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A Wampum Basket from New England: 
Discovery of an Account Providing Verification of an Oral Tradition

Marshall Joseph Becker, Ph. D.

Abstract:

Wampum, originally a Native-produced commodity, was first made in the 1590s, to provide an important commercial interface between Native Americans and Europeans. How and where Natives stored this commodity, and in some cases the diplomatic strings and belts fashioned from it, are now better understood. During the course of general wampum research, an 1854 account was identified that may provide validation for the records and oral tradition associated with a rare surviving example of a Native-made container once used to hold wampum. Consideration of this recently published container for wampum, now in private hands, using several aspects of anthropology (folklore, culture history, material culture, archaeology) points out differences in wampum use among Native Americans occupying different parts of the Northeast. The evidence also supports the oral tradition associated with this significant container.

Wampum: An Introduction

The documentary evidence for storage of wampum in New England, in a specific form of basket, provides the basis for this paper. New evidence independently confirms the long held oral tradition among some Euro-Americans regarding the function of a now well-known piece of Native material culture (Drooker and Hamell 2004). A brief review of the beads long believed to have been stored in this bag at one time provides the setting for understanding this specific use. The small shell beads of relatively uniform size and shape known by Algonquian speakers as *wampumpeag* first appear in the archaeological record about 1595 to 1600 (see Becker 2012a). White shell beads, in a wide variety of sizes and shapes, had been powerful symbols for centuries before the development of the relatively standardized bead form called wampum. Individual wampum beads, in white or blue, were called *porcelaine* by the French (*porcelaine blanche* and *porcelaine noire*), reflecting their similarity to the new type of ceramic (bone china) that ca. 1600 was becoming increasingly common in Europe (see Becker Ms. B).

A basic question regarding the use of wampum in diplomatic contexts relates to how these items were stored and/or transported. We have only a few hints as to what type of container or containers were used to bring belts or loose beads to a treaty, or how large these containers may have been (cf. Becker 2013a, 2015a). A wide range of types of containers is preserved in museum collections around the world (e.g. Coe 1976: 102-103). Detailed descriptions, however, are rare and attributions often are questionable (cf. Becker 1990). In addition, terms such as bag, sack, pouch etc. may reflect regional variations in usage rather than size. Similarly, any differences between casket, chest, trunk and satchel are difficult to determine.

By the 1620s wampum beads probably were being used to create flat bands. The relatively standardized and tubular shape of each wampum bead, ca. 3mm in diameter and 7 or 8 mm in length, enabled them to be “woven” into flat panels or bands. The wampum bands used for political purposes in the Core Area of wampum diplomacy were identified as “belts” in English and “colliers” in French. These were “two sided” or “reversible” bands. Other “woven” forms employing wampum beads are known from later historic times, but are not common (see Lainey 2004). Bands, and strings of wampum, became central to diplomatic processes among a number of Iroquoian groups in what I call the Core Area, as defined below (see Figure 1). This aspect of diplomacy, involving specific protocols, lasted until the early 1800s (Becker 2008b, also 2012a, 2012b).

The primary protocol in wampum diplomacy involved wampum prestation, anthropologically recognized as involving the formal presentation...
of one or more strings and/or belts of wampum along with a request to the intended recipient, either an individual or a group. If the wampum were accepted, the recipient would comply with an accompanying request by performing a specific activity or providing specific goods. This is first documented in 1604 (see Becker 2001, 2006a). The requests generally were quite explicit, with acceptance indicating agreement by the receivers to comply with the request. Wampum, as well as white marine shell beads of all sizes, is believed by some modern scholars to have represented good faith, honesty, and commitment (see Hamell 1992: 451, 455-457), but this is not supported by the evidence (Lainey 2004).

A variation or subset of diplomatic wampum bands are those made and presented by one Catholic religious community to another. I have identified these as “ecclesiastical bands.” All appear to be identified by the presence of a Latin cross woven into the beadwork. The prestation of such a band signified that the makers, as pious Catholics, wished to exhort the recipients to keep the faith (Becker 2001, 2006a). When ecclesiastical wampum was presented, both the request and compliance were implicit (Becker 2006a: 89-92).

The requests made with the presentation of wampum had many possible variations. A short string of wampum sent with a verbal message asking a group to attend a meeting validated the words of the bearer. When accepted, the commitment to attend was very strong. Requests for more significant actions, such as agreements to a treaty, were made with more and/or larger belts of wampum. In the Core Area by 1650, wampum prestation had overshadowed the smoking of the calumet (“peace pipe”) at diplomatic gatherings. While Brown (1989) focuses his attention on calumet activities in the Southeast, the smoking of tobacco was perhaps more important at meetings in the Northeast, perhaps beginning ca. 1600 CE. Fenton (1991) believes that the calumet dance is a late, perhaps eighteenth century import to Iroquoia, apparently arriving long after smoking the calumet had become important in diplomacy. I found that the calumet ritual becomes less evident in the documents after 1650, probably being overshadowed by wampum prestation. Gundersen’s (1993) note on “Catlinite” and the spread of the calumet ceremony can be considered as a caution in any review of the archaeological evidence. The documents may help us to understand the dynamics of place. The records from the Northeast suggest that smoking of pipes, if not elaborate calumets, formed a part of diplomatic gatherings during the period of wampum use, and probably long before.

Core and Periphery

The Core Area was the zone within which diplomatic uses for wampum became essential (Figure 1). Of some interest is the finding that the Core Area of wampum diplomacy, including several Iroquoian speaking tribes, lies at some distance from the area of Long Island Sound where the beads were first mass produced (Becker 2010). By the 1640s wampum had become central to diplomatic transactions and all business conducted at treaties (councils or meetings) between the colonists and those Native peoples living within the Core Area of wampum use (Becker 2007b, also 2005). The League of the Iroquois formed the enduring center of the Core Area, which originally included the Susquehannock Confederacy of central Pennsylvania (Becker 2007b) and probably the Saint Lawrence Iroquoians of Canada. Thus, the Core Area originally stretched from the drainage of the Susquehanna River in central Pennsylvania up through most of New York and into that part of Canada from eastern Lake Ontario to the east of Montreal. These peoples generally constructed relatively permanent longhouses within palisaded villages, which in turn provided secure storage for crops, peltry, and wampum. The use of the longhouse, and the social organization related to village life, may have been factors in delineating the Core Area. The use of volumes of wampum and the need for storage to be used in treaties, both given and received, required secure and substantial housing.

The Periphery may be defined as the entire area surrounding the Core Area of wampum use. This included most of New England and some of the Maritimes, as well as much of the region immediately surrounding the remainder of the Core Area (cf. Becker 2012c). The western boundaries were more flexible, as peoples such as the Wendat shifted their locations and took the use of wampum in
diplomacy with them. In the Periphery all the Native peoples sustained foraging with less, if any, use of supplemental maize horticulture (or gardening). The peoples of the Periphery generally used dispersed residential patterns, far different from the palisaded villages that characterize the subsistence horticulturalists of the Core Area. The peoples of the Periphery commonly used wampum for decorative purposes, with diplomatic uses being rare and largely confined to interactions with peoples of the Core Area (cf. Becker 2014a, 2016a). When Electa Jones (1854: 96) recounted that on 8 April, 1819 “a string of wampum was sent with the letter or message” that had been read by Captain Hendrick Aupaumut, she was describing what I call an “intermediate” event. We know that Hendrick Aupaumut was literate from several sources, including his own signature on the Treaty at Konondaiqua, held in New York [also Canandáigua] on 11 November 1794. His flowing signature, more faded than the others, appears as the fifth in the first column of names on the left. The complete image of this treaty, also called the “Pickering Treaty,” with all the signatories listed can be seen at www.nmai.si.edu/static/nationto-nation/treaty-of-canandaigua.html (Indian Treaty 21, Record Group 11; see also Kappler: 1904). Aupaumut’s signature appears in the column directly below that of Pickering. In 1819 Aupaumut read a letter to be sent to their “brethren who were encamped about Jerusalem [a Christian mission community].” A string of wampum attested to the validity of that message, or to the request that was sent via the letter. While a wampum attachment would be essential in the Core Area, they are documented far less often from the Periphery, despite the 1819 example. Aupaumut’s diplomatic skills as well as his literacy talents (see Aupaumut 1827) were important to much of his later career.

Diplomatic wampum, using only true shell beads of the correct form, and not glass or metallic beads, formed but one subset of the many uses for this post-Contact commodity. In the area immediately surrounding the Core Area, or what I term the Periphery, wampum was used primarily as personal ornamentation. In the Periphery, without villages with relatively permanent housing, storing even small quantities of wampum could be a problem. Even more problematical in strongly egalitarian communities was sharing the burden of storage and transport. In New England and other areas on the Periphery wampum was generally personal property (used for ornament), and the conversion to communal diplomatic uses was infrequent and limited (cf. Becker 2005).

Goals of the Study

The written documents that record the oral tradition associated with a basket once owned by Susannah Swan identify it as a container for wampum (Drooker and Hamell 2004). This information is considered here in light of a recently discovered account dating from 1854. The 1854 document had not been known when Drooker and Hamell (2004) published their excellent review of the Susannah Swan “wampum” basket, a surviving example of basketry dated to the seventeenth century. The 1854 record provides important confirmation of the oral history linked to this rare artifact, and how it relates to the few examples of early Native basketry known to survive.

