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Discovering Settlement Systems of the Past in New England Site Distributions

Settlement pattern studies seem to work better in certain periods and places than in others. Prehistoric New England is, unhappily, not an easy region for settlement archaeology. One important reason for our difficulties has been the failure to specify clearly our analytic units. I present definitions of analytic units and discuss their interrelationships. A second problem has arisen from the failure to consider the differences between the settlement systems of foragers and farmers, and the impact of these for archaeologists. A related difficulty derives from lack of consideration of the particular features of survey-derived data in our area. In particular, I discuss the features of sequences of occupations typical of New England, and their impact upon archaeological analysis of survey data. I conclude with a brief example, and some opinions about future directions for research.

DEFINITIONS

I will try to offer definitions which employ words in common-sense, if restricted, fashion. A site is a modern place where evidence of past human activity is preserved. A component is the archaeological remains of a period of use and human activity, which cannot be subdivided chronologically. An occupation is the archaeological manifestation of a single period of use, from human arrival at the site through to abandonment. A place is a site defined purely in terms of geography: a rock shelter, a patch of river bank, the crest of a ridge. A neighborhood is the environs of any place, approximately congruent with Binford's "play radius" (1982:7). Following Binford (1982) again, beyond the neighborhood lies the foraging radius where resources are exploited by specialized work parties, and the annual subsistence range, corresponding to the entire area exploited by a group over a twelve month period.

ROBERT E. DEWAR

The area or size of a site is the area of apparently continuous distribution of archaeological remains. The area of a component is the area of a site which bears evidence of all activities of the specified historic period. The area of an occupation is the area of debris deposited by a single occupation or continuous period of use.

UNITS OF ANALYSIS

Sites. Chang (1967a) regards settlements as the remains of communities and argues that understanding the communities' lifeways ought to be a primary goal of settlement archaeology. In my terminology, it is occupations which are the remains of communities; sites, components and settlements as defined by Chang (1967a:38) are often composites, or palimpsests, of the traces of different communities, or of the same community at different points in time. As Chang recognized, the first question to be asked about a site is: how many components are evident here? In New England prehistoric archaeology, this is equivalent to asking, in how many periods (Late Archaic, Early Woodland, etc.) were artifacts deposited here. Our analyses must start with distribution maps of broadly contemporaneous components across the landscape.

Analysis of "sites" without chronological assignment cannot lead to an understanding of the articulation of any of them. Some sites along the Connecticut River extend for miles and contain the remains of millennia of occupation, but the size of such a site says little about the way that place was important at any one point in time. Analysis of the locational qualities of sites is of course, useful for the cultural resource manager interested in the a priori likelihood of discovering prehistoric remains at a given location.

Components. A component is the product of one or more occupations. Occupations can vary in length from days to decades, can be intermittent or year-round, and can represent once a year visits, or one of multiple visits each year (Binford 1982, Chang 1967). Any direct interpretation of the size, season of use, duration of use or activities evident of the occupations comprising a component is possible only if the archaeologist is willing to assume that each occupation of a component was more or less equivalent. This problem is familiar in discussions of intra-site spatial analysis (e.g. Yellen 1977 vs. Binford 1980). It also arises in assigning spans of occupation from floral and faunal remains, if there is a likelihood of multiple occupations in a single year (Binford 1982).
Similarly, the areal extent of a component is a poor guide to the number of people who used it at any point in time, if there were many occupations which were not precisely centered on one another.

This means that before the archaeologist can approach questions about the groups or communities who lived at a place and whose activities are responsible for the component, she must try to tell whether the component is the product of one or of many occupations, and in the case of multiple occupations, or single occupations of long duration, whether the site was always used in an identical fashion. In my terms, before modeling communities, it is necessary to deal with the nature of the sequence of occupations.

Occupations.

An occupation is the material result of a human group's use of a place. The archaeologist may move directly from the nature and distribution of material remains of a single occupation to inferences of the patterns of human activity. The area of a single occupation is a reasonably good index of the resident population, and the distribution of tools and debris over the site ought to reflect the spatial patterning of activities. Floral and faunal materials deposited in the course of the occupation offer a relatively direct guide to season of use.

Obviously, the direct analogue to the ethnographer's vision of seasonal round is an articulation of occupations of a single year. To the extent that we cannot usually distinguish single occupations in our components, we cannot directly interpret them in such terms.

REMNANT SETTLEMENT PATTERNS

Recently, Kevin McBride and I have borrowed from Rouse (1972) the term remnant settlement pattern analysis. We use this as a label for the method and theory which allows archaeologists to interpret the modern geographical patterns of sites in terms of the patterns of past human activity. Implicit in remnant settlement pattern analysis is awareness of 1) taphonomic problems of differential burial, preservation and destruction of differing site types (Binzer 1982; Foley 1982) 2) the problems engendered by use of the same place by nearly contemporary occupations of different types (Binford 1982) and 3) the likelihood of year to year variability in the location of occupations (Binford 1972; Dewar and McBride in press; Foley 1982).

Most settlement pattern analyses seek to identify the site types habitually used by a defined human group over the course of a typical year. Commonly the goal is a description similar to that given by an ethnographer who has lived with a group of an extended period. For example:

In early April the families gather at the village by the river where they will stay for the next seven months, fishing, growing corn, gathering wild plant foods, and holding ceremonies. In early November, each family departs alone to a sheltered upland valley where it will spend the fall and winter gathering and storing nuts, hunting for deer and bear and ice-fishing on the frozen lakes and streams.

We have no difficulty recognizing two "site-types" here: the spring/summer village and the fall/winter family camps, and we can guess about the geographical distribution of these site types, their relative frequency, and the nature of the associated assemblages. Distinguishing this settlement pattern ought to be easy: different seasons of occupation in different areas, differences in the range of activities, differences in the size of sites. However, diagnosing this pattern from site surveys is not simply a matter of sorting broadly contemporaneous sites of different sizes and seasons of occupation and articulating them into an annual round. In part, this is because of the problems of differential preservation and destruction of sites. However, and equally important, modern distributions of sites are not the product of a yearly round, but rather the product of many years rounds, and the occupations of each of those years may not have been at the same places. In face, 1) the size of site or component bears an uncertain relationship to the size of community which used it, and 2) the relative frequency of site types in our surveys may bear little or no relation to the relative numbers in use at any point in the past. To show why this is especially true in New England, I have to identify two hidden assumptions in much settlement pattern analysis.

Settlement pattern analysis was developed in areas (Peru, Mesoamerica, the Near East) where almost all sites were occupied for spans of hundreds of years, be they hamlets, villages, or regional centers. Often, temporary hunting and collecting camps are identified in the surrounding distance, but they tend to have limited annual periods of use, and to be few. In such circumstances, the joint assumptions of temporal continuity and spatial congruence of occupation (each year, at any time, the place, a given group occupied is exactly
predicted by where it had been the previous year) are sound. A map of Early Classic villages, hamlets, regional centers, and nearby temporary camps can be directly transformed into a settlement pattern, and rules of settlement system deduced.

In New England, however, the assumption of temporal continuity (year after year, the same places are used) is improper; for we know that temporal continuity over long periods was not characteristic at the time of contact (Thomas 1980; Cronon 1983). Villages moved frequently, often as the result of firewood shortages, after periods of occupation of a decade or less. In the valley or Oaxaca, a community of farmers might leave a single village site as the product of a century of activity; along Narragansett Bay, a similar community might leave behind ten sites. While it is justifiable to use the area of occupation of the Oaxacan village as a measure of the size of the resident community, and to sum all contemporaneous village areas in a valley as a measure of the valley's population, would it be reasonable to do the same thing with the ten Narragansett villages? Obviously not: the necessary assumption of temporal continuity is unreasonable. To return to our example, would an archaeologist who found ten broadly contemporaneous "villages" along 5 km. of river bank, diagnose a settlement pattern with only one summer base camp at any point in time?

The assumption of maximal spatial congruence (sequential occupations are directly on top of one another) of sequences of occupation is also less reliable in New England than where permanent villages are common. When permanent houses represent major investments, they seem to lead to spatial congruence over long periods (Flannery 1972; Whiting and Ayres 1968; McGuire and Schiffer 1983). But how likely is it that Aboriginal New England families constructed their dwellings on the exact spots that they lived on last year? If new spots were frequently chosen, how far away were they from the previous year's choice? There is no good answer to this question, because in different times and at different places the factors controlling spatial congruence have been different. Component size is obviously very sensitive to patterns of spatial congruence.

