaps that of a large female.

Of the fusion of roots of the second and third lower molars, Brues notes, “Apparently this tendency is a general racial characteristic; in this particular sample of three cases it may be exaggerated by the fact that the individuals were members of a small community and quite probably related to one another.”

It would be interesting to learn what skeletal remains from Ipswich Harvard analyzed. If the analysis is correct the dental genetics offer physical proof supporting suppositions that the people of Agawam (“Other side of the marsh”) and the people of Wenesquawam (“End of the marsh”, i.e., Cape Ann, the source name for Annisquam) were the same people. In contemporary Abenaki,
Wenesquawam might be rendered Wanaskwi-wam, and my translation diverges from earlier ones based on less closely related languages of southern New England, such as Massachuset and Narraganset (Names of the Rivers, n.d.; Norton and Baker 2007; Trumbull 1870; Douglas-Lithgow 2000; Bright 2004; Williams 1643; Eliot 1670). Such a genetic relationship as is suggested by the teeth, along with cultural data, may suggest the great antiquity of band exogamy in an area long occupied and reoccupied by the same basic population.

Phillips also notes that human skeletons were excavated on Indian Hill in Ipswich and on Indian Hill in West Newbury, homes of the last resident sagamores Masconomet and Old Will, respectively, and their families (Winthrop 1628; Hubbard 1801; Felt 1862; Rantoul 1882; Currier 1902), as well as on Adams Hill in Annisquam, discussed in more detail below. Artifacts from the Ipswich Indian Hill site are in the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology at Harvard (see Figure 11).

Phillips was not aware that the Cole’s Island site actually was larger, older, and richer than he thought based on the middens he dug. During the 40 years following Phillips’ death, 36 more artifacts, mostly hammerstones, sinkers, weights, and gouges were taken from the Cole estate by its gardener, Clifford Roberts. These post-Phillips Cole’s Island finds are now in the private collection of Tom Ellis of Gloucester (Ellis, 2013). Three of the examples, which he acquired in 1990 from Roberts’ widow, are shown here in Figures 12 - 14. The Ellis Collection also includes more than 50 items from Cross Island, just to the west of Coles Island, around 40 artifacts from Hog Island in Essex Bay, and an array of mostly Woodland period points, bases, and tips from Bull Brook.

Alan Leveillee’s MHC archaeological survey of Coles Island in 1988 turned up even more material, including chipping debris, Levanna points, burnt rock, aboriginal ceramics, shell middens, and non-calcined mammal bones (Leveillee 1988).

**Farm Point**

At the eastern end of Coffin Beach is a rocky promontory at the mouth of the Annisquam River, called High Rocks on old maps, Coffin Point in Phillips’ day, and Farm Point today. This site was not among those Speck and Johnson identified. On the point, which divides Wingaersheek into Coffin Beach on the west and Wingaersheek Beach on the east, Phillips found pestles, stones for working and straightening fibers, stone arrowheads, both worked and discarded, and hammerstones he believed were used in making pigment (“red paint and green paint”). Phillips’ notes do not always make sense, as in this account of stone paint pots, a thread-pulling stone, and a preform, none of which seem to be in evidence.

We came home from [the eastern end of] Coffin’s Beach one day and we had some stones and didn’t know what they were. They looked sort of funny. But we washed them up and found we had two stones or pestles. At the same time we found the hammer stones for the red paint. They would have one little thing for red paint, one for green, and one for another color. Furthermore, you have seen how people will take a thread and pull it through something to make it fine. Well, the Indians would pull the thread through a stone….We [also] found one arrowhead that an Indian had apparently nearly finished, and there was a knot in the stone. We broke it and it was a mighty nice arrowhead, so evidently the Indian just got mad and broke the tip off and threw it away (1940 p. 14).

It’s not clear what Phillips means by green paint, although green clay containing glauconite is available regionally (Sears 1905). Today, residues on stone could be submitted for chemical or stable isotope analysis and may yield evidence of use. Turgites (yellow and brown ochres), hematite (red ochre), graphite, malachite, or kaolin residues would support the conclusion that tools were used in the production of yellow, red, black, green, or white pigment, respectively, the colors used for body paint. Turgite and kaolin are both available locally (Shaler 1890; Gleba 1978), while graphite, as well as steatite and malachite, may have been trade commodities from central Massachusetts.

The closest Agawam/Pawtucket trading partners were the Nipmuc to their west (Gookin 1674), mak-
As well as mineral residues, organic residues also point to tool use, for example, in the processing of corn, pine resin or tar, oil seed, bear grease, fish, or blood from meat and bone (Barnard 2007). Phillips did not report finding corn kernels or other food residues, other than burned nuts among heat-cracked rocks in fire pits here and there, which he believed to be acorns and chestnuts. He did not save any burned nuts, but did collect ashes from a fire pit in Lanesville, which are not in evidence. In any case carbon analysis was not available in Phillips' time, and he washed all his finds. Lab analysis of residues on unwashed artifacts at hand, especially in the Saville and Ellis collections, may prove useful even now in reconstructing the prehistory of Cape Ann.

Old Coffin Farm in Wingaersheek

South and east of Farm Point is Old Coffin Farm, and Phillips describes what he calls a “village site” there on the southwestern slope of Wingaersheek Beach. At this site he excavated an extensive shell heap (350 to 480 square feet to a depth of 3 feet (measuring 35 - 40’ X 10 - 12’). There he found the following objects:

- Stone arrowheads, broken and whole
- Bone points, awls, and needles
- Diverse animal and fish bones and deer antler
- Marked potsherds

Phillips regarded Wingaersheek Beach as “very definitely the site of a former Indian village...and I am hopeful that a great deal of Indian treasure...will be recovered here, to throw additional light on the story of the Cape Ann Indians” (n.d., p. 18).

In the spring of 1941 a rather extensive shell heap was located on the old Coffin farm at Wingaersheek beach. Preliminary exploration indicated a site perhaps 35 to 40 feet long, 10 to 12 feet wide, and over 3 feet deep at some points. From the excavations made so far some excellent stone arrowpoints, both whole and broken, have been recovered. Other interesting relics taken out are, a very beautiful bone arrowpoint, one of the finest in the collection; a considerable number of pieces of potsherd, showing the old Algonquin markings, but not in sufficient number or sizes to determine the dimensions of the pots.

Phillips does not identify the types or styles of arrowheads but describes a 5-inch bone awl and a large, curved, eyed needle made from a bird bone. The needle had a large eye (3 inches by 3/8”) burned through the bone, which is not in evidence. He also noted many burned bone “sockets”, or vertebrae, of deer, which he seemed to think were used in fire making. Judging from Phillips’ carefully mounted specimens in the Cape Ann Museum, I confess I don’t see how this might have worked, except possibly as a container for carrying a small amount of smoldering duff.

Among the bone specimens found in this shell heap were the following: two pointed arrowpoints, which could also have been used for awls; an awl, 5” long, with a long sharp point; bone sockets, evidently of the deer family showing wear due to use as a socket for the shaft used in making a fire; a deer antler; and the finest specimen of all, a needle, made from the bone of a bird, curved, 3” long and 3/8” wide, the thickness of an ordinary piece of cardboard, with an eye in one end clearly burned in, and pointed at the other end, with indications that it had been much used. There was one other broken needle point. There were also bones of the hawk, otter, raccoon, brown crane, wolf dog, great auk, and angler fish and many vertebrae of fish too badly decomposed to be definitely identified. Of the animal family the
Virginia deer, the familiar white-tailed deer, inhabit Cape Ann to this day. Phillips notes that the presence of large anglerfish bones here and in Riverview indicates that the people were engaging in deep-sea fishing and not just seasonal fishing of species that enter the rivers to spawn. The anglerfish bones were determined by the Smithsonian in Washington to be those of a benthic species.

Phillips’ reference to wolf dog bones rather than wolf bones appears to reflect the state of paleozoology at the time. While dogs have been known domesticates in the Americas over the past 10,000 years or so, the times, places, and circumstances of their domestication and their genetic distinctions from wolves have not been resolved to everyone’s satisfaction (Butler and Hadlock 1949; Larsen et al. 2012). In any case, wild wolves were present on Cape Ann at the same time as “Indian dogs”, attested in colonial accounts (Bruen 1681) and in recurrences of the place name Wolf Hill. Wolves were no doubt attracted to colonists’ plantations manured with fish, not to mention their livestock, and became a bane of 17th century farmers. Gloucester offered bounties on wolves into the 18th century (Gloucester Town Records 1700, 1713, 1754; Gloucester Selectmen’s Records 1707).