Background:
Wampum served in economic and diplomatic interactions between colonists and Natives (cf. Ceci 1982) as well as among Native groups. Forty years ago Lynn Ceci (1982, cf. Becker 1980) made some important observations regarding the uses
of wampum by the Iroquoians of New York in their dealings with the colonies. Our understanding of the many and varied roles played by this post-Contact commodity has greatly expanded (see Becker 1984, 2002, etc.). Staggering numbers of wampum beads, woven into “belts” or incorporated into “strings” of various lengths, were presented, or exchanged, during treaty interactions over the nearly two centuries (ca 1620-1810) when wampum diplomacy was crucial in specific areas of the American Northeast (Becker 2013a, 2013b). Although large numbers of wampum belts were produced for diplomatic purposes, most were recycled by unraveling and transforming them, or by reusing the belts in the form that they were received (Becker 2008b). By 1850, those diplomatic belts remaining, then being held in the hands of supposed “keepers,” had lost their meaning and their political value. Some of these may have been dismantled to use the beads for ritual purposes or for ornament, such as the wampum necklaces sometimes used along with ribbons to decorate the dogs used in the White Dog Sacrifice (see Becker and Lainey 2013, also 2009).

Wampum served decorative as well as political functions among the Native peoples of the Northeast and often beyond that region (Becker 2012c). The importance of wampum as an item of ornamentation is sometimes overshadowed by the sheer numbers of diplomatic bands that survive. Decorative examples of wampum bands may have had cloth or leather “backings.” I suggest that ornamental bands, or panels, were affixed directly to clothing. Ornamental bands that incorporated wampum can be identified by the presence of glass and metal beads, or non-Native products. The exclusive use of wampum in the fifteen known Huron or Iroquoian “cuffs” (Becker 2007a; Feest 2014) strongly suggests that these were not ornamental in function but had served as status markers within the community. Straps used for Native pouches commonly were covered with black and white glass beads of the size and shape of wampum. These straps superficially resemble wampum bands, but comprise a very different category of material culture, closer to ornamental wampum bands and artifacts (Becker Ms. A). When photography began to record the surviving diplomatic examples, they commonly are seen as they were draped over a shoulder or around the neck of an individual (see Lainey 2004: passim).

Political uses for wampum formed only one of the many categories in which this commodity was employed (see Becker 2006a). Wampum as small change became extremely common in many colonies and soon became monetized, with each government establishing a value for the white and dark beads (Becker 1980). Not only was wampum established as legal tender, but specific legislation concerning quality also was common. In addition to these legal records relating to the monetization of wampum, the need to carefully document diplomatic events led to the survival of enormous numbers of written records such as Native-colonial treaties.

**Belt Size and the Survival of Examples**

In documents that indicate specific numbers of wampum used, a small belt might hold 500 to 600 beads while a “large” belt required 2,000 to 4,000 beads. A very large example held 10,000 or more wampum beads (cf. Becker 2006a: 93). The impressive numbers of belts presented at any major conference had considerable variation in size, as indicated by the numbers of rows (width) and numbers of files (length). The “strings” presented could vary from single short lengths of three or more strung wampum beads, to more complex “branches” or “hands” that often were also called “strings.” These complex “strings” were composed of several individual strings, of varying length, tied at one end. Minutes from various major treaties indicate that 100,000 or more individual beads might be used for all the belts and strings presented by each party attending. Twice that number were used for the belts exchanged on special occasions (see Johnson 1921 passim).

The total volume taken up by loose or strung wampum beads is a matter of some interest as it enables us to estimate the size of containers needed to transport and store this commodity. A moderate string of 20 to 30 beads could be held in a cupped hand, while a large belt could be carefully folded over or rolled up to form a cylinder or unit some 25cm in diameter and 15cm or more in height. The “Vatican 1831” wampum belt, composed of ca. 9,900 beads (15 rows by 660 files) measures 2.03 by 0.10 meters when lying flat, excluding the fringe. The actual beaded panel of the “Vatican 1831” belt varies slightly in breadth, but 0.11 meters is about average (Becker 2001, 2006a: 93). Since wampum
bears tend to average about 3mm in diameter, we can estimate the volume of the Vatican 1831 belt at about 650 cubic centimeters. Including the fringe, and allowing for any irregularities of the surface of this piece, we have a unit with a volume of under 700cc (roughly three cups), or less than a liter. Loose beads should occupy about the same volume or less. By this estimate a one-liter container might hold 15,000 beads of wampum. Their cash value depended on the color of the bead. Fathom (2 yard) lengths of strung white beads generally had a value specified by law. The fathom was held to include 360 wampum beads. In 1643 Roger Williams (1643: 154) noted the decline in value from nine or ten shillings down to five shillings for a fathom (also see Becker 1980: 8, Table 1).

Only rarely do the design elements on a belt, often called “figures” in the documents, even vaguely correspond to any aspect of an “agreement” or terms discussed at their presentation. The recipients might use the design elements, or perhaps their numbers, as mnemonic devises to recall some elements of the treaty, such as when the belt was received and what terms had been involved. All these details had to be retained by a “keeper,” but when and if formal keepers emerged remains speculative (Becker 2013b). This will be discussed below. The original meaning of a belt could change when it was reused or recycled. As treaties became increasingly complex toward the end of the eighteenth century, the Five Nations Iroquois became increasingly concerned with the written treaty documents. Diplomatic wampum rapidly lost its functions in the Core Area and soon went out of use (see Becker 2002, 2006a, 2012a).

Possibly as many as 300 bands of wampum survive to this day, and perhaps as many strings. Of these many bands, perhaps three quarters represent examples of diplomatic wampum. About thirty ecclesiastical bands (cf. Becker 2006a) and fifteen cuffs are known to exist (Becker 2007a, Feest 2014). The diplomatic bands reflect the vast quantities of this commodity that went into filling the specific needs of frontier diplomacy (cf. Becker 2002). Comprehension of the details of wampum diplomacy can be developed through reading the extraordinary numbers of colonial documents that record these transactions. The five volumes of papers of Sir William Johnson (1921) are particularly informative, but even summarizing some of the many wampum records in the published literature provides a daunting challenge to those who consider the task. The unpublished documents are even more of a challenge to read for the relevant data they include.

**Wampum Storage: Bags, Boxes, Pouches, etc.**

Every culture requires bags or pouches of various types. Parfleche bags or cases, with their broad shoulder straps, may be one of the better known general categories of containers commonly used in aboriginal North America. The glass-beaded versions of the straps generally associated with this type of container often are mistaken for wampum bands. The slit pouches of eastern North America are very well documented by Feest (2006), who also offers an excellent bibliography. Most slit pouches could be folded over a belt. Drawstring pouches are perhaps as common (Kasprycki 1997). Various types of containers for tobacco and/or pipes are known, and several arrow quivers may be described as pouches. A Susquehannock “pouch” now at Skokloster Castle in Sweden, and that I had misidentified as Lenape in origin (Becker 1990), may fall in this category. The most ornate examples of every type survive as museum pieces.

Historical accounts rarely mention containers within their descriptions of cultures. De Vries (1853: 134, 140), in his early 1600s description of the “Indians here, whom they call Maquas” or “Maecquase Indians” [Mohawk], notes bags made of hemp fiber, but not their size nor shape. De Vries (1853: 139) mentions varieties of fish caught and dried, indicating that they “put them in notessin or bags, which they plait of hemp, which grows wild, and keep the fish in them till winter.” Even what is meant by “basket” in these accounts is problematical. On 9 August, 1681 the Maryland colonist named Daniel Mathews testified:

> “that an Indian came to his house in May or June last past two yeares agoe and he had a parcel of Letters in a silk grass basket, and Desired his wife to putt them up and my wife asked him from whence the Letters came, and the Indian answered that the Letters came from my Lord, … and … that he carried them to the Sinniquos, and my wife askt him what he carries then there for, the Sinniquos cannot read, and the Indian answered that the ffrench were hard by and that they could read them for the Sinniquos …”(Browne 1896, XV:406)
The intent of these letters was to arrange a peace with the raiding Seneca. Another colonist testified at the same time that he did not know who sent the letters or to whom, but the letters comprised “almost a small Indian basket full.”

A Wampum Bag and a Sachem as Described by Miss Jones

Very little is known about Electa Fidelia Jones (1806-1853). By the time that her book was published in 1854 she had been dead for almost a year (see also Jones 1852). On the 1850 census she was living in Stockbridge, with her brother and his family and her widowed mother. Electa was one of the nine children of Deacon Josiah Jones (ca 1770-1834) and Fidelia West, both of Connecticut. Quite possibly Electa became involved with the Stockbridge community of Mahican as a result of missionary interests. Ms. Jones was described as “a well-read antiquarian and genealogist” (Goodwin 1856: 135-136). Her slim contribution to the ethnographic record, although even less than that of Franklin B. Hough (see Einhorn 1976) and other scholars of that period, places her at the margins of proto-ethnographers, but as an early member of what might be called the anthropological community. Whether she knew of the work of Lewis Henry Morgan and others, or perhaps even corresponded with them, remains unknown.