Before New England archaeologists can model settlement patterns of the traditional sort, they have to deal with the problems of differential spatial congruence and temporal continuity, and their impacts on the distribution of sites. The rest of this paper is devoted to a discussion the avenues available to us.

Settlement archaeology will always be different in the Connecticut and Viru valleys, since the pattern of congruence and continuity in sequences of occupations are different. There are two important avenues for New England archaeologists to explore: 1) delineate individual occupations within individual sites and 2) delineate the patterns of congruence and continuity of occupation sequences of each phase.

Distinguishing individual occupations, even in a single component site, is a difficult task. To choose a local example, was Bull Brook a single occupation by a number of families, or a series of occupations by much smaller groups? The site is characterized by 45 "hot-spots" about 5 m in diameter. Interpreting these as encampments of nuclear families, it has been argued that this was a "rendez-vous" of associated individuals (Jordan 1960; Snow 1980). If it was a single occupation, then it may be used to estimate the size of Paleo-indian bands. If it was the product of a dozen or more occupations, then it is not relevant to that issue.

The argument for a single occupation at Bull Brook has been based upon a near circular arrangement of the "hot-spots" which cannot be accounted for in terms of geomorphology. In general terms, evidence of formal patterning of features is usually strong evidence of contemporaneity, though with some limits: formal structure in a graveyard is not usually interpreted as evidence of simultaneous burial. Refitting studies can also assist in the identification of contemporaneous use of features. On the other hand, most archaeologists find it difficult to segregate those portions of assemblages assignable to distinct occupations (Binford 1982; cf. Flannery 1976:113). More often, we can detect the signs of multiple, not perfectly congruent, occupations: for example, disorderly distributions of hearths, intrusive shallow pits wholly contained in a single component, and criss-crossing patterns of post-molds are readily recognized as signs of multiple occupations.

To make inferences about the size of prehistoric groups, or the characteristic range of activities and the season of occupation of site types, we first have to attempt to distinguish single occupations. Failing that, we have to consider the possibilities of sequences of non-congruent occupations, or of more than one occupation during a single 12 month round. In any case, clear discrimination of the number of occupations responsible for any component probably requires substantial excavation, and will often prove impossible.
An alternate path focuses on the patterns of sequences of occupation of a place or neighborhood during a specific phase. Because few archaeologists have thought hard about how the archaeological record of hundred repetitions of a yearly round might differ from that of a single year's round, there is no developed terminology, nor theory to guide us. I will offer a few suggestions, based mostly upon our work on the remnant settlement patterns of Glastonbury, Connecticut (McBride and Dewar 1982; McBride, et. al 1981; Dewar and McBride in press).

The first step in the analysis of survey data is to try to correct for the biases in our data: differential sampling, differential destruction of sites in different depositional environments (e.g. deeply buried floodplain sites vs. rock shelters). The likelihood of dealing with representative samples of sites even after winnowing the data, is low (Wobst 1983). Even so, our distribution maps contain some information, and further steps can be taken to try to identify it.

The second step is to try to construct a typology of sites for each phase or period. Most site typologies constructed from survey data tend to rely on location and size as the most important variables. But measures of component size are strongly affected by the nature of occupational sequences, and so are most locational qualities. While I have mentioned the impact of different degrees of spatial congruence on size, the impact of sequences on locational data is also important.

Most archaeologists approach the analysis of the location of sites as a problem in optimization; they assume that sites were located at the best possible location, described in terms of the specific geomorphic and microenvironmental setting of sites. In so doing, they disregard the problem that occupation of a place may alter its future attractiveness. There are good reasons for believing that continual occupation of any locale will have some effects, positive or negative on its future suitability as a focus for occupation (Dewar and McBride in press; Flannery 1972; Linera 1976; Binford 1972, 1978; Yellen 1976, 1977; Johnson 1982; Williams 1976; Simmons 1978; Brasser 1978).

When occupation sequences tend to be long and concentrated in a limited area, tremendous quantities of debris can build up. When sequences tend to be very short at any place, the quantity of debris may be quite limited. This not only affects the archaeological visibility of certain site types, it will have important consequences for the perceived size of the site, and, ultimately, the archaeologist's inferences. In consequence, even before we construct our "site-types", some consideration should be given to the nature of the occupational sequences which produced our components.

By McGuire and Schiffer's (1983) standards aboriginal New England house types are temporary structures, suggesting that temporal continuity was typically short. It is important to recognize that different site types in a single settlement system can display different patterns of spatial congruence and temporal continuity. For example, Binford has limited evidence that special-purpose camps tend toward higher congruence and continuity than base-camps do for Nunamiate (1978:488-495). Within any time period, the archaeologist must ask where on the spectrum of temporal continuity do our occupation sequences fall? (See Figure One).

![Figure One. The spectrum of temporal continuity](image)

At one end are permanent sites of very high temporal continuity; these are the location of very long sequences of occupations, uninterrupted for 100s of years. At the other are temporary site types of very low temporal continuity: places used for one season or year and then abandoned. There are site-types of intermediate temporal continuity; places once chosen for an occupation tend to be occupied for a sequence of ten or twenty years and then abandoned.

Similarly, there is a range of spatial congruence. Some places, if occupied sequentially, will be occupied almost perfectly congruently; an obvious example is very small rockshelters. Other places may place no premium on perfect congruence; sequential occupation along the bank of continuous stretch of river or stream may rarely be perfectly congruent. This can also be thought of as a continuum (see Figure Two); I prefer to think of it in terms of the average distance between the center of subsequent occupations of the same place or neighborhood. I break up this continuum into three broad classes; a) congruent occupation
sequences where the center of occupation in successive years apparently differs by no more than a few meters, b) localized occupation sequences where the center of each occupation falls within tens or a few hundreds of meters of the previous occupation, and c) dispersed occupation sequences where subsequent occupations are many hundreds or thousands of meters apart. As in the case of temporal continuity, this continuum covers two or three orders of magnitude.

Mean distance in m of sequential occupation centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>500</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Localized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure Two. The continuum of spatial congruence

I would note that variations in temporal continuity and spatial congruence have to be explained by processes which have a time scale of years and decades, rather than months and years. For this reason, McBride and I refer to them as medium term processes, most of these come under the general heading of local environmental degradation or enhancement, but their impact on a given settlement system is strongly related to local geomorphology.

A comparison of occupational continuity and congruence in the Connecticut Late and Terminal Archaic may illustrate some of the utility of this approach. In Glastonbury, upland occupation sequences, in both periods, fall into one of two types; high congruence, high continuity occupation sequences and medium to low congruence, medium to low continuity places. The former are usually rockshelters; the latter are often small open sites along streams, apparently used for a few seasons, and then abandoned for other places. We are a large number of examples of each kind of the Late Archaic; the few Terminal Archaic sequences seem limited to rockshelters.

On the terraces, one finds low continuity, dispersed (low congruence) medium continuity components of all sizes, but no very high continuity occupation sequences. Differences of continuity produce very different kinds of components, even when the occupations may have been of similar sizes. Low continuity components characterize the Terminal Archaic habitation sites. Thin, widely scattered along the western edge of the terraces, they have been often overlooked. Smaller, but higher continuity Late Archaic camps have a higher visibility.

On the floodplain, one finds some tiny, low continuity, unknown congruence Late Archaic and Terminal Archaic components of small size, but, and most spectacularly, low to medium continuity but localized (medium high) congruence components. These are the huge Narrow-stemmed floodplain summer/fall base camps. The location of these camps was apparently limited to "knolls" of better drained soil, which are hundreds of meters long, and only a few meters wide. While the length of such knolls is covered with archaeological material, this is undoubtedly the result of hundreds of different occupations, each established for a few months, and each some tens or hundreds of meters distant from the occupation of the year before.

I can't resist suggesting that it is the localized occupation sequences of the Narrow-stemmed Late Archaic and the very large thick sites which result, which have led to us to characterize Late Archaic foragers as quintessential "central-based wanderers". In fact, we have no evidence that the average coreident summer/fall groups in the Connecticut Late Archaic were any larger then the Middle Archaic, the Terminal Archaic or the Early Woodland. Similarly, the increase in the number of "components per century" reported for the Terminal Archaic in New York (Funk and Rippteau 1977; Curtin 1979) may be the result simply of decreased continuity, and not a factor of population change, or of an increase in the use of special purpose sites.