At Old Coffin Farm in Wingaersheek Phillips also found many marked and plain potsherds. The people would have had easy access to abundant high-quality clays on the banks and marshes of the Annisquam, for example at Clay Pit Landing in West Gloucester, Cambridge Beach in Annisquam, and Pavilion Beach in Gloucester. Phillips says (1940, p. 14): “A large number of pieces of pottery was found, and some very substantial fragments were reconstructed from the potsherds. Altogether there were parts, mostly rim pieces, for 23 different pots. All the pottery can be classified as early Algonquin.” (see Figure 16)

What Phillips means by “early Algonquin” is not clear, but he may be referring to “Old Algonquin Group”, Charles Willoughby’s classification of the time (Willoughby 1935), which seems to have been superseded by newer efforts. Characteristics such as wall thickness, rim shape, type of temper, and style of design are attributes used in classifying ceramics, but pots of different manufacture and style can coexist in time and place, making both typology and chronology difficult (Chilton 2010).

New England is known for its diversity in ceramics (Lavin 1997), which seems consistent with Algonquian band-level social organization, subsistence diversity, and settlement mobility (Bourque 1973, 1995; Hasenstab 2000). Coastal Algonquians farmed and grew corn but they also fished and fowled and dug clams and retained their traditional hunting and gathering subsistence base (Brennan 1979). They did not become dependent on corn as a dietary staple as did interior groups, such as the Iroquoians (Hoffman 1989; Ritchie and Funk 1973), and the sites on Cape Ann reflect this reality. The coastal Algonquians were more mobile, less sedentary, and more diverse in their practices than other horticultural groups (Hart and Reith 2002). In other words, their populations remained comparatively small and were organized as bands with less social stratification, if one is permitted to generalize, in contrast to larger interior groups in large permanent settlements with perhaps more demarcated social divisions and greater dependence on wide-scale cultivation of corn.

Some new attempts at classifying New England ceramics seem to focus on use rather than attributes. For example, pots may have been used more for storage and transport than for cooking; types of temper and wall thicknesses can make pots resistant to the thermal stress of cooking or to the mechanical stress of portage, but not both; and small thin pots with pointed bottoms may be better for quickly boiling meat, while large thick pots with rounded bottoms may be better for foods requiring longer cooking, such as corn (Chilton 2010).

In terms of general chronology, the presence of stone bowls seems to indicate Late or Terminal Archaic sites. Thick, incised, fiber-tempered wares seem to predominate in Early Woodland sites. Stamped, cord-wrapped paddled, and burnished wares appear in Middle Woodland sites, and pots with punctate, collared, or castellated rims are Late Woodland (Howes 1943; Fowler 1960, 1991). At an-
other Cape Ann site, Phillips refers to the pottery he found there as "of the New Hampshire type"—another uncertain designation. New Hampshire pottery is diverse and shares characteristics of pottery made, for example, in Connecticut and elsewhere in southern New England (Dincauze 1971; Lizee 1994; Bunker 1994).

Phillips' drawings and photographs of the sherds have not been found, but boxes of plain and decorated rim pieces are in the Cape Ann Museum and the Robbins Museum of Archaeology. Phillips describes the sherds as thin and friable, indicating they were fired at low temperatures (perhaps around 1500°) and were used primarily as containers. He did not identify the temper—plant fiber, shell, ground quartz or other mineral, sand, or crushed pottery—which possibly could have aided in the relative cross-dating of sites. Winter's collection from Essex Falls at the R. S. Peabody Museum has good examples of both shell-tempered and quartz-tempered wares.

Phillips notes that the pots had oval or slightly pointed bottoms, consistent with other ceramic finds throughout New England. Algonquian pots were intended to be propped in sand or between rocks in fire pits. Otherwise, the people cooked on large, flat, heated stones in fire pits and invented the method of baking in sand that we call the clam-bake (Winslow 1624). Phillips refers to "cooking pits", which may have been re-excavated clam-bake sites. He does not refer to other ceramic objects, other than a clay pipe recovered from a Late Woodland grave in Annisquam.

The Old Coffin Farm/Wingaersheek Beach village in West Gloucester may have been among the last sites to be occupied by the Pawtucket/Pennacook after English contact, following previous occupation of an even more extensive older village site across the river in Riverview, which Phillips also investigated. The most ancient local accounts repeat a claim that the Indians' name for Cape Ann was Winggaersheek (Pool 1825; Thornton 1854; Babson 1860). The word was later translated erroneously as derived from Dutch Low German Winggaerts Hoek, "wine garden peninsula" or variants thereof (Horsford 1886; Ogilby [Montanus] 1671). If the Dutch noticed Cape Ann on their way to Long Island Sound or Gravesend Bay, however, they left no other sign of it.

I think it is more likely that the Pawtucket were giving the name of their village. Based on their Western Abenaki dialect (rather than the Massachusetts and Narraganset languages on which other translations of Cape Ann place names are based (Eliot 1670; Williams 1643; Sleeper 1949; O'Brien 2012), the word can be reconstructed as Winga-queek or Winkawecheek, "place for getting sea snails", such as dog whelks, used to make white wampum (e.g, Scozarri 1995).

Winga (winka) = "snail, whelk, periwinkle"
Wechee = "ocean, sea"
k = (locative) at, on, place

(Source for Abenaki/Micmac etymologies: Dana 2011; Redish 2012; Cowasuck Band of the Pennacook-Abenaki 2012; Western Abenaki Dictionary and Radio; Ventromile 1857; Rand 1875, 1888; Laurent 1884; Frame 1892; Bruchac 2006.)

Algonquian place names typically refer to an economic resource or geographic feature of a place rather than to an activity or abstract characteristic (Trumbull 1870; Chamberlain 1902; Huden 1962). Phillips mentions finding small white shells here and there in the West Gloucester sites, and tools for working shell, but he does not ponder the reason for their presence or report finding any shell beads, which he may have missed for lack of sifters. A contemporary excavation in the same area yielded several examples of dog whelks and other shells (Keller 1965).

I believe the Old Coffin Farm site near Wingaersheek Beach that Phillips excavated was on property still largely undeveloped today near Cape Ann Campsites, owned by the Matz family—on Atlantic St. facing the Jones River and its federally protected Jones River Saltmarsh. Robert Matz remembers Phillips conducting an excavation on his parents' property when he was a child. Another excavation was made there in 1965 by a Boston University graduate student (Keller 1965). Her "Matz Collection", showing evidence of a possible Contact Period site, is housed at the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology at Harvard. (See Figures 17-18) In 1940, according to Matz (2013):

Sources for Abenaki/Micmac etymologies: Dana 2011; Redish 2012; Cowasuck Band of the Pennacook-Abenaki 2012; Western Abenaki Dictionary and Radio; Ventromile 1857; Rand 1875, 1888; Laurent 1884; Frame 1892; Bruchac 2006.)
Matz says that excavation took place over several weeks one summer before the war (World War II). A daily visitor was Dr. Carleton Coon, who “lived around the corner”. Coon had a summer home in Wingaersheek and lived there between 1939 and 1942 at the time Phillips was working. Coon retired in the 1970s and died there in 1981 at the age of 76. Coon’s mentor at Harvard was Ernest Hooton, to whom Phillips sent the Cape Ann and Ipswich skulls. Coon also would have had connections via his old school, the Phillips Academy in Andover, such as Frederick Johnson. Coon also would have known Frank Speck, also a Gloucester summer resident at the time and connected via the University of Pennsylvania, where Coon taught (Howells 1989).

Keller's later Matz Collection may have come from Peter Coffin's English colonial farmstead that happened to overlie a Native habitation site, or it may have been a Native habitation site exhibiting Contact era adaptations. Mr. Matz said that upon his death he expects the property will be sold for residential development.

Completing his survey of West Gloucester, Phillips names Presson's Point on Little River as the site of several small shell heaps containing “arrowheads, spearheads, and an axe head”. He also notes special miscellaneous finds, such as a small “incised stone pestle”. Phillips thought the incisions were symbols such as those seen in petroglyphs. The specific provenience of this stone and Phillips’ sketch of it are unknown, but the Chadwick collection does contain a small incised pestle, actually perhaps a penis effigy, with possible petroglyph-like markings (see Figure 19).

The River Islands

To the east of Wingoersheek and the other West Gloucester sites is the Annisquam River and its islands: principally Rust Island (referred to erroneously as Russ island in a site report at the Robert S. Peabody Museum of Archaeology, formerly Biskie or Biskey Island) and Pearce Island (sometimes spelled Pierce or Peirce Island, previously Merchant’s Island). These river islands appear to have been campsites for shellfish gathering (soft-shell clams) and processing of the meats for preservation (Phillips 1940). Growing dependence on soft shell clams and the use of portable dried shellfish meats is well documented in coastal New England from the Middle Archaic on (e.g., Braun 1974; Brennan 1979).