Although we have no specific idea how Jones came to contact the Native peoples about whom she wrote, she was resident in or near Stockbridge, MA for much if not all of her life. Jones admirably recorded the role of an elder, or chief, among the Mahican (1854), one of the peoples resident in the Periphery where the Native cultures were distinct in so many ways from the Five Nations Iroquois (cf. Becker 2010). The Mahican had been among the many foraging groups along the Hudson River collectively identified as River Indians. Salwen (1978) locates the aboriginal Mahican as occupying the area on the eastern side of the Hudson River and all of the northernmost Housatonic River drainage. They had been dislodged from the west side of the Hudson by the Mohawk, probably by 1630. Conkey et al. (1978: 178, Fig. 1) locate the “settlement” known as “Wnahktukook” where Stockbridge was later situated, near the center of the border with New York in western Massachusetts. Barbara Covey (pers. Com. 7 June 2011) suggests that this name appears in the Moravian Archives as “Westenhuc” and also that it may have been used by the Moravians to refer to the Housatonic Valley in general.

Despite severe disruptions in the foraging range of the Mahican by Five Nations’ raids early in the 1600s, several scholars have made efforts to reconstruct their complex history and to link it to the limited archaeological evidence (Salwen 1978, Conkey et al. 1978, also see Huey 1993, Dunn 1994, 2000). At least one group of Mahican formed an integrated or cohesive tribal unit into and beyond the 1750s. On 29 June 1754, during the prelude to a major treaty at Albany, a message was delivered at the Court House indicating that “a considerable Number of Indians from Stock bridge, being of the Nation known by the name of the River Indians were in Town.” The bearers of this information also indicated to the officials that they often were “present at Treaties with the Six Nations.” The governor then included them in this gathering as a distinct tribe (O’Callaghan 1855, VI: 864-865), but they themselves did not present or receive wampum. Decades before the 1754 treaty, various factions of the Mahican had become affiliated with mission communities. By 1738 many were resident at the Stockbridge mission village, and many of these Mahican relocated to a tract made available to them by the Oneida in New York in the 1780s. By the 1800s most of the people who identified as Mahican had joined praying communities while others joined the various Oneida factions or had merged into colonial society.

The Electa Jones narration published in 1854 purports to be the story of Captain Hendrick Aupau-mut, a Mahican who had died circa 1829. Jones was 23 years of age in that year, but whether she had ever met Aupaumut is unknown. I do not believe that the narrative, transcribed below, derives from his views of Mahican culture. As P. Drooker points out (pers. com. 11 June 2011), this text appears to be a transcription of speech that is not that of a speaker of standard English. The text appears to be a Native recounting rather than an attempt to replicate faux-Native patterns. Hendrick Aupaumut contributed significantly to the “literature of the Muh-he-ka-ne-ok” (Jones 1854: 20), in the form
of religious writings in the Mahican (Mahikan) language. How much he influenced Jones is not clear, but she may have used his name when presenting this account because he was a well known military hero. We know less about Jones than about Hendrick Aupaumut (circa 1757 – circa 1829) who was born at Stockbridge, MA and served with distinction in the Revolutionary War. His early military successes led to his appointment as a captain. He also served in the War of 1812. Later he moved to Wisconsin where he translated a number of religious texts into Mahican.

We do not know how or why Electa Jones interacted with the Mahican, but it was probably at Stockbridge. While the account seems to offer information derived from Mahican still living in Stockbridge during the first half of the nineteenth century, there are many aspects of her narrative that appear to reflect Oneida material culture rather than Mahican. Her description of the role of an elder among the Mahican was as that of an unpaid person advising his people, but being provided with food and other resources in exchange. She also recorded the changes that had taken place among the “mission” Indians at Stockbridge, who elected a single leader in a very non-Native process.

The various peoples of New England, as well as the Mahican, used wampum almost exclusively when dealing with The Five Nations, or Core Area peoples. Wampum was rarely used in diplomacy among the peoples of the Periphery (see Becker 2010, also 2005). The Mahican traditionally employed wampum as ornamentation, often as bands. Small baskets were used to store their loose wampum. Jones’ description of the traditional role of a “Mahican” sachem appears combined with aspects of wampum diplomacy that appear to be Oneida. Diplomatic uses for wampum among the Five Nations had effectively ended about the time of Jones’s birth, and many Mahican had been resident among the Oneida for perhaps 50 years when Jones gathered her data. Where and from whom she gathered this information is important to understanding her description of the volumes of wampum held by the sachem. This report may reflect an elided view of wampum as seen by Mahican who had taken on an Oneida view of this commodity. This background is important when considering what Jones says about wampum and the containers in which beads were stored.

“The women also at times, some give him, Mkith-non, or Muk-sens [moccasins], some [give him ornamental] belts for the body, other garters, and some other ornaments – as wampum to be for his own use. They are also bring victuals to Sachem’s to enable him to feed strangers; - for whenever strangers arrived at their fire-place they are directed to go to [the] Sachem’s house. There they stay until their business is completed. The Sachem is allowed to keep Mno-ti, or peaceable bag, or bag of peace, containing about one bushel, some less. – This bag is made of Weeth-kuhn-pauk, or bitter sort of hemp; grows on [sic] intervals, about three or four feet long; and sometimes made of Wau-pon-nep-pauk, or white hemp, which grows by the side of rivers, or edges of marshes.- amazing strong and lasting – of which they make strings, and die [sic] part of the strings of different colors; then worked and made into bag of different marks. In this bag they keep various Squau-tho-won, or belts of wampum; also strings; which belts and strings they used to establish peace and friendship with different nations, and to use them on many occasions, and passed as coin. In this bag they keep all belts and strings which they received of their allies of different nations. This bag is, as it were, unmoveable [sic]; but it is [sic] always remain[ed] at [the] Sachem’s house, as hereditary with the office of a Sachem; and he is to keep the Pipe of Peace, made of red, hard stone – a long stem to it. Besides this bag, they keep other smaller bags which they call Ne-mau-won-neh Mno-ti, or Scrip, which contains nourishment on [a] journey, which they carry with them when they go out to hold treaties with other fire-places. In such scrips they occasionally put belts and strings for transacting business abroad. When they find the wampum will be [sic] fall short, besides what is kept in the bag, the Sachem and his counselors would send their runner to gather, or collect wampum from their women, which business [assembling of belts, or making of
beads] they called mauw-peen, or sitting into one place.” (E. Jones 1854: 21)

I suspect that tobacco pouches and the calumet pipe bags that were related to diplomacy during the pre-wampum era evolved into, or became interchangeable with, bags used to hold wampum. With the end of wampum diplomacy among the Five Nations Iroquois around 1800 CE, the smoking of “the Pipe of Peace” appears to have enjoyed a resurgence in the Northeast. References to pipes at treaties in this region, whether of catlinite or some other red stone (see Gundersen 1993) or soapstone, have not been gathered. My impression is that in the absence of wampum prestation, there was a revival of calumet rituals.

Changes in Makers and Uses of Wampum

Prior to 1700 wampum beads were almost exclusively made by Native peoples along Long Island Sound. About that time a colonial industry emerged that used early mass production techniques and generated large numbers of beads at low cost. This development in wampum technology appears to have generated a general devaluation in the value of wampum (cf. Becker 1980). As water- and wind-powered drilling and polishing techniques replaced Native hand labor, production costs dropped and most Natives may have left the market or became peripheral to it (cf. Becker 1995, 1999). There are records indicating that throughout the eighteenth century small numbers of wampum continued to be fashioned by Indians, but rarely from the areas in which major production existed prior to 1700. By 1810 wampum use in diplomacy had all but ended within the Core Area.

For a few years after 1810 a few wampum belts were still being used in diplomacy on the western frontier. Most commonly at that time the belts used were old examples that were “shown” but not given to participants in treaties. In New York and parts of Canada many of the surviving belts were being cannibalized. We do not know the source of the nearly 10,000 wampum beads used in the ecclesiastical belt fashioned at the Lake of the Two Mountains in Canada and sent to Pope Gregory XVI in 1831 (Becker 2001, 2006a). Quite possibly some old belts were dismantled as part of the effort to gather the necessary wampum to fashion new examples. The records suggest that wampum beads were still generally available when this last “traditional” band was assembled in 1831. No “new” examples of wampum bands are known to have been commissioned (see Lainey 2004: 31) or produced for traditional purposes after 1831 (but, see Becker 2015b).

In 1850 Lewis Henry Morgan had a wampum band assembled by Native crafters in what may be the earliest known example of experimental ethnography. I doubt that Morgan was aware of the making of the Vatican 1831 band. He may have wished to determine if the technology involved in “weaving” these artifacts was still viable in western New York. The band, which also may be considered as the first “reproduction” band, was commissioned by Morgan using nearly 2,000 old beads that Morgan had purchased from a daughter of Joseph Brant who may have lived on the Tonawanda Reservation, where he had the band made. This dark 7-row belt, now called “kaswénhtha,” is mostly dark beads with nine open diamonds, unevenly spaced, and a small open square at one end. The New York State Museum catalogue number is 37419 (Clarke 1908: Plate 30:2). The Morgan band has elements of construction not generally seen on any of the traditional bands that survive, although some aspects may be seen on the ecclesiastical belts now held at Chartres.

Linguistic Notes: Examining Terms Extracted from the Electa Jones Account Published in 1854:

Jonathan Lainey’s concern (2004) for the terms used for wampum by the French, as distinct from those used by Native purveyors, is vital to our understanding of differences in perception as well as possible regional differences in use. Let me note that the orthography used by linguists may incorporate an “8” to indicate, most simply, the “ou” of French or the “w” in English (Wendet = Ouendat = 8endat). John Steckley, in an important review of native terms used by various Iroquoian speakers, offers a section entitled “Beads and Oh8ista.” Specifically he provides references to Wendat terms for the type of container: “N. son,8aarenh8a. [N.
bears our bag, sack] N. nous trahit pprie [sic] porter a nos Ennemis le sac de porcelaine,” or “N. betrays us, properly, to bear to our enemies the bag of porcelain [wampum]” (Steckley 2007: 168-180, from Anon. 1697: 212). These linguistic data are accompanied by important data on the varied diplomatic uses of wampum.