After establishing the nature of the occupation sequences responsible for the components, we can define "site-types". These can then be articulated into standard models of yearly-rounds. To "explain" our remnant settlement patterns, we have to be able to describe the processes controlling the nature of the occupation sequences, as well as explaining the location of the individual components. Note that if medium term processes lead to occupation sequences of relatively low continuity, and low congruence (as for example on the ethnohistoric New England coast), then it is unlikely that any given, single occupation will be optimally placed, with reference to permanent landscape features.

PROSPECTS

Settlement pattern analysis suffers from a lack of middle range theory (Binford 1977). Very few archaeologists have considered how the record of hundreds of years of occupations might differ from an ethno- graphically derived model of a single year. For some sorts of analysis,
in some places, the problems of differential continuity and congruence are not critical. I suspect that this is often, but not always true for historic archaeologists in New England, although I claim no expertise here. The medium-term processes which limited aboriginal settlement sequences have their analogues in historic soil loss and exhaustion, fur market extinction, timber depletion and environmental degradation.

I am sure that it will not be easy to develop adequate middle range theory for settlement archaeology. One problem is that actualistic studies (Binford 1982) are difficult when the processes of interest only have effects over decades. Nonetheless, we must direct substantial efforts in this direction.

I believe that the development of useful models of prehistoric settlement, ecology and economy will require much more intensive excavation than New England has seen for the past decade. Quite frankly, we have more occupations, components and sites than we know well what to do with. Contract projects will continue to identify and locate components, often, perhaps, in unlikely places. But the understanding of the settlement systems of the past will require much more detailed knowledge about the size of co-resident groups, the seasonality of occupations, and the specific resources these prehistoric people exploited than we have at present, or will ever develop through the simple analysis of the distribution of components.
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Constructing the Past

In recent years, archaeologists, both prehistoric and historic, have ventured to take archaeology "beyond subsistence and dating" to understanding social systems through archeological remains. While exciting and stimulating, these studies have also raised a number of criticisms concerning behavioral transformation of materials and the units of observation and analysis. The 1984 conference will focus on archeological observation and analysis, specifically the problems involved in defining meaningful spatial units for drawing inferences about past human behavior. Particular concerns include the identification of attributes that will allow precision in defining the use of space by past societies on both local and regional levels. For prehistoric archaeologists, a major concern is the function of sites within larger settlement areas and their validity as analytical units. For historic archaeologists, relevant units for analysis include sites, landscapes, and the larger societal and economic region in which they are imbedded.

Scheduling of the 1984 conference is planned as follows. Papers focused on theoretical issues will be presented in the morning. Afternoon papers will illustrate individual cases from recent prehistoric and historic archeological research in New England.

Morning speakers will include PAT RUBERTONE, BARBARA LUEDTKE, PETER THOMAS and MYRON STACHIW. Afternoon speakers will include PAUL ROBINSON, DICK WALDBAER, DEAN SNOW and FRANK MCMANAMON.

1984 Conference

The 1984 CNEA Annual Meeting will be held on Saturday, March 17 at the Crystal Room, Alumnae Hall, Brown University. In case of a major snowstorm on March 17, the conference will be cancelled and re-scheduled for Saturday, April 7th. The conference, entitled "Constructing the Past," will follow a format similar to last year's meeting. There will be a series of theoretical papers (20-30 minutes in length) delivered in the morning session. A series of case studies in both prehistoric and historical archeology will follow in the afternoon. The annual business meeting will be scheduled during the lunch break. We are planning to have lunch catered at the Commons Room also located in Alumnae Hall. Please note that Saturday parking is permissible in Brown University lots. Street parking is also available.

MOTEL/HOTEL ACCOMMODATIONS

Holiday Inn, Providence (401) 831-3900
single $53 + tax
double $64 + tax

Marriott Inn, Providence** (401) 272-2400
single $77-87 + tax
double $87-97 + tax

Suisse Chalet, Seekonk, MA (617) 336-7900
single $32.50 + tax
double $26.50 + tax

**Group rate $58 (up to four persons in a room) if we can guarantee a block of 10 room reservations.

The CNEA Steering Committee and conference speakers will meet on Saturday, February 18, 1984 at Old Sturbridge Village, weather permitting. Participants should get their papers to David Yesner by February 1 in preparation for the pre-conference meeting.
AGENDA

"CONSTRUCTING THE PAST"

SATURDAY, MARCH 17, 1983

8:30 - 9:30  Registration
9:30 - 12:00  Theoretical Presentations
12:00 - 1:30  Lunch and Business Meeting
1:30 - 4:00  Case Studies

RECEPTION FOLLOWING THE PRESENTATIONS

MORNING PRESENTATIONS:

Barbara Luedtke
UMass - Boston

Flexible Tools for Constructing the Past

Patricia Rubertone
Brown University

Historical Landscapes: The Archaeology of Place and Space

Peter Thomas
University of Vermont

Basic Building Blocks of Settlement Patterns: Exploring the Possibility of Identifying Single Occupations

Myron Stachiw

T.B.A.

BUSINESS MEETING:

I. Annual Report
   a. Recent activities of CNEA
   b. Membership and finances

II. Election of 1984 Steering Committee

AFTERNOON PRESENTATIONS:

Paul Robinson
Rhode Island Historic Preservation Office

Seventeenth Century Narragansett Religious and Social Systems: Inferring Human Behavior from Mortuary Data

Frank McManammon
National Park Service

Units of Analysis and Prehistoric Land Use on Outer Cape Cod

Dick Waldbauer
Brown University

House not a Home: Hill Farm Clustered Communities

Dean Snow
SUNY-Albany

The Definition of Spatial Units: Case Studies from Eastern New York

See page 59 for map of 1984 Conference Location
Current Research

The RHODE ISLAND HISTORICAL PRESERVATION COMMISSION and RHODE ISLAND COLLEGE sponsored a conference titled Topics on the Management of Rhode Island's Archaeological Resources on May 13-14. At that meeting, steps were taken to form a RHODE ISLAND ARCHAEOLOGICAL COUNCIL. The committee to form the Council includes representatives from state government, the SHPO, secondary schools, colleges and universities, museums, contract firms, Narraganset tribe, and nautical archaeology. The Council's major purpose is to undertake projects that will further the aims and goals of the archaeological community in Rhode Island. The proceedings of the two-day conference, which also included sessions on integrating history and historical archaeology (RUBERTONE), archaeology and Native Americans (ROBINSON), underwater archaeology (CEMBROLA), archaeology and the public (CONAWAY), and an evaluation of the conduct of contract archaeology (MORENON), will be available in 1984. The RIAC will meet on April 7, 1984, 10 a.m. to 3 p.m., at the Roger Williams Park Museum in Providence. This is an introductory meeting, open to the public and free of charge.

The following survey and planning grants in archaeology were awarded by the RHODE ISLAND HISTORICAL PRESERVATION COMMISSION for 1983-84: a video documentary of Rhode Island archaeology (LARRY BUDNER and PIERRE MORENON, RHODE ISLAND COLLEGE), survey of Potowomut Neck (JORDAN KERBER, BROWN UNIVERSITY), survey of the Sakonnet River (PETER THOMBAHN and DEBORAH COX, PUBLIC ARCHAELOGY LABORATORY, INC.), State Repository study (MORENON), Roger Williams Park Museum Collections Survey (MORENON), a study to establish the context of the Narragansett cemetery (MORENON), analysis of shellfish and other faunal remains at the Greenwich Cove site (DAVID BERNSTEIN, SUNY BINGHAMONT), survey of contact period and other Native American burial grounds in Rhode Island (RICK ELIAS and LAUREN COOK, BOSTON UNIVERSITY), inventory of the Congdon collection at the University of Rhode Island (BILL TURNBAUGH, URI), and a study to develop several archaeological sites as interpretive parks (CITY OF CRANSTON).
The Rhode Island Historical Preservation Commission and Brown University have completed excavations at a 17th century Narragansett cemetery in southern Rhode Island. The project directors are PAUL ROBINSON at RHODE ISLAND HISTORICAL PRESERVATION COMMISSION and PATRICIA RUBERTONE, ANTHROPOLOGY DEPARTMENT, BROWN UNIVERSITY. MICHAEL NASSANEY, UMAS AMHERST, directed the 1983 summer field season. GAIL GUSTAFSON is directing laboratory conservation and cataloging. The project is being conducted in cooperation with the Narragansett tribe. The decision to excavate the cemetery was reached after all preservation options had been exhausted. The cemetery was discovered accidentally after having been disturbed by bulldozing on private land. The remains of at least 17 individuals were recovered from the disturbed portion of the cemetery during the summer of 1982 with the help of numerous volunteers. Forty-seven intact graves were removed this summer. The artifacts recovered date approximately to between 1620 and 1660 and include a variety of European (primarily Dutch and English) and aboriginal items: glass and shell beads, European and aboriginal ceramics, brass kettles, textiles, signet and "Jesuit" rings, hoes, stone pestles, stone and clay pipes, glassware, and spoons. Analysis by WILLIAM TURNBAUGH, UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND, will refine the dates, place of origin, and function of these artifacts. The information will be useful in examining Narragansett social organization, trade networks and temporal patterning in the cemetery.