The Speck and Johnson site report cards in the R.S. Peabody Museum note that they “found nothing much” and “lost” what they took from a shell heap in the southeastern part of Pearce Island under a summer cottage there (Site No. M-14/4). They took worked stones and potsherds from Rust Island, however, and Phillips notes that he reconstructed a pot from the miscellaneous pieces they found there, with the intention of exhibiting it. I don't know the present location of this jury-rigged pot. The shell heap that Speck and Johnson sampled on Rust Island was on the old road to the ferry landing to the mainland (on the second rise). The small area and 2- to 3-foot depth of the shell heaps on the river islands generally suggest the seasonal reoccupation of resource sites by a small number of people over time.

Phillips refers to many hammerstones on Rust Island, including “small lap stones for opening or breaking clams”. He notes that the clam meats were dried and pickled and transported inland for winter. The presence of stone tools specialized for working shell suggests that the Rust Island site may also have been used to produce shell objects. Shells were worked for many kinds of tools and utensils, such as fiber combs, trowels, and beads, although Phillips did not report finding any of these there.

Because of its proximity to the Little River tributary of the Annisquam, Rust Island may also have been a staging area for trapping anadromous fish
Such as the rainbow smelt that still attempt to spawn there. Phillips does not report finding weirs or fishing gear there. However, he did find “sinkers, arrowheads, and hammer stones” in the shell heap on Merchant’s (Pearce) Island. The presence of weights and sinkers specialized for net and trap fishing suggest that Merchant’s Island may have been a staging area for eel and crab fishing. The Island is situated on the Jones River tributary, which still features abundant Atlantic eels (Sargent 2011).

The Annisquam River islands may have been stone tool manufactories besides. In the Rust Island midden Phillips found “diagonal hammerstones of the kind used in working stone”, which probably refers to the pecking hammers and all-purpose chisels and gouges used to shape granitic rocks, which are not amenable to flaking, or to axes (see Figure 20).

On Russ [sic] Island, just where the old road goes over the second rise, there is evidence of an encampment. That road was originally built through an Indian shell heap…. We dug around here and we found a number of things, very interesting tools. There were many different kinds of hammer stones, and there were lap stones which they used to break the clam shells….(1940, p. 7).

Riverview appears to be the largest and perhaps the oldest site on Cape Ann. Phillips found three large shell heaps in all along the Annisquam River in Riverview, which is a north-south aligned kame between the Annisquam and Mill rivers (MAS Site M-14/6). At the north end of Riverview on Wheeler’s Point was an extensive midden. Local lore has it that the Wheeler’s Point midden was more than 12 feet in depth (a kind of mini-Damariscotta in scale and reputation) and was mined as fill for road, bridge, and causeway construction. To the south of Wheeler’s Point, Thurston’s Point had caches of lithic artifacts and stone but no midden, followed by a large shell heap south of that at the “village site” just north of Pole Hill in the center of Riverview. The third large midden lay at the southern end of Riverview near Cow Island (Commonwealth of Massachusetts 1911). A colonial source, reported by an early chronicler (Poole 1823), identifies the causeway joining Cow Island to the mainland below the “Neck of Houselots” in Riverview as originally a Native American construction.

The next place we went was Riverview, and there we found an extensive shell heap. Here we found the stone implements of the Indians lying amongst the shells, also bone tools and an Indian needle…. There were arrow points, a bone awl, and two harpoon points, right and left (Phillips 1940, p. 7). (see Figures 21-22)

Artifacts identified as coming from the Riverview site are in the Cape Ann Museum. At this “village site”, Phillips reported recovering the following items (1940, p. 7):

- 2 harpoon points
- Stencils, gravers, scrapers, and smoothers for working clay and making pottery
- Assortment of small, sharpened stones used as scrapers
- Assortment of stone projectile points
- Gouges

The collection at the Cape Ann Museum includes dozens of whole points in diverse styles, including some that Phillips carefully mounted on velvet. The points seem to represent great diversity in style and time depth (Boudreau 2008; Fowler 1991) and it has been suggested that some types, such as Susquehanna, Adena, Kirk, and Vestal, may have been added to the collection from other sites or regions through collector trade (Hoffman 2013), although it must be said that these points also may have been carried or traded into the area by the people who used them. Side-notched and stemmed points in the collection, kindly identified by Curtiss Hoffman, include Otter Creek, Rossville, Brewerton, Meadowood, Orient Fishtail, Beekman, Vosburg, Neville, Mansion Inn, Merrimack, Cape Stemmed, Squibnocket Triangle, and Levanna (see Figures 23-26).

Phillips also found “2 pecks of animal bones: Virginia deer, beaver, wolf dog, great auk, bear”
Out of that place I think we took perhaps a couple of pecks of bones, and everything we found we saved. We would collect the bones, wash them, and send them to Dr. Allen at Harvard. In due time he would come back and say, “These bones in this box are from the Virginia deer. These bones are from the beaver. These bones are from the wolf dog. These bones are from the great auk.”

Bear might be regarded as rare on Cape Ann, except for the story of Ebenezer Babson’s killing of a bear on the eponymous Bearskin Neck in Rockport in 1695, saving the life of his nephew (Babson 1860; 1990). Phillips speculates that both great auk and black bear were processed for oil and grease respectively. He also points to the presence of auk and wolf dog as evidence of the prehistoric antiquity of Native Americans on Cape Ann.

It is rather interesting to note that in the three shell heaps that we have excavated along Squam River we have found bones of the great auk. Now the great auk’s original home was on Funk Island in the Bay of St. Lawrence. In 1887 Capt. Collins of the “Grampas” was sent up there to see what he could find. Funk Island is sort of table land, and there were two passageways which the auks had made from the water up to the cliffs on top. It is recorded that the Norsemen and the early navigators from Norway landed at this island and killed these auk in great numbers, for the grease. The food was no good, but the grease was. Capt. Collins of the “Grampas” collected a lot of skeletons and he brought them back and gave them to the museums. So if we find in these shell heaps the bones of the great auk, if means that we are back prior to any recorded history of the white man in this locality (1940, pp. 7-8).

Furthermore, we find the bones of what they call the wolf dog. They don’t say dog, and they don’t say wolf. They say wolf dog. We know that the dog was a domesticated animal from the wolf, and it took years and years for the wolf to domesticate to the dog. So when Dr. Allen reports that these bones he says they are those of the wolf dog, that certainly gives some time to the Indian habitations. I don’t think there is any question about that. I can give you one little theory that will give you an indication. None of these bones we are getting are from domesticated animals, which can only mean that the time the Indians occupied these sites was prior to the white man, or what we call prehistoric times. I think we can say that these shell heaps that we are excavating without question are prehistoric. That is, they were occupied by the Indians I imagine for a great many years before the white man came to these shores. The number of shells in the shell heaps indicate that these sites were occupied by a great number of people, or by a few people for a great many years.... (1940, p. 8).
We found a bone of an angler fish down at Riverview that is about 5 feet long. At another shell heap we found these bones and harpoon points, and this stencil for their pottery. How do they make these? In the shell heap we found bones partially cut, so as to show how the Indians cut their bones to do this work. Furthermore, we found little sharpened stones. We also found arrow points, gouges, and harpoon points, and in this shell heap we found the great big bones of a haddock. So evidently they were deep-sea fishers (1940, p. 13).

Today, haddock and sea bass are also fished from shore. The extent to which the people ocean fished from canoes is not known, and there is no evidence at all for dugouts on Cape Ann, although a large number of heavy-duty tools for the purpose of processing trees have been found in previously heavily forested areas near the coasts (Mass. D.C.R. 2000; Hayward 1857; Dow 1921).

In addition to spearing fish at weirs, harpooning, line fishing with sinkers, and cast netting, the people also may have strung weighted nets between proximate headlands for shoal fish and between headlands and nearby offshore islands for channel fish. This is suggested by the presence of surf sinkers—grooved stones of sufficient size and weight to hold the lower edge of a net in place in the surf—bigger and heavier than needed for line fishing or useable for cast-netting or suitable for mooring canoes, which would simply have been drawn up above the tide line on beaches or banks (see Figure 27). A net suspended weir-like between anchor points in the surf and dragged or hauled onto the beach would effectively seine shoals of small fish, such as menhaden, or, pursed, would catch fish flowing through a narrow natural channel between a headland and an offshore outcrop. This is speculative, of course, but seventeenth-century Europeans used these methods and regarded them as traditional (Andrews 1986; Cell 1969; Fisheries of Gloucester 1876; Felt 1882; Goode 1887).