Initially I had incorrectly believed that the “chief” of the Electa Jones account referred to an Oneida chief, since many of the people at Stockbridge had settled on lands of the Oneida after 1800. However, “chiefs” among the Oneida are more properly termed clan elders, while the once egalitarian Mahican at Stockbridge were electing a “chief” since before the 1800s (cf. Becker 2006b, 2010). Ives Goddard (pers. Coms. 22 Oct 2007, 27 May 2011) confirms that the words in the Jones transcription are Mahican and offers an important caution: “The publications of the Mahican history are full of copying errors; both must be used, and they must be analyzed critically, as sometimes when they disagree both are clearly wrong.” His study of linguistic variation within a small community in Canada where “Munsee” is spoken (Goddard 2010a, also 2010b) also provides some cautions that might be applied here. There is general agreement that ‘muk-sens,’ ‘wampum,’ and ‘sachem’ can be regarded as loanwords in English, of Native origin. Some suggested translations of the Native words said to have been spoken by Captain Hendrick Aupaumut are presented in Appendix I.

Surviving Wampum Bags: Susannah Swan’s and Others

Written records, probably reflecting family oral history, provided with the Susannah Swan basket suggest its function as a container for wampum. The Electa Jones narrative of 1854 provides information that appears pertinent to the suggested function of the Swan basket. The Jones account was unknown to Drooker and Hamell (2004) when they published a superlative description of Susannah Swan’s “wampum bag.” Their well illustrated and exhaustive review of this important ethnographic item, which remains in private hands, is now enhanced by the record offered by Jones.

Susannah Swan had been held captive among the “Abenaki” (probably Norridgewock) of southern Maine in the late seventeenth-century. Based on their research, Drooker and Hamell found the traditional date accompanying this object correlated reasonably with a date that could be assigned based on their research into the history of this twined basket. The basket measures 21 cm high, with “a distorted 28 cm wide equivalent to a diameter of about 18 cm.” Being unaware of the historical documents relating to wampum, Drooker and Hamell suggest that “Given this bag’s original form and large size, its dedicated use to store and transport wampum seems very unlikely.” This container may have been used to store loose beads, or even a few wampum bands, especially of the size of the narrow ornamental bands made by the Penobscot of northern New England (Becker 2012c). Even one very large container would not have been able to hold the quantities of diplomatic belts brought to any major treaty attended by one or more of the Five Nations Iroquois; a volume of wampum that Einhorn (1974: 72) describes as enough to “stagger the imagination.”

The Swan bag is made of a combination of 2-ply cordage (warp) and flat basswood strips (dark weft) and the lighter color weft is formed from (flattened? hollow plant stems, possibly rush (Drooker and Hamell 2004: 200, Welters and Ordoñez 2002). The design on the Susannah Swan “bag” includes “serrated-edge diagonals” (Drooker and Hamell 2004: 203; see also Ulrich 2001). This motif is often seen in the patterns that appear on a number of wampum bands (Lainey 2004: passim). Also impressive are the five examples of similar twined containers that survive, carefully listed by Drooker and Hamell (2004: 205-210).

Perhaps the most significant “feature” of the Swan bag is a detail in the tale that is part of the history of this item. The legend recounts that she escaped with the help of one woman who gave her a blanket and “a ‘wampum bag’ containing food” for the journey (Drooker and Hamell 2004: 198). The account with the bag echoes aspects of the Electa Jones narrative of 1854 in which bags used to hold food are described as sometimes holding wampum:
“they keep other smaller bags which they call Ne-mau-won-neh Mno-ti, or Scrip, which contains nourishment on [a] journey, which they carry with them when they go out to hold treaties with other fireplaces. In such scrips they occasionally put belts and strings for transacting business abroad”

This echoes the food and/or wampum-holding functions of the Susannah Swan bag. The Jones data suggests a strong association between the ethnographic wampum “bag” and her 1854 description of containers that could be used for food or for wampum. The relatively small bags made in New England are likely to have held both strung and loose wampum, rather than diplomatic and other bands.

Very few examples of twined basketry survive from anywhere in the greater Northeastern region. An extraordinarily well preserved twined example now in the Musée du quai Branly – Jacques Chirac (Musée de l’Homme: M.H.78-32-71) had long been in the Cabinet du Roi in Paris (see Phillips 1987: 48). This 12.5 inch (32 cm) tall example is identified as a “Huron type” basket (see Phillips 1987: 48) and dated to about 1725. The impressive design includes a vivid meander pattern among other elements (cf. the design on the Mollocket wallet; No. 8 in Appendix II, below). The paucity of surviving examples of basketry in this region leads us to consider the equally rare archaeological examples. Not surprisingly, archaeological evidence for organic containers is extremely rare (see Ordoñez and Welters 2004; also Welters et al. 1996). Some extremely fragmentary remains of possible baskets that are held at Harvard’s Peabody Museum are listed in Appendix II, below, which is far from a complete listing of examples from the Northeast. Also noted in that Appendix are some fragmentary organic remains that derive from Wapanucket 8, a specific area within a huge, sprawling area in which have been found traces of activity from the Late Paleoindian through the Contact Period. All the Wapanucket Loci are in Middleborough, MA. Loci 3, 6 and 8 of this complex include encampments dated to the Late Archaic period (Robbins 1959a, 1959b, 1980, 1970, Robbins and Agogino 1964). None of Robbins’ works mentions the important findings of basketry or fiber within the Wapanucket site-complex, as I identify the general area. Appendix II lists two locations at which basketry or related fibrous materials that have originated from the various excavations within the general area of these Wapanucket sites.

Discussion

There are a small number of Native-made baskets that survive in collections and a very few represented by archaeological finds. Assigning functions to any of these relies, to a great extent, on oral tradition. Thus the tradition associated with one basket previously had no independent evidence to support the “legend” that long had been associated with it. Discovery of an independent statement by Electa Jones, dating from 170 years ago, provides important confirmation of the association of wampum with this surviving example. Anthony Wonderley (2004: xx-xxi) correctly observes that “wampum undoubtedly is the most symbolically charged substance known to the Iroquois people today.” Thus the discovery of any item associated with storage or use of wampum beads has importance for Native culture history. As recently as the 1950s, artifacts incorporating wampum were recognized primarily as reflecting monetary meanings, or as marking political events in culture history. The search for more relevant symbols in the quest for a new identity among deculturated Native Americans in the Northeast led to what I see as the abandonment of Plains Indian headdresses and the sacralization of wampum bands. In the course of this shift, or revival, a new set of fictions have been devised, generally devoid of any connection with the complex historical record and cultural values of those peoples who once actually used wampum. Just as teepees were used by modern peoples whose ancestors never had horses or lived on the Plains, wampum has become inserted into the histories of peoples far removed from the original makers and users of this commodity.

The majority of the known documentary references to wampum containers for which the material can be determined appear to indicate that they are leather bags (Becker Ms. B). Specific identification of a wampum container as a basket, of either fiber or wooden slats, is rare (Fitzgerald 2008; cf. Becker 2014b). I infer that fiber or leather bags used to transport and store diplomatic belts that were
received by Native groups employed only Native materials in their fabrication. This would be in keeping with the nativistic attributes of wampum use (but not manufacture, which required metal awls or drills). Bags incorporating wool are unlikely to have been used to hold diplomatic wampum, but may have been used as containers for ornamental wampum. I believe that wampum bands strung on wool as well as baskets incorporating wool are most likely to derive from the Periphery. Some containers in New England, where diplomatic uses for wampum were rare (Becker 2010), incorporated woolen ornamentation. The use of wool (another non-Native product) in making these containers, which could have served to store loose beads or for strings of ornamental wampum, may offer clues regarding those five belts now known to be strung on woolen lines (cf. Becker Ms. C).

While researching containers for wampum I found that of those now known, two incorporate woolen yarn in their production: the Dinah Fenner basket and the basket at the Heritage Museum. The presence of this basic material, a colonial product not yet part of Native industry, provides insights into a class of wampum bands postulated several years ago (Becker Ms. C). At least five of the surviving wampum bands are known to be strung on woolen warp, a group not previously recognized as representing a distinct “class” of bands. The post-1999 recognition of distinct categories of wampum bands, such as ornamental and ecclesiastical (Becker 2001), sets the stage for the identification of characteristics that denote the different uses to which bands were put. I believe that bands using woolen warp, like bands that incorporate glass and/or metal beads, functioned as ornamental examples. Both the Fenner and Heritage Plantation baskets (Appendix II, nos. 5 and 7) may have been used as wampum containers and both incorporate woolen ornamentation. Both have their origins among peoples living in the Periphery of wampum use, where diplomatic belts seldom appear (Becker 2005, 2010). The use of non-Native materials, such as glass or copper beads, is common on ornamental bands (e.g Ordoñez and Welters 2004: Fig. 9.4). I postulate that only Native-made products were used for diplomatic wampum, and believe that materials used in containers for diplomatic wampum were similarly free from imported elements. Ornamental bands of wampum, however, incorporated purchased materials such as glass or brass beads. This leads me to postulate that some bands of ornamental wampum had been strung on wool. This insight enables us to suggest that the five bands of wampum now known that are strung on wool (Becker Ms. C) all derive from the Periphery of wampum use, and that all were ornamental in function.