Preliminary pathological and osteological analysis by MARC KELLEY, UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND, suggests the presence of widespread tuberculosis. Spinal defects, some trauma (bullet hole) and extensive dental caries are present; and there is at least one individual with a treponemal infection. The population is quite robust with males ranging in height from 5’7” to 6’0” and females, 5’4” to 5’7”. Females by far outnumber males at ratio of between 2.5 and 3 to 1. Infants less than three years of age are not present.

The structure and organization of the cemetery suggest adherence to a rigid set of mortuary practices. This is seen in orientation of graves and individuals, placement of grave items, and the ordering of the individuals within the cemetery. Preliminary findings from 1982 are reported in Bulletin 45 of the Archaeological Society of Connecticut. The results from this summer will be presented in a series of papers and reports over the next year.

PAT RUBERTONE reports that the program in historical archaeology at Parker Woodland, Coventry is scheduled to open on October 8. The program which combines public presentation with the scientific ways of constructing the past includes a trail-side exhibit, a field guide and instruction kits on the use of documents and landscape reconstruction. During the 1983 summer field season excavations were conducted at an 18th-19th century farm in the Woodland. The architectural remains of five farm buildings, including the main cellarhole, barns and less permanent outbuildings, were excavated. Preliminary observations suggest substantial differences in construction technology, materials and orientation among the buildings. On-going analysis of the architecture and artifacts will attempt to relate material patterns to the developmental cycle of the homestead. Interestingly, property research for this site (the Vaughn Farm) revealed a pattern of ownership that seems to be repeating itself for many interior Rhode Island farm sites of the period. I.e., long term single family ownership and occupation until ca. 1860s followed by a series of short-term ownerships and eventual abandonment. Also, a charcoal processing site containing two mounds was investigated. The mounds, approximately 20 feet in diameter, exhibited no permanent architectural facilities. Given the size and apparent construction of these mounds, compared to others reported in the literature, it seems that charcoal making at Parker Woodland was simply a part-time activity engaged in by local farmers. Plans are underway to get charcoal samples analyzed for species identification.

JORDAN KERBER, BROWN UNIVERSITY, completed a survey and intensive testing program of prehistoric sites on Potowomut Neck, Warwick. Sediment cores taken from a saltmarsh will be used to reconstruct local paleoenvironmental setting and obtain dates of marine inundation of the Potowomut River. Archaeological testing yielded projectile points, bifaces, chipping debris, burnt rock and pottery. Most of the lithic material was quartz with some quartzite, argillite, felsite and chert. Several shell middens contained a variety of shellfish remains, charcoal and bone. Data analysis, which is well-underway, is focused on changing patterns of coastal resource exploitation; radiocarbon dates are forthcoming.
The PAL, Inc. reports that their excavation of the Brian Bouchard site in Usquepaug, originally located by Wilbur Smith and Associates in 1982, confirmed its assessment as a small prehistoric campsite. Despite its limited extent and low density, it contains an unusually complete set of known data classes including chipped stone tools, a variety of lithic materials, pit features, and faunal remains. A radiocarbon date of 2080 +/- 50 BP and diagnostic projectile points suggest occupation during the Terminal Archaic. Sites of this type, age and in this riverine environmental setting are very rare in the region of the Narragansett Bay Drainage Basin.

In surveying the margins of the Pettaquamscutt River, the PAL has collected data that will provide a detailed picture of prehistoric land use patterns. Synthesizing environmental and cultural data, the survey has defined the density and nature of prehistoric site location in one highly sensitive section of Rhode Island's coastal zone.

PIERRE MORENON at RHODE ISLAND COLLEGE reports that a comparative study of Truston and Potter Ponds, two salt ponds in South Kingstown, was completed this past summer. The contrasting ecology of the two ponds is reflected in significantly different prehistoric, historic and modern patterns of land use. A two volume report, a short popular report and a 50 minute video will result from this study.

The Department of Anthropology and Geography at RIC now has a monograph series. Volumes 1-15 are archaeological reports completed by the Public Archaeology Program since 1980. Although the details are currently being worked out, Pierre has indicated that each report will be available at cost to those who are interested.

Excavation at the CAMPBELL SITE on the east bank of the Merrimack River in Litchfield, N.H., has been completed by avocational archaeologists under the direction of VICTORIA KENYON (NEW HAMPSHIRE HISTORICAL SOCIETY). Wide horizontal areas were excavated along the terrace edge to expose post holes, hearths and occupation floors. Artifactual remains indicate that the site was inhabited primarily during the Woodland period. Middle and Late Woodland pottery was excavated. This suggests that the site was occupied during the contact period and may have been related to the 1656 trading post of John Cromwell, located directly across the river. Identification of on-site activities and seasonality of occupation will be the focus of this winter’s research.

HOWARD SARGENT (FRANKLIN PIERCE COLLEGE) continued the excavation of a 120m² area slated for intensive study during the fourth field season on the Russell's Inn site (NH29-1) in George's Mills, N.H. The site is now known to contain evidence of Paleo-Indian, Stark, Merrimack, Brewerton, Squibnocket, Orient, Meadowood, Middle and Late Woodland occupations. An assessment of data from NH29-1 and the Croteau site (NH29-3) suggest that Paleo-Indian occupation of the Lake Sunapee area occurred when Glacial Lake Newbury occupied the Sunapee basin and continued into the period of time when the glacial lake breached a dam in what is now Sunapee and began draining into the Connecticut Valley. One aspect of the site is the remarkably high incidence of quartz cores and debitage, steep-edged scapers, etc. A visit to the site by glacial geologists WILLIAM NEWMAN and PETER ROSEN is anticipated in September. It is hoped that this will lead to a combined geological and archeological survey of the shoreline of Glacial Lake Newbury in the near future.
VICTORIA KENYON (NEW HAMPSHIRE HISTORICAL SOCIETY) and JAMES BRADLEY (MASSACHUSETTS HISTORIC COMMISSION) have initiated a study of Lovewell’s Fort, constructed in 1725, on Ossipee Lake in Ossipee, N.H. Research is focused on analysis of artifactual materials collected at the site by Dr. Ernest Tyzzer several decades ago. Included in the surface collection are aboriginal ceramics, black argillite flakes and tools, pipe stem fragments and a large quantity of beaver bone in a state of excellent preservation. A descriptive article documenting the context of the area, the development of the fort and any associated trading post, and the collected assemblage is planned.

During June-July of 1983, DAVID STARBUCK (RENSSELAER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE) and MARY DUPRE (NEW HAMPSHIRE HISTORICAL SOCIETY) continued excavations at Sewall’s Falls on the Merrimack River in Concord, N.H. Work conducted here in 1981 had the primary objective of locating the 17th century fort of the Penacook leader Passaconaway, and the 1983 excavations expanded the search to include additional areas on both the eastern and western banks of the river. The 1983 work failed to locate definitive evidence of the fort, but the new excavations did reveal a large fire-cracked rock feature that was probably a roasting or smoking platform (c. five feet in diameter).

Excavations are continuing at the site of Joseph Hazeltine’s pottery shop in the Millville district of Concord, N.H. Directed by DAVID STARBUCK (RENSSELAER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE) and MARY DUPRE (NEW HAMPSHIRE HISTORICAL SOCIETY), excavation has now exposed nearly all of one kiln house and part of a second; waster dumps are being tested; and work is about to begin on the potshop where Hazeltine made red earthenware between c.1825 and 1880. The exposed kilns are each c. 11-12 feet in diameter, and both were surrounded by large quantities of “wasters” and kiln furniture. Work is expected to continue into 1984 until all features of this unusually intact site have been adequately tested.