Phillips remarks that many bones were worked and included a bone needle, awl, and point. At Riverview, he also found scrapers “for dressing hides and wood”, a sea turtle shell, hammerstones for bones or clams, gouges, and many arrowheads. Phillips also collected “in Riverview” an effigy stone with a human face, but offers no further description, and the object is nowhere in evidence. Phillips is unclear about differentiating the sites in Riverview, however. One paper refers to Riverview generally, reporting finds (such as the slate pottery scraper, turtle shell, semi-lunar knife, and effigy head) that the other draft paper refers specifically to the midden at the southern end of Riverview near Cow Island (c. 1941, p 15) (see Figure 28).

In the early fall of 1940 I began, with two assistants, a systematic exploration of a rather small shell heap on the southern end of Riverview, on the Annisquam river, near Cow island. The work was started in September and continued intermittently through the entire fall. In proportion to its size this was one of the most productive shell heaps that has been examined.

The first relic found was a scraper made of slate, 1 ½” long X 1” wide X ¼” thick. All edges were worn on both sides, and there were worn grooves where the index and next finger would normally fit for use as a scraper. In my opinion this implement was used in the making of pottery or its repair, due to the fact that there is not a straight edge on the scraper; the edges have different curvatures and were probably used in scraping and smoothing up the curving surface of the pots. Fragments of pots that were found show the markings of some implement of this nature.

Among the other stone implements found at this location was a very good squaw knife or semi-lunar. It is not ornamented as some similar knives are but is of the same material, rather sharp edged, and must have been a very satisfactory tool. A number of small scrapers were found that might have been used in cleaning skins as well as in dressing wood. Among the other finds were a turtle back, broken arrowpoints, a steatite block, used by
the Indians in dressing and constructing their steatite bowls, and one or two bits of gouges. A few hammer-stones were found which had probably been used for the breaking of bones or clams.

Distributed throughout the heap were many flat stones and in my opinion these were used the Indians for baking their pottery or cooking their clams and fish. The fact that these stones were found near three fire pits, each bordered by fire stones, lends weight to this theory.

A large number of pieces of pottery was found, and some very substantial fragments were reconstructed from the potsherds. Altogether there were parts, mostly rim pieces, from 23 different pots. All the pottery found can be classified as early Algonquin.

Among the bone specimens found in this shell heap were the following: two pointed arrowpoints, which could also have been used for awls; an awl, 5” long, with a long sharp point; bone sockets, evidently of the deer family showing wear due to use as a socket for the shaft used in making a fire; a deer antler; and the finest specimen of all, a needle, made from the bone of a bird, curved, 3” long and 3/8” wide, the thickness of an ordinary piece of cardboard, with an eye in one end clearly burned in, and pointed at the other end, with indications that it had been much used. There was one other broken needle point. There were also bones of the hawk, otter, raccoon, brown crane, wolf dog, great auk, and angler fish and many vertebrae of fish too badly decomposed to the definitely identified. Of the animal family the most common and numerous of the bones found were those of the Virginia deer. All the bone specimens which this shell heap yielded were sent to Dr. Glover Allen, at Harvard University, for examination and identification.

I did not see the eyed curved bird needle in the Phillips Collection at the Cape Ann Museum, but examples of deer “sockets” and worked bone are shown in Figure 9. Tonya Largy (2013) has identified these as deer astragali.

In digging down at Riverview one day, Dominick’s boy turned over a stone and said, “Look at what's looking at me! Sure enough, there was a stone with a perfect outline of a human face. There isn’t a sign of any workmanship on that stone, yet it is about uniform thickness and has a nice shape. It was found in an Indian shell heap, and you can’t tell me that the Indians didn't recognize that face and have it for an effigy. (1940, p. 16).

Is Phillips still talking about the Cow Island site, or the “village site” in the central part of Riverview north of Pole Hill? In his other paper he tells a slightly different story about the portrait effigy, again not admitting the possibility that it was an intentional work of Native American construction rather than a freak of nature:

There was considerable amusement at this shell heap one day when one of the workmen who was doing the excavating suddenly exclaimed, “See what's looking at me!" Sure enough, there, imbedded in the soil, was a stone with a perfect outline of a human face peering up at us. It was uncanny, for the features were clear and distinct, the eyes, nose, mouth, and even the tapering of the chin. On examination there was no evidence of human workmanship on the stone; it was just a freak product of nature. It had been through the fire as was evident by its color and was easily recognizable as an effigy of a human face. It was evident that the Indians were aware of this fact but for what purpose or use they had retained it is hard to conjecture. This interesting specimen is about 1½” in thickness (Phillips c. 1941 p. 17).

At the Riverview village site Phillips found evidence of shellfish food caches. He says (c. 1941, p. 15): “In two places at the Riverview site we found where the Indians had dug below the level of the surface soil down about 1½ feet into the yellow sub-soil, and in these pockets we found whole
clam shells and stones, their condition showing clearly that they had been through the fire.” It again seems significant that in all his investigations Phillips did not find or report burned corn (kernels or cobs).

In two places at the Riverview site we found where the Indians had dug below the level of the surface soil down about 1½' into the yellow sub-soil, and in these pockets we found whole clam shell and stones, their condition showing clearly that they had been through the fire. After minute examination it was our theory that the Indians had used these pockets for a clam-bake; they had thrown the hot stones and seaweed in, creating the steam, and then placed the clams in to cook, much the same as the method employed by the white man to-day at the picnic clam-bakes in the summer time. After the Indians had eaten all they wanted they evidently dumped the remains of the feast back into the pits, for these were the only places in the heap where whole clamshells were found.

In Riverview, a contemporary underwater archaeology survey identifies Curtis Cove just north of Thurston’s Point as a potentially large prehistoric site recommended for further investigation: “on Thurston’s Point, at the southerly side of the Annisquam River, there are evidences of Indian occupancy, but no extensive shellheaps have been found. Excavations at this location may be carried on at some future time” (Thompson 1978). Then, at the south end of Riverview near Cow Island, Phillips reports three fire pits bordered by large flat fire stones. He again determines that the many flat stones were used for firing pottery and cooking clams and fish.

The Indians that occupied this site at Riverview were not large in number, but you can see the sites of 18 wigwams up over the wall toward the shore, where the so-called Lily Pond is. The Indians would come here, make their site, and then would go out and collect clams and bring them ashore, take a large stone and break them to open them, and then throw the shells in a heap. Underneath these shell heaps we found yellow dirt, I don’t know why, and we found fire pits with flat stones on top, and the ashes. We found 23 different pieces of pottery of different types of pottery, and I am inclined to think they made the pottery there, as evidenced by the fire pits, the stones, and the vast amount of pottery found. ...We would be digging along and come to a stone and we would find a piece of pottery, and then we would find another, and another….As we got down underneath the clam shells, down to the yellow dirt, we would find whole clam shells and stones that had been through the fire. So it isn’t very hard to imagine that they took the seaweed and the hot stones and created steam, and had a clambake. There is no doubt in my mind that we copied the Indians in the clambakes we enjoy today (1940, pp. 9-10).

In the other draft, the 18 wigwams seem to become 16 wigwams and they are in Old Babson Pasture instead of in Riverview (c. 1941, p. 15). Alternatively, there are 34 wigwams collectively at two sites.

To the east of the Riverview shell heap a few hundred yards, around what is called the Lily Pond, in the old Babson pasture, there are sixteen wigwam sites, clearly discernible to this day. Excavating has been carried on at this site in years gone by, so it was decided not to conduct any extensive search here. After spending half a day in making tests, we abandoned the project at this location.

Phillips’ undated circa 1941 draft repeats his Riverview finds of many diverse potsherds with incised rims and tools for working clay, including a slate scraper “1½ X 1 X ¼ inch, worn both sides with grooves for thumb and finger, used to mark pottery” and the ground slate semi-lunar knife (“Squaw knife” or ulu in reference to recent Inuit use of this ancient technology), used to clean fish (Johnson 2004).
In addition to not keeping track of which sites he was reporting on, Phillips’ excavation methods would have mixed up artifacts from different periods. New England coastal sites are notoriously difficult stratigraphically in any case (Lynch 2012). While the decorated pottery indicates Woodland period occupancy, the use of ground or polished slate for cutting tools and steatite mortars and atlatl weights point to Middle and Late Archaic occupations. At the same time, some projectile points seem to have Early and Middle Archaic origin (Fowler 1991).