For any research relating to woven or fiber bags, and not just in the Northeast, the tour de force paper by Drooker and Hamell (2004) must be a starting point. This brilliant review of the subject, and its definitive study of the Swan bag as an outstanding surviving example, carefully notes the legends, or “oral tradition” associated with this artifact. The validity of any supposed oral tradition is extremely difficult to verify. Distinguishing a chain of reliable oral transmission from stories made up by a narrator anywhere along the line is a goal of folklorists and anthropologists alike. The narration that accompanied the Swan bag was carefully recorded by the family (see Drooker and Hamell 2004) and includes many important features that can be researched. The connection of the Jones text of 1854 with the “wampum” aspect of the Swan narrative derives through my studies of all aspects of wampum. In this situation the Jones narrative offers an extraordinary confirmation of the validity of the oral tradition that is part of the history of the Swan bag.

Conclusion

By the end of the American Revolution the new government’s political interactions with the several Six Nations had become extraordinarily complex. The terms of treaties, often involving massive tracts of land once hunted by those Iroquoians who had joined the losing side of the war, were seen as extremely generous by the victors. The complexities of these treaties were far greater and far more involved than could be “recorded” by the belts commonly presented in years past as part of these kinds of negotiations. Wampum belts as symbols of former accords, often quite changeable, did not suit the new political realities (Lainey 2004). The varied fates of individual belts, or rather the histories of surviving examples of wampum, are
still being studied. The containers in which these once important symbols were stored remains even more rarely documented (see Becker 2013a). Considering this category of material culture provides us with an expanded view of how diplomatic belts and loose wampum were used during the period in which they were central to diplomacy in a specific region of the Northeast.

Within the cultures where they were used, wampum containers were a subset of bags or pouches. The oral tradition that is linked with the Susannah Swan basket, or bag, was examined through the direct evidence for how wampum belts were used and reused. Early documents relating to how wampum "records" were preserved suggest that the tribes in the Core Area held them as communal property, but without rigorous attention paid to individuals who held them or to the original "meanings" of specific examples (Becker 2013b).

The Native-made fiber basket or bag with an associated oral tradition suggesting that it may have served to store wampum (see Drooker and Hamell 2004) appears similar to small "scrip" bags described in 1854 by E. Jones, or perhaps to the larger "bag of peace" described in her account. The use of small containers to store food as well as wampum, as described in the Jones account, provides an independent validation of the functions that were recorded for the Swan artifact.

APPENDIX I: Translations of Mahican terms extracted from the Electa Jones (1854) narration.

The primary question regarding the Native terms used by Jones in her account concerns the specific language that was used. As noted in the text, Goddard affirms that these words are indeed Mahican in origin. In searching for translations for this set of Algonquian words I turned to Goddard and several others who had various suggestions. Most of what is appended here is based on translations as suggested by Raymond Whritenour (pers. coms. 18 Oct. 2007) based on what he knows of the "dialects" of the several peoples often called "Delaware." These tribes include both the Lenape and Lenópi, along the lower Delaware River, and other "Delwarean dialects" or languages. These include the languages spoken by the various peoples called "Munsee" as well as the Mahican, and I presume by many other tribes up along the Hudson River (see Becker 2016b) and into New England. O'Meara's (1996) "Delaware-English" dictionary uses "Delaware" as a gloss for "Munsee Delaware," peoples who derive from the Hudson valley.

In his suggested translations for the terms listed below Whritenour uses "Del." for what he calls "Mission Delaware." This is, basically, what some call the Northern Unami dialect that was spoken by the people of New Jersey south of the Raritan. These are the people whom I believe called themselves Lenopi [Leh-NOH-pih] (Becker 1987, 2008a). Some of these people had migrated into Pennsylvania after 1733 (see Becker 1987), from where they later referred to the Lenape, who lived down the Delaware River below the Lehigh River in Pennsylvania, as "Unami" (Down River People).

muk-sens : cf. Del., maksen ("shoe")

wampum < wamp- ("white") + -um (contraction from wampumpew, or what MJB translates as white shell beads). Whritenour translates "Northern Unami" (Becker's Lenópi) "wapapiak" (the nasal "m" being absent) as "white wampum beads." Whitenour states that "The generic term for wampum in Delaware is 'kekw' (pronounced like English 'cake' plus whispered voiceless 'w'" (Pers. Com. 2 June 2011)

sachem = Del., sakina (RW "chief"; Becker suggests "elder")

mno-ti = Del., menotey ("bag")

weeth-kuhn-pauk: RW suggests that this basically translates as "bitter leaf." Goddard believes this may be the bitter variety of hemp, Apocynum cannabinum. Varieties of hemp were used for cordage and basketry throughout the Northeast. Goddard (pers. Com. 27 May 2011) offers the following discussion (italics added):
"The second element is the cognate of Munsee áhlapak ‘(commercial) flax plants’ (< *'Apocynum [Indian hemp] plants or strings’, latterly called ahlapíisak), varying in shape according to the Mahican metrical pattern (which resembles but differs from the Delaware pattern of weak-strong alternation). The retention of the animate plural suffix as Mahican “-auk” (which would match Munsee -eek) is a remarkable archaism; cf. the Meskwaki cognate asapye:ki 'Apocynum strings'."

wau-pon-nep-pauk = [RW] wau-p- (“white”) + -on-neppauk (“leaf”). Goddard suggests that this may be white hemp, Apocynum sibericum.

squau-tho-won = Del., ochquason (“wampum belt”; I suggest this is refers to a “wampum band,” as in an ornamental or decorative band of wampum; cf. Becker 2008b).

ne-mau-won-neh mno-ti = Del., *nimawanni menotey (“food bag” or “provisions bag”)

mauw-pee: Goddard (pers. com. 27 May 2011) offers the following commentary on this word:

“Hendrick explains ‘mauw-pee’ as the word for collecting wampum ‘from their women’ in order to have wampum belts and strings for diplomatic use. The Munsee cognate is máawapuw ‘makes a contribution, puts money in the collection plate’ (O’Meara [1996]). The ambiguity about collecting or contributing is probably an artifact of translation that would be cleared up if we had actual sentences. As Hendrick says,”the literal meaning is ‘sitting into one place’ (< maaw- ‘gather’ + -apii ‘sit’; not maw- ‘go and’); so the reference was originally to what Hendrick calls ‘transacting business abroad,’ and the meaning later shifted. All in all a good example of how meanings can drift in cultural context and do not always correspond to the etymology.”

APPENDIX II.
The Swan Wampum Bag and a preliminary listing of bags, baskets, and fragments of Native-made woven objects from the Northeast that have been excavated or preserved (cf. Turnbaugh and Turnbaugh 1986, 2014, etc.).

J. B. Petersen’s (1996) efforts to showcase the importance of fiber arts in eastern North America brought together a number of important papers on the subject. Petersen’s work was significantly augmented by a later compendium by Drooker and Hamell (2004: Tables 11.1 and 11.2) that includes information about “false embroidered” bags and pocketbooks, both Algonquian (N=3) and Iroquoian (N=6), as well as two Algonquian bags worked in wrapped twining (see also Webster and Drooker 2000: 6, Table 1.2).

Drooker and Hamell (2004) provide an important update to Charles C. Willoughby’s (1935: 244-258) pioneering review of textiles and fabrics that had been recovered from early grave excavations. Willoughby had noted several ethnographic items then in various collections, but that listing has been significantly augmented by the Drooker and Hamell volume (2004), that remains the standard reference for known surviving examples. Brassier’s listing of false embroidered, twined examples (1975: 64) includes eight surviving ethnographic pieces plus two that appear depicted in works of art; on a water color (No. 1) and a painting (No. 4).

Willoughby (1935: 138) also had noted an important account from near Plymouth Harbor in 1603, nearly two decades before the arrival of the Pilgrims. Two quivers (pouches?) fashioned from rushes are described; divided into compartments (for bow and also for arrows?). Ulrich (2001: 47-50, 426 n.19) offers an update with several useful references to preserved Native textiles in New England (cf. Turnbaugh 1984, McNeil 2003). Other important publications also should be noted (e.g. McMullen and Handsman 1987; Turnbaugh and Turnbaugh 1999; S. Turnbaugh and Turnbaugh 2014). McMullen and Handsman (1987) also provide illustrations of two fragments of Seneca baskets dating to the late 1600s that are useful comparative examples.
Most of the items listed below are containers, but some separate fiber fragments are included as indications of the techniques that were commonly used by Natives in making mats and cordage. Woodsplint examples are not included here, but are the focus of work by W. and S. Turnbaugh (2013; see also Becker 2014b). Archaeological as well as ethnographic finds of plants that were used for other functions, such as the sedges used for insulation (Largy and Rainey 2006) are not included in the following list. The few examples noted here of basketry and cordage from the Northeast represent only a glimpse of the hundreds of surviving storage containers made and used by Native Americans that now survive in museum collections around the world. All these rare items merit extreme care in their preservation (see Kuttruff and Strickland-Olsen 2000; Gardner 1996; W. and S. Turnbaugh 2013).