HARRISVILLE, INC., has contracted with DOUGLAS GEORGE of Boston University to assist in testing and evaluating a group of archaeological sites within the town of Harrisville, New Hampshire. Included are several redware pottery manufacturing shops dating from the 1790s to the early 1860s, woodenware manufacturing sites of the 19th century, and several late 18th and 19th-century hill farms. Information gathered during this survey is to be used to assist in the preparation of several National Register nominations, including one proposing a rural multiple resource district.

Students at Keene State College continue to survey and perform test excavations at the Broadbrook Site inside Pisgah State Park (located southwest of Keene, NH) in a second field course taught by FAITH HARRINGTON (NEW HAMPSHIRE HISTORICAL SOCIETY). During the summer course, students helped locate, survey and map many features of the 19th century Broadbrook lumbering community including several field stone cellar hole foundations, stone dams, holding ponds, retaining walls, streams, ditches, and a submerged wooden turbine box. Test excavations, which were conducted adjacent to a dwelling house foundation, in a blacksmith’s refuse area, and inside what may have been a sawmill shed, yielded hundreds of mid- to late 19th century domestic and industrial artifacts. Documentary and archaeological research continues to reveal how local entrepreneur Ansel Dickinson operated a large scale lumbering industry during the 19th century and prompted the formation of the Broadbrook, Nash City, and Hardscrapple communities in the area now known as Pisgah State Park.
The Ivory Pond mastodon (ROGER W. MOELLER, AMERICAN INDIAN ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE) created a major stir when it was found in a bog in western Massachusetts during a backhoe operation to make a stock pond. Although the recovered data included several large bone slabs, chunks of ivory, and teeth from a mastodon, additional excitement was generated by the associated materials: seeds of najas flexilis and white spruce cones. The excitement increased when the carbon-14 dates of 11,4000 +/- 655 years BP and 11,630 +/- 470 years BP were returned on bone gelatin and spruce cones respectively.

But the greatest excitement was thought to come. One of the bone slabs had rows of long striations which appeared to be butchering marks. They seemed to be too regular to have been caused by geological forces or animals. To confirm their cultural nature a scanning electron microscope study was done by DR. PAT SHIPMAN of JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY. The analysis clearly showed that the marks are actually vascular or neurovascular grooves from an artery and its accompanying nerve bundle.

This puts a very different light on the entire project. So long as there is currently no decent possibility of a human association, the project is one of post-glacial paleo-environmental reconstruction. While the project has not been abandoned, the likelihood for funding to recover more of the animal and its associated ecological indicators has been significantly diminished.

CURTIS HOFFMAN (BRIDGEWATER STATE COLLEGE) has developed a series of hypsometric integral curves for drainages in the Northeast and is plotting dated site locations against them to determine large scale settlement pattern changes over time. He would greatly appreciate receiving the following information on dates associated with cultural
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material between 6000 and 2000 B.P.: 1) date and range; 2) elevation above sea level; 3) percentage of quartz (tools and debitage) associated with the dated feature (within 5 inches horizontally and in same stratigraphic unit); 4) presence/absence of Small Stemmed Points associated with dated feature.

Several organized groups of stone piles in Freetown, Massachusetts, each numbering between one and two hundred, are the vehicle for developing methods for determining the origins and functions of this little-studied but common class of New England landscape feature (JAMES MAVOR, JR. and BYRON E. DIX, WOODS HOLE). The piles are being mapped and considered in relation to the natural terrain, stone rows, nearby Native American sites and historic material of white settlers. One cairn, one meter high and four meters diameter above ground, is being excavated. Every stone in the cairn in being cataloged by size, shape, material and position to form a baseline for future excavations of such features. The cairn has been found to extend one meter underground. Stratigraphic comparison with the nearby Wapanucket Archaic site invites consideration of possible prehistoric origin. Two sealed charcoal deposits deep within the cairn, are undergoing carbon 14 analysis. Many of the stones of which the cairn is built can be identified as hammerstones and anvils of unknown cultural context. No tools, weapons or implements which are datable by design have been found. Based on a comparison with many other New England sites having similar material and setting, we suggest, in addition to possible historical farm associations, a working hypothesis that the site is a ceremonial Native American place possibly used for fasting and conducting vision quests or similar ritual. If this is the case, most or possibly all stones in the cairn may have cultural significance or importance. We do not expect that the cairns are typically for burial purposes.

THE OFFICE OF PUBLIC ARCHAEOLOGY at Boston University, directed by Dr. RICARDO J. ELIA, has conducted cultural resource surveys in Colrain, Amherst, East Longmeadow, Medway, Montague, Northbridge, Oxford, and Shirley, Massachusetts, this past summer. A variety of sites, including those of prehistoric and historical period occupations, were identified and recommendations made for mapping or intensive
testing. Historic sites included several 19th-century domestic occupations in Shirley. Reports of all of these investigations are available through the OPA, Boston University, 232 Bay State Road, Boston, MA 02215.

In Canton, site examination was conducted by the PUBLIC ARCHEOLOGY LAB of two prehistoric sites areas near the Neponset River to establish a sequence of occupation from the Middle Archaic to Late Woodland, a temporal span of about 6,000 years. These sites were recently determined eligible to the National Register. The Meadowlands site is a large multicomponent site with very high densities of features which appear to be related to intensive processing of resources from the Neponset River and riverine wetlands near the site. A radiocarbon date of 2270 +/- 110 BP has been determined for a burnt rock feature on the site.

A combined reconnaissance intensive elvel survey along the upper Assabet River drainage in the town of Marlborough located five sites. Four prehistoric sites and a nineteenth century farmstead were found within a 130 acre proposed industrial park. Fragments of steatite from one prehistoric site of probable Late/terminal Archaic affiliation indicate that partially completed items, possibly bowl preforms, were being finished these. Likely sources for this steatite are the southern Worcester County quarry group in the upper Blackstone Valley drainage, approximately 15 miles away.

A reconnaissance survey of the Shick Farm tract in Wayland verified the location of three previously reported prehistoric sites and identified five others. Historic period sites identified include two eighteenth/nineteenth century houses and the probable route of a mid-seventeenth century road associated with the first period of settlement in Sudbury.

On the Wordell Farm, one of the last remaining undeveloped tracts along Fall River's Taunton River shoreline, a group of four intact sites was located. While one is a relatively large area, part of a previously located shell midden, three are small low-density deposits of lithic debitage. Such site distribution indicates complexity in site function in proximity to a riverine environment.

Site examinations along the Acushnet River in Acushnet have defined two, very small sites, Swift I and II, that date to the latter part of the Middle Woodland or beginning of the Late Woodland. These short-term occupation sites were used for shell fishing and hunting. They are unusual because they occur in the lower valley of a major river, just where large, semi-permanent villages or basecamps would be expected.

An intensive survey of South Cape Beach State Park in Mashpee allowed a compilation and analysis of prehistoric site distribution in the coastal zone bordering Nantucket Sound. The results indicate that prehistoric sites, at least in this section of Cape Cod, are located in specific and limited environmental zones.

LINDA TOWLE, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, directed a mitigation project at the John Quincy Adams Birthplace in Quincy, Massachusetts. A drainage system was installed around each structure. The ceramic assemblage clusters around 1760 to 1860 with a few earlier 18th-century types. Both structures were constructed in the last half of the 17th-century and were occupied as residences until the early 20th-century. A report is available.

Work continued by JAMES WHITALL (EARLY SITES RESEARCH CENTER) this past Summer at the Wheeler Site, Morrill's Point, Salisbury, Massachusetts. The excavations recovered both American (circa 1200 A.D.) and Historical material (circa 1600's - 1700's).
Of particular note in the recovery of Amerindian material from a midden were the fishing related tool assemblages. These included numerous forms of bone tools, as well, as some unique lithic fishing lures and fish-hook barbs. Small scrapers and utilized flakes, mostly made of exotic flints and jasper were also numerous. Projectiles recovered ranged from Steeped to Jack's Reef.

The most interesting part of the Summer's work was the uncovering of one of the foundations to the 1755 boil-down saltworks buildings. The saltworks were shown in an engraving of 1767 in Currier's History of Newburyport, and mentioned in deeds of the area, as well as shown on a map of 1800; yet no physical evidence was there to show the exact location of the site. Now, with the locating of one of the foundations, we can locate the others. Measurements of the foundations and use of the visual engraving will make it possible to reconstruct the site. The boil-down system of salt recovery in the colonial period in New England was limited and little is known about such sites. Numerous artifacts dating from 1750-1800 have been recovered.