Slate and soapstone are not indigenous to Cape Ann. Maine and the Green Mountains of Vermont are the most likely sources of the slate, and the nearest steatite is on the banks of the lower Merrimack, for example in Haverhill, and along the Blackstone River in central Massachusetts, for example in Grafton (Sears 1905; Hein 2006). At Riverview, Phillips notes the presence of “a steatite block for making steatite bowls”, and his collection in the Cape Ann Museum includes a steatite mortar and pestle from Hog Island in Essex Bay (see Figure 29), four whole steatite atlatl weights (see Figures 30 and 31), including two that are definitely from Riverview, and atlatl fragments. The presence of soapstone and slate and the focus on intensive seafood processing I think is further indication of Riverview’s relatively earlier place in time compared to the more horticultural sites in West Gloucester at Cole’s Island and Wingaersheek.

Riverview, with its ideal location for a village (Lynch 2012)—on a level kame on an outflow plain between two tidal rivers, endowed with fresh water springs and massive rock outcrops (likely including an astronomical observatory on Pole Hill)—may have been reoccupied over a very long time, such that Archaic and Woodland artifacts abounded in proximity for Phillips and other collectors to find.

A transcript of an anecdotal historical account in the Cape Ann Museum (the handwritten original is in Rockport in the basement of the Sandy Bay Historical Society)—Ebenezer Poole [Pool] recording in 1823 his grandfather’s recollections of the Indians—states that there were “30 to 40 wigwams” in Riverview north of Pole Hill when the English began to settle Gloucester in the late 1630s (Poole 1823). This would have constituted a sizeable village (Luedtke 1988). The account further asserts that the first English settlers rented or bought land from the Pawtucket in installments in exchange for bushels of Indian corn, with only the final installment paid in cash to Samuel English in 1701 (Salem Registry of Deeds), which Gloucester ironically had to sell some land to raise. I am looking for corroborating evidence of these transactions in records of John Endicott’s land transactions from 1642 when Gloucester was incorporated, but deals between Cape Ann squatters and the Pawtucket prior to the establishment of the Mass Bay Colony will be harder to find if not altogether lost to time.

Native Americans certainly were present on Cape Ann until some time after contact. There are court cases involving Cape Ann Indians dating to the 1670s (Dow 1922). In an anecdotal account in his travel journal, a book salesman from England describes his visit to an Indian village called Wonasquam near Gloucester (Dunton 1686). This name and its variants appear early. For example, William Wood’s 1634 map identifies Wonasquom (Wood 1634), and Wondosquam appears on Josseley’s map of 1663 (Josselyn 1674). The name survived from the mid 19th to early 20th-century in the form of a tourist accommodation in Annisquam Village called the Wonasquam Lodge (Cox 1921).

In addition to the anecdotal accounts, there is a letter of Rev. John White noting that the Dorchester Company managed to pay off debts for its failed Cape Ann fishing venture of 1623 within three years through trade with the Indians at Naumkeag (Salem Village, later Beverly) and at Fisherman’s Field (in what would become Gloucester) (White 1630; Bradford 1952; Adams 1882: 43). Gloucester town records seldom refer to Indians, except to report mischief or fears of uprisings or laws relating to them enacted by the General Court of the Massachusetts Bay Colony (Ray 2002). In 1682 in response to continuing conflict and confusion after King Philip’s War, Gloucester selectmen discussed whether to ask settlers to distinguish resident Indians from “strange” ones and to generally refrain from vigilantism (Minutes of Selectmen’s Meetings, Gloucester Archives).
The selectmen’s decision is not reported, and what happened in the contact period remains to be discovered. A map of native territories in 1700 shows coastal Massachusetts and New Hampshire as “Cleared of Indians” (Hoffman 1955). It is an inaccurate and misleading claim, however—repeated by local librarians, teachers, antiquarians, and docents over the generations—that Indians on Cape Ann never lived there or had all died out from disease or warfare prior to English contact. Such “erasure” apparently is a common story in New England coastal communities (Patton, 2013). In addition, earlier archaeologists tended to regard coastal sites as comparatively unimportant because they lacked monuments or signs of permanent settlement, regarded as preconditions for “civilization” or “culture” (e.g., Putnam 1867). The memory of native presence had otherwise perhaps been suppressed in favor of colonial legends or dismissed through reference to the pre-English contact leptospirosis outbreak of 1611-1619 (Crosby 1976; Marr and Cathey 2010), which caused catastrophic mortality, or to internecine warfare with traditional enemies, the “Tarrantines” (Mi’kmaq) to the east and Kanien’kahaka (Mohawks) to the west (Goff 2008; Stewart-Smith 1994; Bourque and Whitehead 1985).

**Old Babson Pasture**

Riverview seems not to have been a site of intensive horticulture, but the Mill River flood plain to the east of it may well have been. A historical map based on Mason's 1831 map identifies the slope above the Mill River to the east as the Old Babson Pasture (Babson 1860). Phillips uses this name but also refers to “the Lily Pond area”. It’s not clear where this is. The pond known today as the Lilypond lies to the west of Riverview in West Gloucester, but Phillips is specific about the Lily Pond area near Old Babson Pasture, which lies to the east of Riverview.

Thus, it is not clear exactly where the 16 or 18 visible wigwam floors were that Phillips located “up over the wall toward the shore where the so-called Lily Pond is”. I so far have not been able to find a candidate for “a wall toward the shore”. Phillips does not elaborate but says only that the wigwam sites remained “discernable to this day”. Old Babson Pasture is now the grounds of the O'Malley Middle School on Mill Pond off Washington Street. If this is where Phillips saw the wigwams, they probably are under the ball fields or parking lots or nearby Cherry Street along the verge of the Mill River, or even under Mill Pond, where the river has swelled ever since construction of the first dam in 1642 (Ray 2002: 15).

Inconsistencies between the two drafts are vexing. In the undated draft circa 1941 Phillips abandons Old Babson Pasture, for example, but in his 1940 draft, he reports finds there—a shell heap and several fire pits with burned wood, acorns, and clams. He also finds more than 20 pieces of pottery “of different types” made on site in the fire pits. He notes that the pottery was “of a New Hampshire type, different from the Salem-Beverly pottery”. Phillips may have been finding a distinction between northern New England and southern New England ceramic styles as classified at the time. I have not been able to find anything called “Salem-Beverly pottery” in the literature (see Figure 32).

Judging by Archaic ceramics in southeastern chronologies, the presence of pottery and pottery making is not in itself an indication of intensive horticulture (Sassaman 1993). Other than the corn hills on Cole’s Island, Phillips makes no mention of finding corn remains or residues in the pots, caches, or fire pits he examined, although—lacking modern excavation protocols—this may have been an oversight on his part. On the other hand, I have seen two likely corn mills in Rockport in slabs of natural granite, including one in Mill Brook Meadow and another in Andrews Woods.

South of Babson Pasture, Phillips notes in passing an axe head found in 1887 in the cellar of Ezra L. Phillips’ house on Gloucester Avenue, a polished celt under the Universalist Church near Middle St. in Gloucester, and arrowheads in the undescribed “village site” at Fishermen's Field on Stage Point, where English adventurers of the Dorchester Company first established a fishing station and trade relations with the Cape Ann Pawtucket in 1623 (Adams 1882; Thornton 1854). The area between Riverview and Gloucester Harbor was the first to be settled and developed by the English, which may account for a paucity of finds there. Just to the east of that area was a “Great Swamp”, which the
English drained to make farms for Gloster Plantation (Babson 1860). They also started leveling surrounding hills for harborfront fill (Massachusetts Coastal Zone Management 2000).

The Phillips collection at the Cape Ann Museum and the Chadwick collection at the Robbins Museum of Archaeology contain points, awls, drills, gravers, scrapers, sinkers, plummetts, weights, gouges, chisels, anvils, axes, and so on of every size and description in both local and exotic stone, from quartz crystal microliths to so-called war clubs fashioned from grooved cobbles. Unfortunately, Benjamin Chadwick’s collection includes items not only from Cape Ann but also from Wakefield, Saugus, and Marblehead, so provenience cannot be certain without a perfect match between an item and Phillips’ description in his notes. An exception is artifacts in the Chadwick Collection specifically identified as coming from Phillips’ excavations of grave goods in Annisquam (see Figures 33 and 34).

In a letter to Tonya Largy of the Robbins Museum, Chadwick writes (1986):

Twenty-five or more years ago I came into a very large collection of Indian artifacts from the widow of Mr. (can’t remember) who was president of the Lepage’s Glue Co. of Gloucester MA.