Not included below are the considerable numbers of textiles and organic materials recovered in the burial ground on Conanicut Island in Narragansett Bay (Simmons 1970, plus an array of later publications as listed by Ulrich 2001: 427 n.23). Also not reviewed is the impressive artifact array from Burr’s Hill in Warren, RI (Gibson 1980), and a vast assemblage of organic remains skillfully recovered from two major sites excavated under the auspices of the Mashantucket Pequot Museum archaeological program (see McBride 1993a, 1993b, also 1984). These sites have not been revealed and only hints of these important collections are available in print. Goodby’s (1998) suggestion that there was an intensification in the decoration of pottery and hemp baskets in southern New England might be tested through a review of the evidence now available.

Note also should be made of the large numbers of bags, baskets and other objects in various collections that are identified as Indian in origin or having belonged to a known Native personage. These generally cannot be documented as Indian made (see Holdcraft et al. 2007 for a belt attributed to (King Phillip”). Perhaps the most interesting of these “attributed” items is a bag (Peabody Museum Harvard cat. No. 90-17-50/49302) long believed to have belonged to the Wampanoag named Caleb Cheeshataeumuck. Cheeshataeumuck had completed his degree at the Harvard Indian College in 1665, but died tragically before being awarded the diploma. The bag had been held at the American Antiquarian Society prior to transfer to the Peabody Museum. A paper label from the AAS provided the earlier attribution. Recent examination of this bag suggests that the techniques used to fashion it, and possibly the fibers themselves, derive from West Africa (Eager 2002).

1. Wampum bag, later converted to a Sewing Bag: The Swan Bag (Private collection).
Height 21cm, diameter ca 18cm (Privately owned).

Drooker and Hamell (2004) provide, along with their impressive study of the Swan bag, an excellent listing of those woven fiber containers from the greater Northeastern region that are now known to survive. Very little historical information or any “oral tradition” survives for most of the examples noted below, which leaves the Swan bag as a notable piece. The evidence from the 1854 Electa Jones account, included above, provides an independent confirmation of the record that accompanies the Swan Sewing Bag (see also Ulrich 2001: 49-50, 427, n21, Fig.; also Becker 2016).

2. “Huron or Iroquois type” Basket (Musee de l’Homme 78.32.71)
Phillips 1987: 48, item “W 51”: An early basket displayed at an exhibition in 1987, along with an early bag (see below), were published with only brief and possibly erroneous information. The tiny basket is identified as “Huron or Iroquois type, early 18th-century type” and said to be made only of vegetable fiber and moose hair. Before 1789 this “basket” was held in the Cabinet du Roi, Paris. Most of the Native pieces in the Royal collections came from French Canada, and a Huron or other northern origin is probable. The height is given as 12.5cm and circumference at 34.5cm, suggesting a small diameter of ca. 11 cm.

3. Twined basket from the northern Great Lakes, ca. 1725, in the Wörlitz collection (Phillips 1987: 83, fig. 74).
Phillips (see Number 2, above) identifies a second container in the 1987 exhibition catalogue as a twined bag or bucket, and is tentatively dated
at early 18th century (Figure 2). The materials include an unidentified fiber with possible porcupine quillwork decoration. The height is listed at 22cm and the circumference from 42 to 54cm, suggesting a diameter of ca 13-17cm.

Figure 2: Twined Basket from the Northern Great Lakes, ca. 1725, now in the Wörlitz Collection (see Phillips 1988: 83).

(Holdcraft et al. 2007: 4, Fig. 7)
This highly ornamented “Abenaki” bag definitely incorporates Eastern Indian design elements (cf. Bourque and LaBar 2009:12-23, for so called “Wabanaki” ties to the Iroquois at Caughnawaga).

5. Rhode Island Historical Society (Providence). Catalogue Number 4-B.1132
The “Dinah Fenner” basket, donated to the RIHS in 1842. Narragansett twined basket, ca. 1675 (Simmons 1978 190-197). S. Turnbaugh and W. Turnbaugh (1986: 121) list the original catalogue number as 1842.2.1. Height ca. 10-12 cm (ca. 5-6 inches).

Drooker and Hamell (2004: 205-206, Figs 11.15.a & b, Table 11.3) make comparisons between the RIHS example and the Swan bag. Willoughby (1935: 251-254, Fig 135), who describes the RIHS item at length and provides excellent illustrations, identifies it as Narragansett in origin. The “find location” of this tumbler-sized container is given as Cranston, RI. Simmons (1978, Fig. 2) offers this description: “Design formed by 2-strand twined weft of cornhusk or other fiber and red wool around a basswood warp. The red wool, now largely disintegrated, may have filled most of the open areas”. See also comments listed with No. 7, below. This basket has excellent documentation. It is exhaustively described and illustrated by Ulrich (2001: 41-48, Figs., notes 1-19 on pp. 425-426), who provides important data and illustrations for several other examples (see also W. and S. Turnbaugh 1999: 65, also S. and W. Turnbaugh 2014).

Received as a gift in 1842 (Ulrich 2001: 48-49, 427, figs.; Salwen 1978: 163, Fig. 3; Willoughby 1935: 253-255, Fig. 136; Butler 1947; esp. S. and W. Turnbaugh 2014).
Height ca. 32cm (12 inches)
Salwen identifies this as a Mohegan twined basket made of Indian hemp (Apocynum cannabinum) and gives a probable date as mid-17th century. Cynthia Tecumwas, or Tocumwas (b. 1775) donated this object to the Society and identified it as a “Yohicake basket” or a container for carrying or storing powdered parched maize (for the Tocumwas or Tocamwap family, see Butler 1947: 42). The reconstruction of the basket and its complex design pattern derive from Willoughby (1935: 253). P. Drooker (pers com. June 2011) points out that at least two sources identify porcupine quills in this piece (McMullen and Handsman 1987: 8, 86; Turnbaugh and Turnbaugh 1999: 65). Ulrich (2001: 48) says that the weaver “inserted porcupine quills in two shades to create the design.” This has not been verified. The present location of this basket remains unverified.

7. The Heritage Plantation of Sandwich (Mass.)
By good fortune this important basket was donated to the Heritage Plantation for its museum in 1989, but it came with no historic information or tradition linked with it (Rasmussen 1992). This 4 inch high melon shaped basket is just over 4 inches in diameter and has a neck diameter of 3¼ inches.
There is no collar area. It is believed to date from the colonial period. Ulrich (2001: 50) notes that like the “Dinah Fenner” bag (number 5, above) this example “mixes wool with bark.” Ulrich says that the “handling of the materials is different.” In the Heritage Plantation example Ulrich (2001: 50, 417 n22) observes that the “warps are ‘plied’ or doubled and the wool worked in later, as with the porcupine quills on the Yohicake [Connecticut Historical Society, Hartford] bag” (Number 6, above: see Rasmussen 1992). Drooker (pers. Com. June 2011) points out “that this is a confusing statement, as the ‘false embroidery’ technique used on the Yohicake bag would have been done at the same time as the structural twining, not later.”

8. The Mollocket Wallet at the Maine Historical Society, Portland, ME. (Estimated 4 by 9 ½ inches, open). Perhaps the most important surviving fiber artifact listed by Willoughby is a “Twofold Pocket-book” made by an Arosaguntacook woman named Mollocket, about 1785, for Eli Twicket in western Maine (Willoughby 1935: 256-257, Fig. 138) (Figure 3). This “Pocket-book” is also identified by Willoughby as a purse, but today an item of this form would be called a wallet. Day (1978: 155, Fig. 5) describes it as “designed” by Mali [Mary] Agat, also identified as Mollocket, a Native woman who died in 1816 (see McBride 1999). Ulrich (2001: 248-276) lists it as “Molly Ocket’s Pocketbook.” Brass er (1975: 64, 76 fig.11, 98 Fig. 32) identifies it as “twined” and decorated in false embroidery (see also Drooker and Hamell 2004: 205, 207; Bourque and Labar 2009: 52-55).

9. The Wapanucket Archaeological Site, Middleborough, MA. In the Robbins Museum
A significant piece of basketry has been identified, now in the Robbins Museum, that was recovered from an aspect of the sprawling Wapanucket site complex in southeastern Massachusetts (Figure 4). This artifact may date from the Contact period, but further review of the context as well as the artifact is warranted. Curtiss Hoffman gives the dimensions of this piece as about 20 by 30cm. Publications relating to the decades-long excavations at this important site in Massachusetts, most of which is dated to the Archaic period, make no reference to any of the organic remains from after 1000 AD that have been recovered there. The record of such materials may have been recorded in the relevant artifact cards. The rarity of these finds may have been appreciated by the early excavators in that area, but at the time of their recovery specialists in the analysis of such materials were extremely rare.

Organic materials from the Wapanucket archaeological site may owe their survival to the bacterioci dical (poisonous) properties of copper oxides. Not known at this time is whether the copper that had been in contact with these preserved items within the Wapanucket complex was imported from Europe or part of the extensive pre-Columbian copper mining and trading system. The study of these organic materials would be instructive.
Figure 4: Basketry Fragment from Excavations at the Wapanucket Site Complex. This rare fiber artifact is now in the collections of the Robbins Museum, Middleborough, Massachusetts. (Photograph by Dr. Curtiss Hoffman. Used with permission of the Director of the Robbins Museum).

A second example of fibrous materials from the Wapanucket complex found its way to the state of Maine. Prior to 2004, the Davistown Museum in Liberty, Maine received a collection of Native American artifacts recovered by John Davis at the Wapanucket “Village” and “crematory” on Assawompsett Lake in Middleborough, Massachusetts. The Davistown Museum was founded by its Curator, H. G. Skip Brack. John Davis, long affiliated with the Massachusetts Archaeological Society, excavated at the Wapanucket site from 1950-1982. Most of that time he worked under the direction of Maurice Robbins, but for several seasons after Robbins retired Davis directed the dig. The materials acquired by the Davistown Museum may have been collected during those last years. The protocol at Wapanucket – contrary to modern practice – was that excavators could keep what they found, with the exception of grave goods – so long as they recorded it and turned over the artifact cards to Robbins.