DOUGLAS GEORGE, a Ph.D. student in the Department of Archaeology at Boston University, recently undertook an investigation into body and glaze composition of refined white earthenware through the facilities at the CENTER FOR MATERIALS RESEARCH in Archaeology and Ethnology at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. A collection of late 18th- and 19th-century refined white earthenwares selected from the collections excavated from the Narbonne House, in Salem, Massachusetts, was sorted into cream-, pearl-, and whitewares by several archaeologists. The collection was then studied with scanning electron microscope (SEM) and microprobe for compositional elements. No significant distinctions could be discerned between cream- and pearlwares by the SEM, but the microprobe did indicate trace element presence of cobalt in the pearlwares. Whiteware glazes were significantly higher in calcium and reducted in lead content than either cream- or pearlwares. Body composition of all three wares was similar. Investigation is expected to continue this fall using light refraction oils to discriminate the various glaze formulas within each type from one another.

Test excavations recently conducted at the Paul Revere House, Boston's oldest extant wood-frame house (1681), promise to shed new light on the city's early history. The excavations were co-directed by MARY BEAUDRY and RICARDO ELIA of BOSTON UNIVERSITY for the National Park Service. TAMARA RAMSEY supervised the fieldwork. Digging directly behind the house produced abundant remains of the 18th and 19th centuries, with lesser amounts of 17th-century artifacts. The abundance and range of imported ceramics probably reflect the status of the house's occupants, who included the Puritan theologian, Increase Mather; Robert Howard, one of Boston's wealthiest merchants; and craftsman, Paul Revere. An intact cobblestone walkway, dating to the 18th century, provides evidence of exterior surface levels prior to the house's restoration. An adjacent test pit revealed a 19th-century wood-lined privy pit filled with a remarkable assortment of soda bottles, cups, plates, pipes, buttons, and other artifacts in a matrix of clam shells.

The NORTH ATLANTIC REGION of the NATIONAL PARK SERVICE has formally established the Eastern Archeological Field Laboratory. The EAFL is the research arm of the Division of Cultural Resources. Three archaeological collections have been recatalogued as part of the EAFL Collections Management Program. Under the direction of ALAN SYMENKI and SHEILA CHARLES, collections from Morristown National Historical Park, the Great Island Tavern site at Cape Cod National Seashore, and the David Brown House site at Minute Man National Historical Park have been catalogued. Artifacts in these collections have been reorganized in the parks to facilitate their access to researchers. A computer program has been written to access the artifacts by type or provenience.

A short report describing the project, definition of artifact categories, storage location, and potential problems because of lack of field data has been written for each collection.
OLD STURBRIDGE VILLAGE is reconstructing a working up-and-down water powered sawmill on the site of a historic mill that burned in 1802. This will be a functioning exhibit in the museum and will feature a primary sawing floor and an ell with a turning shop. The plan is based on measured drawings of the Nichols-Colby sawmill in Bow, New Hampshire, which was destroyed in the 1938 hurricane shortly after being documented by HAER. The entire project is being directed by THOMAS Z. PENN, industrial archaeologist and technological historian for the museum.

The site of the reconstruction is in the museum and was first exploited for waterpower by David Wight, one of the early settlers in Sturbridge, in the late 18th century. Research and excavation at the site has been led by JOHN WORRELL, director of research at the Village. It has produced a fascinating array of information regarding the ingenious conversion by Wight and his successive heirs of a useless swamp into a facile and convenient waterpower site which eventually accommodated both saw- and grist-mills throughout the 19th century. Information ranges from sawyering artifacts sealed in the 1802 destruction layer through evidences of the engineering and massive topographic alterations by which some unusual geological features were transformed into canals, dikes, wharves and raceways.

During the summer of 1983 a team from RENSSELAER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE spent six weeks surveying and excavating structures of the "North Family" at Hancock Shaker Village. This was the first year of a several year project designed to research the village's outlying settlements and to show how they related to the core. The North Family did much of the manufacturing and processing for the village during the 19th century, and the building foundations and mill features still possess a high degree of integrity. In 1983 the surface of the family was mapped, and excavations systematically tested the remains of a dwelling house, a sawmill and a woolen mill. The excavations were under the direction of DAVID STARBUCK (RPI), and the results are being compared with other Shaker villages to develop an understanding of how the Shakers dealt with technological change.

The Center for Archaeological Studies at BOSTON UNIVERSITY conducted a field school in urban archaeology at the Wilkinson Backlot Site in downtown Boston during May and June of 1983; excavations continued with volunteer labor and with a National Endowment for the Humanities Chairman's Emergency grant through July and August. The investigations were directed by Drs. MARY BEAUDRY and RICO ELIA of BOSTON UNIVERSITY, with the assistance of TAMARA WAMSLEY and WILLIAM BARNETT. JUDITH DOLAN served as site tour guide. The site, located across Scott Alley from the Bostonian Hotel, provided evidence for three centuries of occupation of the Blackstone Block. While the 19th century was most prominent (a brick foundation housing a huge brick cistern dominated the center of the lot), late 18th-century privies filled with early 19th-century material and 18th-century drains were excavated. Mid-17th-century fill layers were found that seem to correlate with the dredging of Scottow's dock area (reported by JAMES BRADLEY et al. in The Archaeology of the Bostonian Hotel Site, MHC, 1983). The most intriguing feature to be excavated was an elongated, narrow pit, possibly a saw-pit, filled with late 17th-century materials. Predominant among these were portions of hand-hewn timbers, including a principal rafter, common rafter, principal purlin, roof boards, wattle, decorative trim pieces, and a fragment of a drop pendant. These remains, which were in a perfect state of preservation, may be architectural debris from a structure that burned in one of the fires that swept Boston in the 1680s. Other remains in the pit consisted of thousands of seeds and fruit pits, textile fragments, a portion of fish net, leather, faunal material, gilded brass straight pins, red and white clay pipes, and ceramics and glass. Pollen analysis and ethnobotanical studies are currently underway at Boston University; this unusual find from the 17th century will undoubtedly contribute considerably to our knowledge both of local vernacular building techniques and foodways. A preliminary report on the excavation has been prepared and may be purchased from the Center for Archaeological Studies.

EDWARD MORIN is currently working as crew chief for Berger and Associates at the Abbot Farm site in Trenton, N.J.

LAURIE WEINSTEIN is currently working at the Boston Children’s Museum as a consultant. She is sorting and analyzing their Native American lithics collection. The Museum has a large collection of artifacts: gouges, chisels, celts, blades, hoes, pestles, projectile points, etc. Most of these artifacts are from New England.

The SOCIETY FOR INDUSTRIAL ARCHEOLOGY will hold its thirteenth annual conference in Boston on June 14-17, 1984. The conference Committee is interested in receiving session proposals and abstracts. For information contact: Jeff Howry, Charles River Museum of Industry, 154 Moody Street, Waltham, MA 02154

NEILL DEPAOLI has recently completed three and a half months of archaeological fieldwork on the Maine coast. By late June, a crew led by DePaoli in cooperation with the EASTPORT WATERFRONT RESEARCH COMMITTEE had completed the second season of exploratory excavations on the site of the officer’s quarters of Fort Sullivan, an early 19th-century American fortification located in Eastport on the northern Maine coast. The excavations were successful in exposing a large portion of the foundations to the quarters, a probable floor to an attached outbuilding and a large early 19th century trash deposit. A preliminary report summarizing the 1982 and 1983 field seasons is available at the Maine Historic Preservation Commission, 55 Capitol Street, Augusta, Maine 04333.

The remainder of the summer Mr. DePaoli was involved in an archaeological survey of COLONIAL PEMAQUID, the site of an early 17th century English settlement situated on Maine’s southcentral coast. The survey, directed by CHARLES RAND and sponsored jointly by the MAINE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION and MAINE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION, located a number of historic features including a series of postholes probably associated with a 17th century structure, the chimney base to an early 18th century structure and the first evidence of the wooden palisade of Fort Charles, a fortification erected in 1677. A report will be completed and available at the MHPC by early October.

Currently, DePaoli is preparing an expanded report detailing the Fort Sullivan excavations. Particular emphasis is being placed on determining the construction sequence of the architectural features along with reconstruction of the consumption patterns of the quarters’ occupants. In the latter case, these results will be compared with those from several similar contemporary American military sites. A final published report will be out in print August, 1984. Individuals interested in exchanging comparative data are encouraged to contact: Neill DePaoli, 14 Washburn Street, Watertown, Mass. 02172 (617-923-0116).
Professor ALARIC FAULKNER of the UNIVERSITY OF MAINE AT ORONO and Dr. BRUCE BOURQUE of the MAINE STATE MUSEUM will investigate what may have been Monsieur Castine's late 17th-century "habitation" on the Bagaduce River in Castine. The site was suggested by an early map which Professor Faulkner and Dr. Bradley located in London two years ago. Following this small-scale survey, Professor Faulkner will continue his major excavation of Fort Pentagoet, also in Castine, built by the French in 1635 on the site of a slightly earlier Plymouth Colony trading post.