Chadwick goes on to describe his Phillips Collection as coming from burials in Annisquam, “where three complete skulls and about a bushel of bones [were] dug up”. He calls attention to “a very nice pendant”, colonial era beads and buttons, “several nice pipes, hundreds of points, drills, and a small library of Indian books”. Chadwick also remembers that “there is a small bear totem in the collection. I think I know where that is.” I did not see this bear in the Robbins Museum but wonder if it is like the Penncook sitting bear basalt sculpture in the possession of the Peabody Essex Museum in Salem (E50296: http://explore-art.pem.org/object/native-american-art/E50296/detail).

Chadwick concludes, “I do not understand why a man of [Phillips’] position didn’t make some disposition of [his collection] before his demise.”

Annisquam

North of Babson Pasture and Riverview lie Goose Cove, Lobster Cove, and Annisquam, the peninsula at the mouth of the Annisquam River. Phillips identifies but does not elaborate on finds in Annisquam. He names the Bent Estate, Lobster Cove, Bay View to Lanesville, and the Old Seaside Cemetery in Lanesville as the locations of finds.

On the Bent estate, in Annisquam, and at nearby Lobster Cove, many stone implements have been found, and there are many evidences of Indian occupancy, which extend along the Annisquam shore to Bay View and Lanesville, as far as the old Seaside Cemetery (c. 1941, p. 16).

Judy Juncker of Annisquam is a noted collector (Waugh 2005), but I have not seen her finds from Bent’s Pasture and other locations in Annisquam. The Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology has a 30 cm sedimentary stone sculpture of a woman’s head in traditional Abenaki headdress with a tumpline holding an infant to her nape and back. The sculpture was taken from a bank of what was fresh marsh near the head of Lobster Cove in Annisquam, before Phillips’ time. It is referred to as the Annisquam Effigy and is kept in the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology at Harvard. It was found in 1922 by a resident gardener and brought to the attention of Ernest Hooton, who ultimately bought the piece for $100 (Teele and Sargent 2013). It is referenced by Charles Willoughby in his Antiquities of the New England Indians (1935:58) and more recently by Kathleen Bragdon in the context of the status of Algonquian women (1996:176). In conjunction with other artifactual evidence it seems likely that the southwest-facing portion of the Annisquam peninsula from Goose Cove around to Annisquam Harbor was the site of a native settlement.

The Bent Estate, which ran from Lobster Cove past Annisquam Harbor to Lighthouse Beach, is partly federally protected today and includes a pasture where seasonally returning Pawtucket were allowed to camp even into the 19th century (Merchant 1942; Lane 1925). In depositions on file in the Gloucester Archives, Charlotte Augusta Lane writes that 1833, the year of her birth, was the last
summer that Indians came by canoe to camp in Bent’s Pasture and sell remedies and baskets to residents and tourists, and Manton E. Merchant describes Indian summer camps on Pearce Island, Rust Island, and Wheeler’s Point until around 1832. These dates closely follow the Great Fire of 1830, which destroyed much of downtown Gloucester and its harborfront. With the four to five hundred fishermen of the time out to sea, a few men and mostly the women coped with the disaster by passing leather fire buckets up and down a human chain, and according to Gloucester Fire Department history, “A party of Penobscot Indians were in town, who also exerted themselves with great bravery” (Somes 1892). The Indians were later defended against accusations of having started the fire intentionally for the purpose of winning favor by helping to fight it (Gloucester Telegraph 1831).

The federally protected area around Bent’s Pasture includes Squam Rock, a huge Ordovician pluton with a sight line to the entrance to the Annisquam River, which may have served as a defensive position against enemies seeking to enter the river. During the Late Woodland period Tarrantines from the Canadian Maritimes, armed with French muskets, periodically came down the coast in canoes in summer to raid Pawtucket corn and carry out blood vengeance (Stewart-Smith 1994). In 1633 in Ipswich John Winthrop Jr. aided Masconomet and the Pawtucket against a deadly Tarrantine raid on Castle Hill (Winthrop 1790; Bourque and Whitehead 1985; Stewart-Smith 1999). Materials published today by the Massachusetts Trustees of Reservations, however, fail to mention that Castle Hill (the Crane Estate), with a sightline to the entrance of the Ipswich River, originally was the site of Masconomet’s principal fort, the seat of his sagamoreship, and the first recorded Pawtucket land transfer (Massachusetts Trustees of Reservations; LeBaron 1874; Savulis 1979; Davis 1996; Salem Registry of Deeds). Masconomet sold Castle Hill to Winthrop in 1633 for £20, perhaps in hopes that an English presence there would deter attacks; the town of Ipswich later refunded the money to Winthrop, perhaps in hopes that he would stay as governor rather than leave to found another colony in Connecticut (Waters 1905; Felt 1834; Salem Registry of Deeds). Masconomet sold the rest of Agawam as far as the Merrimack River to Winthrop in 1634 for another £20 (Salem Registry of Deeds). The governor, having lost his wife and infant daughter that year, returned to England instead, remarried, and returned to found Saybrook, CT (Winthrop Papers).

The area northeast of Bent Pasture extending up the mid-line of the Annisquam peninsula to Diamond Cove is known to have served as a native burial ground (Babson 1860:16). According to Babson, in 1848 ten skulls and a pipe used as a grave good were removed from an undescribed location near Diamond Cove. Over a dozen other burials have been reported periodically (officially and unofficially) to the present day as the area has been developed residentially and services provided such as electricity, telephone, sewers, and cable (Hadlock 1947; McAveeney 2012; O’Keefe 2013).

New England Algonquian burials traditionally were flexed and aligned directionally, tending to face southwest, and overlooked a body of water (Williams 1643; Bragdon 1996). Based on Rhode Island samples it has been suggested that chronologically earlier burials were comparatively nearer to both salt and fresh water and were more associated with sand dunes and shell heaps than later burials, which tend to be found in higher elevations farther from water (Cook 1984). Moorehead Phase burials, cremation burials, and ossuaries in burial chambers also have been reported in New England (e.g., Bourque 1995; McManamon et al. 1986), but there is no evidence for these forms on Cape Ann. Undisturbed midden burials and burial mounds may still exist on Cape Ann, however, and the area near Seaside Cemetery or between Seaside and Locust Grove Cemetery, both on Langsford Street in Lanesville, may be associated with an undeclared Contact Period Indian burying ground. Cemeteries established before 1730 that were on the fringes of colonial population centers include Second Parish in West Gloucester—upstream from Kent’s Cove near Presson’s Point—Bayview Cemetery, and Cove Hill Cemetery in Lanesville.

Just south of Bent Pasture at a site on Adams Hill, Phillips found stone sinkers and a cache of “25 or 30 gouges of the same type”. However, he does not identify this type in his notes. Around 1927 Phillips also examined a skeleton found during
excavations for the foundation of the Nate Ross house on Adams Hill Road in Annisquam. The male skeleton had preserved hair, and Phillips notes that the presence of pieces of copper overlying part of the skull may have been responsible for the unusual state of preservation of the hair. He did not take a sample, however.

At Adams Hill some years ago, when they were digging the foundation for Nate Ross’ house (I think it was in 1927), they ran across an Indian skeleton. They didn’t care anything about it and threw it back. Wouldn’t I like to get that, just to pull a tooth out to see if the roots were fused together….When they dug up the Indian skeleton in Adams Hill they took up some glass beads, and I restrung them. The Museum of the American Indian in New York tried to get these, but we wouldn’t let them have them, because these are coming to the Cape Ann Scientific, Literary and Historical Association for display purposes. The Indian who wore these was not necessarily of the same tribe. After all, some of the other Indians traveled, and that is why with this glassware was found some copper, and that is the only piece of copper that was found around this way. Also, some of the hair of the Indian was preserved by the oxide of the copper, so we have the black hair and the copper, which shows that the Indian was in the habit of using copper (1940, p. 15).

Phillips does not clarify the number, size, or possible use of the copper pieces, but the presence of copper is significant, as is the presence of glass beads. The beads especially indicate that this probably was a Contact era burial of a person of high status. The copper pieces may have been European trade copper, but coastal Algonquian use of native copper for personal adornment was observed as early as 1602 (Brereton 1602). Locally accessible native copper occurs in Lynnfield, Lawrence, Attleboro, and sites in Franklin County in the western part of the state (Gleba 1978) and also was traded down the coast from Nova Scotia and through the east-west trading network between the Great Lakes region and the Atlantic seaboard (Levine 1999). The site nearest Cape Ann was a working Pawtucket copper mine in Topsfield (Dow 1921; Gleba 1978). A colonial source identifies a native copper mine on land in Topsfield deeded to the English by Massaconet and earmarked for John Endicott, who had the mine in operation by 1639 (Towne 1892).