Among the several dozen stone tools within this particular collection of Wapanucket materials at the Davistown Museum are a few “Basket Fragments” identified as 011304NA2 (Status DTM). The material is described as being 1½ inches long or less, and is lodged in a case marked FA417-WAP-8-1974. An illustration of these is available on the Museum’s web site (http://davistownmuseum.org/). Very few traces of organic remains were collected from the general Wapanucket site in the Middleboro area. Two of the post-Contact Wapanucket graves are believed to have yielded woolen remains (M. Ordoñez, pers. com., June 2011; cf. Welters and Ordoñez 2004). These materials, both either from Christian or Christian influenced contexts, now are curated at the University of Rhode Island (see also 11, below).


Willoughby (1935) made note of the three examples of “textiles” from the same burial context then at the Peabody Museum (see in Loren 2008: 100-101). These are as follows:

A. PM22-52-10/A5478

This small piece of “textile” believed to be Native-made and probably part of a bag, was found in Manchester, NH. Loren (2008: 100-101, Fig. 4.6) states that it was made from butterfly milkweed (Asclepias tuberosa). Loren (pers. Com. 24 May 2011) gives the dimensions of this “textile” as 6.5 x 3.6 cm and points out that is “s-spun and stained with copper.”

B. PM22-52-10/A5479

Loren (pers. Com. 24 May 2011) describes this fragment as tightly woven and made from a loosely spun fiber. She remains unsure if this is also milkweed.

C. PM22-52-10/A5480

Loren (pers. Com. 24 May 2011) describes this object as “cordage” and indicates that it also may be made from milkweed.

11. Peabody Museum, Harvard: Twined baskets (N=2)


12. A Fragment from Lake Cochituate, Massachusetts

A piece of Native American cordage found in Framingham, MA is part of the John Carlson collection at the Robbins Museum. This tiny piece of basketry is expertly described and evaluated in a valuable paper that appeared in the *Bulletin of the Massachusetts Archaeological Society* (Petersen et al. 1987: 2-3).
13. *Conanicut Island, Rhode Island (Simmons 1970)*

This important cemetery site yielded an array of organic remains, many of which have been published. As is the case with the Burr’s Hill site, also in Rhode Island, the publication of these items has been reviewed elsewhere (see Ulrich 2001).

14. *Burr’s Hill, Rhode Island (Gibson 1980)*

This second important cemetery site known from Rhode Island (cf. No. 13, above) also offers information on Native life in this region during a short part of the Colonial period. Ulrich (2001) offers a useful review of the basketry from this site.

15. *Two Archaeological Sites in Connecticut*

The massive amounts of information regarding ancient life recovered from two major sites in southern Connecticut defy efforts to ready the information for publication. Some hint of what was found is provided by K. McBride (1993). Ulrich (2001: 426 n13) says that she and Prof. M. Ordóñez examined “wampum strips” on 13 June 1991; strips that I believe came from the excavations sponsored by the Mashantucket Pequot Museum. The names and locations of these sites are part of the information restricted by the Museum directors (but, see McBride 1993a, 1993b).

16. *Susanna Eastman Wood’s Basket*

This artifact is described by Bourque and LaBar (2009: 56, Fig. 2.34).

17. *Indian Queen Basket in the British Museum*

Bushnell (1906: 675) identified, as item “No. 1735” in the collections of the British Museum, “A fine large Indian basket made by an Indian Queen, [collected?] by Mr[.] Winthrop from New England.” Bushnell (1906” 680-681, Pl. XXXVII) also lists as item No. 203, an Indian purse measuring 95 by 30 mm.
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Algonquian Shellfish Industries on Cape Ann

Mary Ellen Lepionka


Atlantic shellfish include soft-shell clams (Mya arenaria) in the tidal riverbeds and salt marshes; oysters (Crassostrea virginica), mussels (Mytilis edulis), whelks (Buscyon, Nucella lapillus), and crustaceans, such as crabs (Brachyurans), in rocky headlands and inlets; surf clams (Spisula solidissima), razor clams (Ensis directus), quahogs (Mercenaria mercenaria), scallops (Argopecten irradians), horseshoe crabs (Limulus polyphemus), and lobsters (Homo- rus americanus) on the oceanside beaches; marine moon snails (Naticidae natica and polinices); and various freshwater and land snails (Abbott 2014).

(See Figures 1 and 2.) Figure 1, courtesy of the New England Aquarium, shows the following marine resources [in alphabetical order]: Lobster claw, Skate egg case, Blue mussel shells, Hermit crab molt, Surf clam shell, Sand dollar tests, Horseshoe crab molt, Moon snail shell, Moon snail shell with “snail fur”, Dog whelk, Green sea urchin tests, Knobbed whelk, Periwinkle shells, Bay scallop shell, Horse mussel shell, Channeled whelk egg cases, Waved whelk shell, Jonah crab molt, Waved whelk egg cases, Sea star. Figure 2 shows surf clam shells recovered from a midden at Wingaersheek.

Figure 1: Some New England Shellfish
Early histories record native shellfish processing on the Essex County coast (e.g., Felt 1862). More recently, Cultural Resource Management archaeological projects, on file at the Massachusetts Historical Commission, also suggest the existence of an extensive and increasingly intensive shellfish industry on Cape Ann from the Middle Archaic through the Woodland Period and into the Contact Period (e.g., Thompson 1978, Savulis et al. 1979, Raber & Tannenbaum 1981, Leveillee 1988, Dwyer & Edens 1995, Wheeler & Stachiw 1996, Macpherson & Ritchie 1999, Bell 2009). Also of interest in this context is a significant decrease in the size of shellfish specimens over time, largely a consequence of increasing overconsumption (Brennan 1974, Sargent 2011). The map in Figure 3 shows the locations and sites identified in this article.

Documented shellfish processing sites are on Rust Island and Pearce (Merchant) Island in the Annisquam River, in Curtis Cove and on Thurston Point in Riverview, and on the Wheeler’s Point peninsula at the junction of two tidal rivers, the Annisquam River and Mill River. Frank Speck and Frederick Johnson documented these middens, now mere remnants, between 1918 and 1925 (Speck 1923, Dexter 1984). The assigned site numbers are on file cards at the R. S. Peabody Museum of Archaeology in Andover, MA.

Local legend describes the midden at Wheeler’s Point as 10 or 12 feet in height in the early 19th century and Damariscotta-like in scale (Sanger &
Shell fragments are still eroding out of the earth over the entire peninsula. European settlers mined this and other middens for construction fill and for the manufacture of lime to sweeten their gardens in Cape Ann’s acidic soils (U.S. Dept. of Agriculture 1984; Cronon 2003).

Pits with calcined shell in the remains of middens attest to the presence of lime kilns (Dincauze 1996). So-called Clamhouse Landing, a peninsula on the Cox Reservation in Essex, is actually the eroding remains of a massive shell heap created through shellfish processing by many generations of Algonquians. A grove of red cedars has grown up through the eroding deposit (Figure 5). Clamhouse Landing is on the Essex River (aka Chebacco River) and features rock outcrops undoubtedly used in seafood production (Figure 6). The people harvested clam meats and laid them out on the
rocks to dry, preserving them for trade inland and for winter stew pots (e.g., Gookin 1674). A huge eroding midden along the seaward side of Choate (Hog) Island in Essex Bay has similar features, including a grove of mature pignut hickory trees that has grown up through the deposit (Choate 1890, Beddall 2014).

Extensive middens on Coffins Beach, as well as Castle Neck in Ipswich, lie under the dunes (Davis 1996). Information about the excavation of sites on Cranes Beach on Castle Neck appear to have been suppressed by the Trustees of Reservations for unknown reasons, but the sites appear on LeBaron’s 1874 archaeological map of the area (LeBaron 1874; Massachusetts Trustees of Reservations 2004, 2013). (See Figure 7) In the 1930s amateur archaeologist N. Carleton Phillips excavated shell heaps on Castle Neck, Coles Island, and Coffins Beach that contained burials (Phillips c.1940, 1941). He told Rotarians (c.1940):

The next place we went to was Cole’s Island, and here there is a very interesting site. We found a pile of clam shells that in the widest part is 3 feet deep in an occupied area perhaps 12 X 25 feet. Now that’s a pile of clams! Now over there on Cole’s Island I got another skeleton. This skeleton was buried about 17 inches deep, the head to the North, the face toward the West, and flexed, which was true Indian style.... It was right near where we had found this wonderful shell heap that we also found the wigwam site....

Phillips sent selected skeletal material to Harvard for analysis and the correspondence survives along with his scripts for his Rotary talks, stored in the archives of the Cape Ann Museum in Gloucester. At Coffins Beach Phillips also found preserved cornrow mounds containing broken shells. He speculated that in addition to practicing dry farming techniques to preserve moisture in the sandy mounds, Algonquian farmers intentionally added broken shells to stabilize the mounds and to augment the topsoil with lime.