EMERSON BAKER, along with THEODORE BRADSTREET of the UNIVERSITY OF MAINE AT AUGUSTA, will be co-directing a highly visible excavation of Forst Western in Augusta, a palisade fortification dating from 1754. Designed with public education as an equal partner of scientific research, this project is a joint effort of the HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION, UMA, the CITY OF AUGUSTA, and the MAINE HUMANITIES COUNCIL, with major funding from the last two parties. It is hoped that the original location of various elements will be uncovered, leading at some time in the future to the complete reconstruction of this National Historic Landmark.

Another National Historic Landmark, the George Tate House of 1755 in Portland's Stroudwater district, will receive attention. The archaeological survey will be directed by AILEEN AGNEW and will involve test excavations on the grounds around the house as a means of identifying the 18th-century sites of paths, gardens, privies, and other outbuildings owned by the National Society of Colonial Dames of America in the State of Maine, Inc. Armed with these data, the Society may then be able to restore the landscape around this important building to its original appearance.

Dr. BRADLEY and NORMAN BUTTRICK of the FREEPORT HIGH SCHOOL faculty will collaborate on testing one or more late 18th and early 19th century farmstead sites owned by the Washburn-Norlands Foundation in Livermore. This project, designed by Buttrick and Mrs. ALFRED W. GAMMON, Director of the Norlands Living History Center, will teach introductory archaeological field techniques, with academic credit available from the University of Maine at Farmington. Beyond this, the excavations will provide valuable primary information on some of the earliest settlers of this interior region.

This past summer, the UCONN archaeological field school, under the direction of NICHOLAS BELLATONI, excavated two prehistoric habitation sites previously located during surveys conducted by the PUBLIC ARCHAEOLOGY SURVEY TEAM, INC. The Gluck site (P.A.S.T. 19-6) is a Late Archaic base camp situated in the eastern highlands on a tributary emptying into the Quinebaug River. The spatial distribution of lithic artifacts as well as a trend surface analysis of the complete artifact inventory suggests at least three occupations, including a Middle Archaic, Late Archaic and a Late Woodland component. Six charcoal features were uncovered and are currently being analyzed. Trend surface analysis was utilized as a predictive tool in locating areas of differential artifact frequencies.

Hoffman's Halfmile (P.A.S.T. 75-7) is a stratified site located on the eastern bank of the Connecticut River in Lyme. The upper 20 centimeters consisted of a Late Middle Woodland occupation with refuse pits and accumulations of bone, stone and ceramic debris. The site is one of several that have produced evidence of the association of quartz narrow stemmed points with Early and Middle Woodland ceramics. Below the Middle Woodland occupation (40-60cm), a Broadspear occupation was excavated, which yielded a hearth feature dating to 970 BC. The site was excavated to test several hypotheses concerning Broadspear settlement and subsistence in the Lower Connecticut River Valley.
JOHN PFEIFFER (SUNY ALBANY) conducted a study designed to investigate the relationship of two previously excavated cremation burial sites which lay 25 meters apart in Old Lyme, Connecticut. The hypothesis was posed that other such sites exist in the immediate vicinity and that the potential for horizontal stratigraphy existed. Testing during 1982 demonstrated prehistoric activity other than burial in the adjacent parcels of land.

Within the first five weeks of the excavation it was clear that the two cremation sites did not overlap. The Bliss site was purely a 4775 year old cremation burial and the Griffin site was a 3160 year old cremation burial. The intriguing and unpredicted aspect of our excavation was that we began detecting house patterns associated with the Bliss cremation. We named this component the Howard site after the land owner.

One hundred eighty-four square meters were excavated, revealing a Laurentian Village directly associated with the Bliss burial complex. Fragments of artifacts found in the 1981 excavations of the Bliss site fit pieces which were recovered from within two of the three oval structures excavated this summer at the Howard site. With these structures were, hearths, storage pits, refuse pits, workshops, and caches. Over 500 artifacts were recovered, including small-stemmed, Brewerton and Vosburg projectile points, scrapers, drills, and knives, and axe fragment, 3 bannerstones, a gouge, and two ulu. From refuse pits which were just outside structure #1 came fish, bird, and mammalian bone, hickory and walnut pieces and chenopodium.

Together the Bliss and Howard sites have provided northeastern archaeology a complete village site along with ritual and habitation loci. This should greatly aid in defining a "Laurentian culture system".

The PUBLIC ARCHAEOLOGY SURVEY TEAM has completed its sixth and final season on the Lower Connecticut River Valley Archaeological Project. This season's field work focused on the Town of Old Lyme, situated at the mouth of the Connecticut River along Long Island Sound. To date over 400 sites and 1200 components have been identified ranging from Paleo through the contact period.

The P.A.S.T. is currently planning two projects in the Thames drainage of eastern Connecticut. The first will be a systematic survey of the drainage over the next five years to reconstruct general settlement patterns for the Archaic and Woodland periods. Preliminary results from the I-84 project in eastern Connecticut indicate a more dispersed settlement pattern in the Thames than in the Connecticut drainage.

The second project, currently in the planning stages will be an ethno-archaeology project in conjunction with the Mashantucket Pequots in southeastern Connecticut. The first stage of the project will involve an intensive survey of the Pegout reservation, which has been continuously occupied since 1637. The second stage will be a survey of the Lower Thames drainage to locate and identify both historic and 'prehistoric' Pequot sites by the presence of diagnostic 'Shantock' type ceramics, in an attempt to focus on the historic and prehistoric lifeways of the Pequots.

The P.A.S.T. is continuing Phase II work on over 85 prehistoric and 12 historic sites located within the I-84 alignment in eastern Connecticut. Phase II will be completed by December, and mitigation on 30 sites in western section of the highway will begin in the spring.
GEORGE NICHOLAS (UMASS-AMHERST; AMERICAN INDIAN ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE) has completed the first phase of a several year study of Paleo-Indian and Early Archaic settlement relating to early Holocene lake and wetland systems in northwestern Connecticut. This study is conducted under the auspices of the Robbins Swamp Project, directed by RUSSELL HANDS (AlAI), which is examining the relationship between Middle Holocene and subsequent prehistoric populations and their changing environments. The early Holocene study includes: mapping and reconstruction of early postglacial lacustrine and riverine surficial geology; systematic survey and testing of related early postglacial landforms for Paleo-Indian and Early Archaic sites; and correlation of these records to those of the Middle Holocene. Location of about 30 new sites, mapping of lake stages, and collection of large diameter cores for sedimentological, macrofossil, radiometric, and palynological analyses has been accomplished with PETER PATTON (WESLEYEN). Preliminary survey results indicate both site clustering and multiple components are frequent, with a very high site density expected for the present swamp area. Although no diagnostic early Holocene artifacts have been recovered in surface collections, materials presumed to be early include heavily patinated flakes that have been reworked into scrapers, projectile point types (eg., serrated, Kirk-like points) that do not fit neatly into Middle and Late Archaic typologies, and other material that includes what may be partially mineralized bone. Work will resume in the fall with survey and testing of shoreline, terrace and upland areas scheduled for 1984.