In his undated notes, Phillips describes the glass beads in the Adams Hill burial as “Jamestown trade beads”, which mainly were small round or oblong blue or clear or white glass beads (Lapham 2001). Between 1608 and 1623 the English intermittently operated a glass factory in Jamestown, Virginia. Few “Jamestown” beads exist today, however, because the factory operated only briefly in 1608 with imported German “glasse men” and then again between 1621 and 1623 with imported Italian glassmakers (Harrington 1952). It may be relevant that the factory manager in 1621 was Captain William Norton, who may have been related to the Norton families of Annisquam and Sandy Bay. If so, this makes more credible the presence of Jamestown beads in a Cape Ann burial. The Jamestown glassworks shut down completely in 1624 after an Indian uprising and a storm knocked it down (Harrington 1952). (Phillips says it closed because they could not find workers, because everyone in Virginia fancied himself a gentleman and would not be caught dead laboring in a glass factory.)

It’s also possible that the beads were not from Jamestown. Glass beads apparently were used as European trade goods in the Americas starting with Columbus’s expedition in 1492, so without further evidence, the provenance of the beads Phillips found cannot be proven. Venetian, Dutch, and Bohemian glass beads were used in the Atlantic fur trade, and the French later introduced ceramic and brass pony beads and glass seed beads (Hayes et al. 1983). Without the beads or their further documentation, we cannot know if they were English or French, ubiquitous or rare. Maybe the beads were buried with Quiohamnek, sagamore of Wenesquawam when Samuel de Champlain met him in Le Beauport (Gloucester Harbor) in 1606 (Champlain [1613] 1971; Saville 1934).

In his undated circa 1941 notes, Phillips tells a different story about the “Jamestown beads”. He claims to have painstakingly restrung them on
a strip of rawhide and sent them as a gift to the Smithsonian, which, however, has no record of such an acquisition. The Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology at Harvard University does have a string of blue and white Jamestown beads that matches Phillips’ description, taken from a grave at Indian Ridge on Argilla Road, Ipswich, an area where Phillips says he conducted excavations and recovered grave goods (see Figure 34).

It should be noted that the Annisquam Historical Society Museum has a collection of artifacts claimed to have been dug up by local gardeners or otherwise donated locally, some possibly by N. Carleton Phillips or Foster Saville, but in most cases provenances and specific proveniences are unknown. In evidence there, for example, are an axe, a grooved net weight, quartz points and crystals, bird points, assorted bifaces (see Figure 35), a large (damaged) ceremonial platform pipe of Pennsylvania jasper or Minnesota pipestone, miniature marked clay pots (see Figure 36), seven portrait effigies—diverse heads broken from figurines of exotic origin, and a small assortment of possibly authentic Contact Period native crafts, including a model of a birchbark canoe with quillwork (see Figure 37).

### Lanesville

North and east of Annisquam lie Lanesville and Rockport. On “Sandy Bank” on Langsford St. in Lanesville, Phillips excavated a “cache” found in a fire pit about 18 inches below the surface. This cache contained the following lithic items:

- 6 spear heads
- 6 arrowheads
- 3 scrapers
- 2 sinkers
- 1 adze
- 1 celt

Last summer a boy called me one Sunday morning and said, “Can you come right down here?” It happened I was going to church that morning, so I told him I would be down right after the church service. I went to see him, and there was a boy named Condon and another boy named Filfalt. One of these boys had been going to a Boy Scout meeting on Saturday morning and in walking through a bank on Langsford St. had found an arrowhead. He picked it up, and then he found another, and he began looking around. In all he found half a dozen spear heads, half a dozen arrowheads, three scrapers, two sinkers, an adze head and celt. The minute I saw them I asked where he had found them. So he showed me where he had found them down on the Sandy Bank in Lanesville. Just about 18 inches below the original soil was an Indian cache. In the bottom of it was some burned wood, which I saved, and a few acorns. On top of this were these Indian relics. Some were broken and we had to piece them together (1940, p. 17).

Phillips goes on to speculate that out of superstition a medicine man may have gathered household implements, dug a hole in the ground, and threw them in the fire to drive away evil spirits. Elsewhere, however, he suggests that heating stones may have aided in fracturing them to more easily make flake tools rather than relying on hammer and chisel alone, especially with Cape Ann’s tightly crystalline igneous rocks. The stones, unidentified as to the classification of their sources, along with a number of burned “chestnuts”, had all been heat-cracked in the fire that consumed them.

The location of Phillips’ Lanesville items is not certain, but in the 1920s Marshall Saville also donated a number of stone tools from a sandy bank on Langsfold Street in Lanesville to the Sandy Bay Historical Society in Rockport. Thus, Lanesville’s rocky shores and sandy banks have yielded concentrations of stone projectile points, preforms, and debitage, possibly indicating sites for routine tool manufacturing, for example, at Plum Cove, Lane’s Cove, Folly Cove, and Halibut Point. Halibut Point has been extensively quarried in historical times, but on Andrews Point is a vein of blue quartz that appears to have been subjected to small-scale quarrying (Brady and Cheney 2000). Similar signs of possible native quarrying may be seen elsewhere on Cape Ann, for example, at rock
shelters off Old Thomson Road and in the Red Rock Conservation Area of West Gloucester.

Phillips also reported an extensive cache of stone arrowheads along Penzance Road near Land’s End in Rockport not far from the old Turks Head Inn. Locally available source material on Cape Ann for the production of lithic tools includes rhyolite, syenite, diorite, gabbro (basalt), and quartz, along with pegmatite, other granite, and a great variety of other minerals (Shaler 1890; Gleba 1978). Sources of rhyolite, argillite, quartzite, steatite, graphite, and other rocks and minerals, including metamorphosed stone, are nearby in Essex County, adjacent regions, and New Hampshire and Maine (Sears 1905; Boisvert 1992).

Conclusions

The prevalence of caches of stone, tool blanks, finished tools, bones, and clams highlights the mobility of Cape Ann’s inhabitants throughout most of the area’s prehistory. Until late in the Late Woodland period they clearly were seasonal migrants to Cape Ann with campsites and seasonal villages on the Annisquam River and Atlantic coastlines. Historical sources identify Wamesit in Lowell as the principal Pennacook/Pawtucket winter village for eastern Essex County (Eliot 1671; Gookin 1674). Wamesit was at the junction of the Concord and Merrimack rivers near Pawtucket Falls, making for a seasonal migration of only 30 miles—a day trip—to Agawam in Ipswich and to Wenjesquawam on Cape Ann (as the crow flies) and 30 miles south to Naumkeag, a large Pawtucket farming settlement that spread between the Porter River in Danversport and the North River in Beverly (Perley 1912). English settlers under Roger Conant and John Endicott who farmed alongside the Pawtucket in Naumkeag in 1626 called their plantation Salem Village (Higginson 1629).

On Cape Ann the first places the Pawtucket gave, leased, or sold to the English were the original site of “Glosta” Plantation, around Green Landing where Grant Circle is today; “Planter’s Neck” at the southern end of the Annisquam Peninsula; Wheeler’s Point and the “Neck of House Lots” in Riverview, allocated by John Endicott in 1639; “thatch lots” of marsh along the west bank of the Annisquam River; the Harbor waterfront, including Fisherman’s Field at “Stage Point” and the proposed “Cut” joining Massachusetts Bay to Ipswich Bay via the Blynman Canal (which exists today); “wood lots” in the watershed and along the back shore; Dogtown commons for pasturage; and the tip of Eastern Point (Bruen 1650; Babson, 1860; Southmayd 1642/1643; General Court of the Massachusetts Bay Colony). Later divisions and reallocations of land to allay the inconveniences of the open field system, accommodate the influx of new settlers and veterans returning from the French and Indian wars, and mitigate the environmental degradation of the commons (Russell 1976; Cronon 1983; Veak 2002; Hardin 1968) gradually extended around the coasts of Sandy Bay, Essex Bay, and Chebacco Lake (Ray 2002; Town of Gloucester Records, 1642-1760).