Shell heaps and occasional midden were also reported on the islands of Essex Bay, including Conomo Point, Cross Island, and Spit Island in addition to Hog Island, as well as in Annisquam. Fossilized shells recovered from sites on Hog Island and Coles Island include a knobbed whelk, a large Atlantic mussel, and an Atlantic bay scallop, from the private collection of Tom Ellis of Gloucester (see Figure 8).
A carved mussel shell (Figure 9), taken from an Annisquam burial in the 1930s, may have been used as a hand tool to smooth the coils of clay pots, creating a uniform surface, and/or to mark the surface of damp clay pots during manufacture. This and other artifacts from Cape Ann, including possibly utilized razor clam shells, are in the Chadwick Collection at the Robbins Museum of Archaeology in Middleborough, Massachusetts (Chadwick 1986).
Tools for processing shellfish include small lap anvils, like the one in Figure 10, and palm-size hammerstones, found on Coles Island in Essex Bay and sites along Sandy Bay, from Marshall Saville’s collection in the Sandy Bay Historical Society in Rockport. Specialized felsite and slate knife blades, for example from Gloucester’s Plum Cove, were made thin to penetrate between the shell halves of bivalves and were sometimes hooked at one end, perhaps to facilitate cutting the muscle that holds the shells closed (Figure 11).

Figure 10: Lap Anvil

The hard shells of surf clams (aka hen clams) were used as scoops, hand trowels, clamming forks, and hafted hoe blades (Williams 1634, Russell 2014). Shell was also carved and drilled to make earrings and other items for personal adornment, as well as beads, including white and blue wampum beads (Scozarri 1995). The Matz site on Atlantic St. in West Gloucester contained nucella shells (dogwhelks, referred to locally as periwinkles), which were traditionally used to make individual beads of white wampum whenever channeled or knobbed whelks, offering multiple bead cuts from a single core, were not readily available. The Matz site, a Contact Period site adjacent to both Wingaersheek Beach and the Jones River, also contained whole shells of surf clams and soft-shell clams and a cache of moon snails (Matz 2013). See Figure 12. Finds from the Matz site are stored in the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology at Harvard (Keller 1965). A retranslation of the place name Wingaersheek, based on recent reconstructions from the Abenaki, yields Wingawecheek,

Figure 11: Shellfish Knife (9 cm.)

“Here are sea whelks” (Dana 2011, Redish & Lewis 2012).

Figure 12: Moon Snail Shells from a Cache at the Matz Site

In summary, archaeological and ethnological documentary evidence from a variety of historical and contemporary sources supports the conclusion that over several millennia Algonquians of Cape Ann had thriving and extensive multi-purpose shellfish industries on the tidal rivers and barrier beaches of Ipswich Bay, Essex Bay, and Sandy Bay. These industries were comparable to those of other coastal communities to the north on the Gulf of Maine and to the south on Massachusetts Bay and the islands of Martha’s Vineyard and Nantucket.
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Data Recovery at the Morse Pond Site, Easton, Massachusetts

Jennifer C. Ort, M.S., RPA
AHS, Inc.

The Morse Pond Site (19-BR-480) is within the Taunton River Drainage, along the shoreline of Morse Pond, an impoundment of the Queset Brook, in Easton, Massachusetts. The site was originally discovered by the Public Archaeology Laboratory (PAL) in 1999 during a routine intensive archaeological survey. This was followed by a site examination survey in 2008, also conducted by PAL (Waller and Mair 2000; Waller et al. 2009). Following these initial investigations, the Morse Pond Site was determined to be a small, Squibnocket Phase campsite and workshop, encompassing approximately 6,000 square meters of a terrace along the edges of Morse Pond. The site was considered eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places based on the recovery of a lithic assemblage dominated by quartz and rhyolite, including flaked stone tools and tool fragments, and projectile points and projectile point fragments. The cultural materials were found to be densest closer to the pond shoreline, and the numbers decreased as testing moved north away from the pond. This suggested that activities at the site were focused along the terrace edge, likely on the “acquisition and processing of resources supported by the Queset Brook” (Waller et al. 2009).

Archaeological and Historical Services, Inc. (AHS) completed a Data Recovery Program (DRP) of the Morse Pond Site in the winter of 2015/2016 (Figure 1). Thirty-six square meters of the site were excavated, and an additional 5,107 square meters were subjected to a pedestrian survey. The DRP of the Morse Pond site was limited to the area of potential effect (APE), which only impacted approximately 30 (Figure 2),000 square feet of the northern Morse Pond Site boundary. AHS recovered almost 800 Native American lithic artifacts. Most of the lithics are represented by small quartz flakes, produced during the manufacture and maintenance of stone tools. Native American cultural materials from the site are comprised almost entirely of quartz (76%), followed by rhyolite (12%), while small amounts of argillite (8%) and quartzite (2%) were also identified. A total of 14 projectile points, including Middle, Late, and Terminal Archaic forms were recovered, although Squibnocket Triangles were the most common point in the assemblage (Figure 2).

Six bifaces and four preforms were identified in the assemblage, suggesting that the production of projectile points was one of the main activities at the site, while six cores, two flake tools, one chopper, two scrapers, and one drill produced on a Neville point indicate other processing activities were taking place. No cultural features were identified during the DRP, although minimal patterning, both temporal and based on lithic raw material types, has survived intermittent disturbance events. Middle through Late Archaic sites like this one are anticipated to reflect family-scale foraging activity. However, the low densities of artifacts recovered at the Morse Pond Site combined with the limitations of excavations due to the APE, could indicate that data recovered from the site represents the perimeters of activities that were likely taking place closer to the shoreline.

While the subsurface excavations showed that the occupations were situated adjacent to Queset Brook before it was impounded, surface artifacts collected during the pedestrian survey revealed that portions of the site may have been present in the northern portion of the APE. The land clearing and stripping activities effectively removed the upper soil horizons, and likely removed upper portions of the B2 horizon. Although a small amount of Native American cultural material was recovered in this area, its presence suggests that some aspect of the site was located in this area, although to what extent and density remains unknown.

The small point assemblage at the Morse Pond Site was dominated by Squibnocket Triangle projectile
points. These points are found in within the beginning phases of the Late Archaic period (5000-4000 BP), while Small Stemmed points tend to date to the later part of the Late Archaic and into the Woodland Period (ca. 2500-450 BP) (Doucette 2003). Similar to the adjacent Queset Site (Jones and Sportman 2015), the Morse Pond Site contained no quartz small stemmed projectile points, which is anomalous for the region. The Morse Pond site examination by PAL yielded only a Squibnocket Complex, while the DRP added Middle Archaic and Transitional Archaic diagnostic projectile points, indicating that the site had been utilized both earlier and later than expected. Most of the activity documented at the site relates to the discard and replacement of tools, probably by a small group of individuals who may have repeatedly visited this location about 4400 years ago. While the DRP added more information regarding the use of the site in both earlier (Middle Archaic) and later (Transitional Archaic) periods than originally proposed, the recent clearing activities and limited size of the APE prevented a determination of the presence or absence of additional activity areas.
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Figure 1. Excavation in Progress at the Morse Pond Site

Figure 2. Representative Flaked Stone Tools Recovered from the Morse Pond Site. Left to right, top row: argillite Neville Variant projectile point, argillite Neville Variant preform, argillite Brewerton Eared Triangle projectile point, and a rhyolite preform tip. Middle row: rhyolite Squibnocket Triangle projectile points and quartz Squibnocket Triangle projectile points. Bottom row: rhyolite Atlantic projectile point fragment, rhyolite Neville Variant projectile point, and a quartz biface fragment.
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Professor Emeritus Marshall Joseph Becker has been studying the Native Peoples of the Delaware River and Delaware Bay for more than 45 years. He was trained at The University of Pennsylvania in all four fields of anthropology. He now applies archaeology as well as other approaches to gather information about the Lenape (“Delaware Indians”) and their neighbors. Dr. Becker has published nearly 200 articles on the Lenape and other Native Americans in scholarly journals as well as popular magazines. He also has published a book and a number of book chapters and monographs on peoples of the Americas. Dr. Becker’s research has been supported by grants from the National Science Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the American Philosophical Society and the National Geographic Society.

Mary Ellen Lepionka of Gloucester is an independent researcher studying the pre-Contact and Contact periods on Cape Ann in preparation for a book on the subject. She is a retired publisher, author (Writing and Developing Your College Textbook, Writing and Developing College Textbook Supplements), editor, textbook developer (Pearson Education, Houghton Mifflin), and college instructor with an MA in anthropology from Boston University and ABD studies at the University of British Columbia. Prior to her career in college textbook publishing, Mary Ellen participated in salvage archaeology on Great Neck in Ipswich, taught anthropology at Boston University and other institutions of higher learning, participated in the excavation of an Iron Age Bantu refuge settlement in Botswana, and conducted fieldwork in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. Her article, Unpublished Papers on Cape Ann Prehistory, appeared in the Fall 2013 issue of the Bulletin of Massachusetts Archaeological Society. She is a member of the Board of Trustees of the Massachusetts Archaeological Society.

Jennifer Ort is a Registered Professional Archaeologist (RPA), and a National Park Service-qualified prehistoric archaeologist. She holds a M.S. in Quaternary and Climate Change Studies from the University of Maine and a B.A. in anthropology from Roger Williams University. She has worked in cultural resource management since 1998, specializing in New England. The author of many technical CRM reports, she has co-authored several articles on topics such as Paleoindian aggregation, social context, and spatial organization, in professional journals. A Senior Archaeologist at AHS, Ms. Ort is responsible for managing projects related to pre-Colonial Native American archaeology. Trained as a geoarchaeologist, she also manages projects with geoarchaeological components.
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