Based on the distribution of tools associated with horticulture, at some time prior to English contact, while still using traditional campsites in Riverview and on the river islands, the harbor, and the coasts, the Pawtucket established semi-permanent settlements in the estuarine bioregions of West Gloucester at Wingoersheek and Essex Bay. There I believe the families worked at maintaining their mixed economy, combining traditional subsistence activities with coastal/marine adaptations and mobile farming in intervale cornhills and possibly in berms and swales on the fringes of freshwater marshes and streams (Luedtke 1988; Smith 1989; Hasenstab 2000; Petersen and Cowie 2002; Brose 2006; Chilton 2010). Prior to 1642—when Gloucester was incorporated, the English squatters, government agents of John Endicott in Salem and John Winthrop Jr. in Ipswich, agents of the General and Quarterly courts of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, and advance men of the merchant prince Maurice Thomson (who never came in the end to make of Gloucester a prosperous place) very likely found Pawtucket families on their West Gloucester farms (Thornton 1854; Adams 1882; Hubbard 1801; Dow 1922; Brenner 2003). Perhaps Riverview and Wingoersheek and some of the other sites should be added to the archaeological maps of New England that the public sees, so they can know and appreciate how 500 generations or more of Native American people lived on Cape Ann before them (see Figures 38 and 39).
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Titicut Mullers

William B. Taylor

Introduction

Mullers were used from at least the Late Archaic Period through the Late Woodland Period. They are usually round in design, with smooth to highly polished sides, and show heavy usage. Granite, quartzite or other hard stones were the choice material selected (Fowler 1963:25; Hoffman 1991:63-64). Most sizes range from 3 ¼” (8 cm) to 4 ¾” (12 cm) in diameter and 2” (5 cm) to 2 ½” (6.35 cm) in thickness. These implements were used to grind corn or nuts in shallow stone mortars. Several examples were collected within the Titicut area during the last 70 years, and seem to be as common as pestles. The following are eleven examples recovered during my lifetime. See Figure 1 for metric measurements.

Description of Mullers

Figure 2 shows a highly polished example found at the Titicut Site (19-PL-161) around 1942. It is made of quartzite and is the first implement that I ever found. It is also one of the finest muller examples in my collection. It measures 4” (10 cm) long by 3 ¼” (8 cm) wide and is 2” (5 cm) thick. The front and back are very smooth, while all the edges show heavy grinding.

Figure 3 shows two examples found at the Cushman-Thompson field in Bridgewater, off Green Street, during 1983-1984. Both are made of granite, are very smooth and show heavy usage. The larger one at the left is 3 ½” (9.5 cm) long by 2 ¼” (5.7 cm) thick and shows heavy wear.

Figure 4 shows two mullers found at the Fort Hill Bluff Site (19-PL-163). The larger one at the left is 4 ¼” (10.7 cm) long by 2 ½” (6 cm) thick and shows heavy wear. The material for both is granite.

Figure 5 shows two examples from the Seaver Farm (19-PL-162), Titicut area. The larger one at the left measures 4 ½” (11 cm) long by 2 ¼” (5.7 cm) thick and shows heavy usage. The material for both is granite.

Figure 6 on left is a circular example from the Taylor Farm (19-PL-165). This measures 4 ¾” (12 cm) in diameter and is 2” (5 cm) thick. When I first found this artifact I thought it was a Flat-Faced Rolling Disc (Fowler 1966:62-63). However, other experts in the Robbins Museum thought I should label it as a muller instead. The material is granodiorite. The smaller muller is made of granite and is from the Titicut area.

Figure 7 shows two additional mullers found in the Titicut area. The largest at the left is 4” (10 cm) wide and is 2” (5 cm) thick and exhibits heavy wear. The material is quartzite and shows grinding along the edges, with a smooth facial surface. The smaller muller is made of granite.

Conclusion

Mullers are not preferred collectable implements, but certainly merit a closer examination. These eleven are well made and show heavy usage. In fact, they are as common at these sites as pestles to grind corn, nuts or other food staples used within the Titicut area. This is somewhat surprising, and collectors should take a closer look at their inventories to see how many they have picked up through the years. Early mullers were used to process nuts while Woodland mullers were associated with grinding maize (Hoffman 1991:63-64).

Rocks that resemble mullers could also be used for burnishing animal hides. Hides are very stiff when separated from an animal. Mullers were then used, along with oil from mammal (seal) fat in the process of thinning, smoothing and stretch-
ing hides to make them more pliable and flexible. This results in the skin becoming softer and more comfortable to wear for clothing. The quartzite mullers (Figures 2 and 7) seem to be more highly polished than the granite examples and could have been tools used in this process. (Bob Trotta, personal communication 2013).
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**Editor's Note:** During excavation at the Middleborough Little League site in 2013, about 9 km southeast of the Titicut area, a pecked argillite muller was recovered from just outside the periphery of a large hearth dated to 3520±80 B.P. (GX-33739; cal 3693 – 3897 bp; Stuiver et al. 2011) (Hoffman 2013:10-11). It is illustrated in Figure 8. Its dimensions are 7.8 cm in length, 5.8 cm in width, and 3.1 cm in thickness. Its weight is 210 g. It appears to have been equipped with finger grips on one side. The author kindly agreed to allow the inclusion of this specimen in his report.

![Figure 1. Metric Measurements of Mullers](image)
Figure 2  Fine Quartzite Muller Found at the Titicut Site, Bridgewater, Mass, around 1942.

Figure 3  Two Granite Mullers Found at the Cushman-Thompson Farm in 1983-1984, Bridgewater, Mass.
Figure 4  Two Granite Mullers Found at the Fort Hill Bluff Site in North Middleboro.

Figure 5  Two Granite Mullers Found at the Seaver Farm-Titicut Area in Bridgewater, Mass.
Figure 6  Large Granodiorite Muller (left) from Taylor Farm. Smaller Granite Muller is from Titicut Area.

Figure 7  Two Mullers from Titicut Area. The Left One is of Quartzite and the Right Muller is of Granite.

Figure 8. Muller from the Little League Site.
The Copper Projectile Points of North Plymouth

Bernard Otto

Every story has a beginning. Throughout my life, I have had a quest for perfection, and sometimes I found it in the efforts of others. First of all, you must consider my memory of being a 12-year old child, living just a stone’s throw from the North Plymouth fields. These fields belonged to a very wealthy Cordage Rope Company executive. His name was Francis Gideon Holmes. He never flaunted his wealth. He was a true conservationist. He lived in a mansion just across the street from his beloved fields. Ephraim Spooner’s Cordage Rope Company was the biggest sisal rope and twine maker in our country, if not the world. Its very tall red brick smokestack is still in place, a reminder of what used to be long ago.

Holmes could have sold his fields to any type of project or business. On his upper flat plain, he had an immense apple orchard, with apples of every variety cared for by the local Huntley Tree Service. Holmes supplied all of the local grocery stores with his apples, not for profit but so folks could enjoy the fruit of his labor.

In the mid-1800s, the local militia used to practice their manual of arms on these fields. Searching the plowed fields when I was a kid, I found a very fine unused gunflint of tan mottled flint. The two photos (Figures 3 and 4) were taken by my son and show the fields as they look today. In all actuality, they are the same now as they were then. On a slight rise on the southeast of the right field are the remains of a scattered shell midden.

In the middle of the southeast field, the land slopes down to a low terrace where there is an active spring. This spring has been active since God knows when! It resulted in a small flowing stream that flowed through a culvert, through a small saltmarsh, and emptied at the inshore line. This spring was the major water source for the Patuxets who occupied the immediately adjacent fields. Mr. Holmes’ fields attracted a lot of surface hunters for stone artifacts, and his workmen had to curb a lot of this activity.

Figures 1 and 2 show my recollection of the main type of well-made copper points which I had the privilege of handling as a child. These points were in private collections which are no longer available for view. One of the copper point collectors had measured the points with a ruler. This I noted very intently. The copper points in his collection were all the same dimensions, with no variations. His measurements were exactly 2 inches in length, both those with incurvate sides and the regular trianguoids. The widths were 3 ¾ inches, exactly. The bases were trianguloid or truncated. Most of the points had holes, perfectly centered.

The ancestral Patuxets occupying the southeast coastal plains and corridor were responsible for making these fine copper projectile points. A source of the copper could be from early old shipwrecks, whose hull bottoms might have been sheathed in copper plating. I can’t say enough about these fine copper points. They were relatively thin, straight, and their edges were ground smooth; perfection, indeed! The use of the holes is questionable – were they a hafting aid? The Patuxets were as good at flinknapping as they were at making copper points. A lot of fine stone points were found in Mr. Holmes’ fields. They have left a legacy which will last forever.
Figure 3. Photo of the North Plymouth Fields, Looking Northeast

Figure 4. Photo of the North Plymouth Fields, Looking North
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