As part of its ongoing research into the world of the early 19th-century, rural, New England craftsman, OLD STURBRIDGE VILLAGE sponsored a second season of excavations this summer at an 1820s-30s craft neighborhood in the northeastern Connecticut village of Phoenixville. JOHN WORRELL (OLD STURBRIDGE VILLAGE) and DAVID SIMMONS (UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA) directed students participating in the 5th OSV Field School in Historical Archaeology, along with a crew of regular, volunteer archaeologists, in the excavation of three sites in the Sprague Hill neighborhood: the Sprague blacksmith shop, in operation by 1822 and defunct by 1836, and two house sites—the Gurley/Taylor house, built on speculation during the early 1820s, and the Wilcox/Simmons house, constructed during the early 1830s as part of the expanding craft complex. Both of these very modest houses were first the homes of blacksmiths working in the neighborhood, and then of relatively poor, single women. A large area of the blacksmith shop floor was excavated yielding considerable functional information on shop workspace, especially with regard to the primary blacksmithing area, storage of fuel in the "coal" (charcoal) house, and the immediate source of water, as well as information on shop production. Work at the Gurley/Taylor house focused upon a large, dressed stone, subterranean feature, probably a root cellar, which was completely excavated. Measuring about 12 feet square by slightly over 5 feet in height, the cellar abutted the front wall of the house, extending under the front yard terrace; it would have been entered from the lower floor of the house through an opening in the front foundation. The cellar was designed to be capped with four or five stones of varying width, of which only one remained in situ. They were over 14 feet long and were sealed with lime cement caulking. Either during its construction or early in its use, several of the cellar's cap stones broke, collapsing onto the floor. The cellar was abandoned and filled with cobbles and boulders. Excavations at the Wilcox/Simmons house site revealed much information on the siting and construction of the house and on refuse disposal patterns about the yard. Excavations will continue at all three sites this summer and fall, and material culture analysis will take place this winter in the OLD STURBRIDGE VILLAGE archaeology lab.
Examining the Urban Environment through the Analysis of Floral Remains

INTRODUCTION

Walking down any city street one is met by the myriad sights, sounds and smells which combine to form that environment which is described as urban. The archaeological record of that environment is both complex and analytically demanding for those involved in its study. In order to insure that the total urban environment be understood, archaeologists working in New England's cities (e.g., Bradley et al. 1983) have begun to employ an interdisciplinary research strategy similar to that used by urban archaeologists in Europe (i.e., Hall and Kenward 1982; Baart et al. 1977). Questions concerning issues such as material manifestations of social stratification are now being combined with a greater interest in the ecological ramifications of urbanization (e.g., Kelso and Schoss 1983).

The purpose of this paper is to present the results of the analysis of floral remains from Queen Anne Square in Newport, Rhode Island. The chief goal is to provide comparative data for archaeologists working in other New England cities. The results are preliminary and therefore are subject to reinterpretation. Furthermore, because in this case it is necessary to be brief, only a fraction of the interpretative results are presented.

RESEARCH FRAMEWORK

The focus of this research was the floral remains from three privies excavated in Queen Anne Square in Newport, Rhode Island. One of the overriding issues under consideration surrounded the discovery of archaeological signatures of socioeconomic stratification in urban society. Based upon prior analysis (Mrozowski 1981) it was possible to isolate the assemblages of two artisan households and one of a prominent merchant. Although artifacts such as ceramics and glassware did indicate noticeable differences between the three households that might reflect status differentiation, it was felt that diet might prove a more sensitive and therefore a more reliable barometer of stratification.

In addition to the questions surrounding stratification, the research also sought to identify those species of plants which might have characterized an heavily urbanized section of Newport during the eighteenth century. The area studied was adjacent to the waterfront and represented part of what was the city's commercial hub in the eighteenth century.

RESULTS

The results of the analysis focus on the individual features, followed by an interpretive section in which household comparisons are drawn.

Carr House Feature 1

Based upon prior analysis (Mrozowski 1981) this feature is felt to be associated with the Tate household (1742-1780). An inventory of all the species identified is presented below, including a quantitative breakdown.

Carr House Feature 2

This feature has been dated to the period 1800-1815, a time when the house was leased by Joseph Yoeman, a butcher. His son sold the house in 1818 after the death of his father.
Brown Property Feature 1

This feature is tightly dated to the period 1740-1760. It is on the property of James Brown, a Newport merchant.

**SPECIES INVENTORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Latin Name</th>
<th>Carr House Features</th>
<th>Brown House Feature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Dewberry</td>
<td>(Rubus flagellaris)</td>
<td>1292*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Raspberry</td>
<td>(Rubus occidentalis)</td>
<td>93#</td>
<td>1292#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Elderberry</td>
<td>(Sambucus canadensis)</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Redish</td>
<td>(Raphanus sativus)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrimony</td>
<td>(Agrimonia striata)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>(No species)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild Crab Apple</td>
<td>(Pyrus coronaria)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackberry</td>
<td>(Celtis Mississippianis)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Squash</td>
<td>(Cucurbita pepo)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple of Peru</td>
<td>(Nicandra physalodes)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Flowered Ground Cherry</td>
<td>(Physalis grandiflora)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringwing</td>
<td>(Cycloma atriplicifolium)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig</td>
<td>(Ficus carica)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grape</td>
<td>(Unknown species)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grape</td>
<td>(Vitis cordifolia)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barberry</td>
<td>(Berberis vulgaris)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flax</td>
<td>(Linum usitatissimum)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild-lettuce</td>
<td>(Lactuca scarola)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Nightshade</td>
<td>(Solanum nigrum)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bur-reed</td>
<td>(Sparganium americanum)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimsonweed</td>
<td>(Datura stramonium)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Mustard</td>
<td>(Brassica nigra)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poi Henselock</td>
<td>(Conium maculatum)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This figure includes both Dewberry and Raspberry.

INTERPRETATION

From an ecological perspective one of the more interesting findings was the representation of four species of Solanaceae in the Newport material. Kelso and Schoss (1983:74) suggest that in Boston the upward trend in nightshade pollen during the eighteenth century indicates progressively drier soils. Their explanation for this shift is that: draining of the local soils by the dredging of the mill creek in the A.D. 1640s and the accumulation of trash and fill in the area progressively dried the soil and created an expanding habitat for grasses (Kelso and Schoss 1983:74).

This explanation seems to be substantiated by the results from Newport. During the seventeenth century, Queen Anne Square was adjacent to a large marsh which was subsequently drained and filled. Therefore, it is possible that an ecological mechanism similar to that suggested by Kelso and Schoss (1983) influenced the spread of Solanaceae in Queen Anne Square as well.

The second major question targeted for research concerned identification of differences between merchant and artisan households that might be attributed to status differentiation. It is in relation to this question that the results of the analysis speak most directly. First and foremost is Anderson's (1971:53) suggestion that in England gardens were "a basic source of foods for all but the very rich who looked upon gardening more as a hobby than a profession." If this argument is extended to the wealthy in the New World the question can be posed: can evidence be found which suggests merchants did not have vegetable gardens? While I believe an answer to this question is obtainable, problems concerning preservation (e.g., Green 1982) with reference to plant remains make interpretation difficult. The fact that little vegetable matter was recovered from the merchant household's privy is far from conclusive evidence that no cultivation took place.

Looking at the question synchronically, there do exist some intriguing differences as well as continuities. Among the similarities is the overwhelming predominance of both blackberries (Northern Dewberry) and raspberries in all three assemblages. Anderson (1971:142-143) and Brown (1966) stress the popular use of these fruits in making wines and brandies during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Anderson (1971:142) also notes that these fruit wines
"constituted one of the most significant modes of preservation for even
the lesser yeoman." Jellies made from these fruits were also popular
although the necessary sugar made their production prohibitive for some.
However, can we say the presence of seeds from these fruits represent
actual household production of these various wines? Helbaek (1970:207)
has interpreted blackberry and raspberry seeds from marsh dweller sites
in the Alps dating to the second millenium B.C. as evidence of wine
making. He has countered arguments that they represent only human
excrement by noting that larger fruit pits found with the smaller seeds
could not have passed through the system. Larger fruit pits such as
peach and cherry were recovered from Queen Anne Square during the
excavation. However, the blackberry and raspberry seeds were recovered
through flotation so it is difficult to say what these remains represent
with any sort of clarity.

Perhaps the most interesting difference is the relatively low
percentage of vegetables found in the merchant's assemblage. This
distinction is coupled with the curious presence of two species
particularly known for their narcotic properties. Both Jimsonweed and
Poisen Hemlock are extremely dangerous if taken in large doses. Either
taken in a small quantity can act as a sedative and anti-spasmodic
(Bentley and Trimen 1880:118, 192). It is documented that Jimsonweed
was used by Virginia doctors during the seventeenth century where it
gained a reputation for having turned the behavior of a group of
soldiers into a "pleasant comedy" (Blanton 1930:112).

Jimsonweed's power as a narcotic was certainly known in the
eighteenth century. Bentley and Trimen (1880:192) note an interesting
use of seeds: "A tincture prepared by digesting the entire seeds in
spirit of wine presents a greenish fluorescent appearance."

The seeds of numerous plants in both artisan privies provide
some substantial evidence of cultivation and household
economy. This is especially true of Feature 2 at the Carr House.
Besides radish, a common garden crop, flax was also discovered. Carrier
(1923:149) notes that most flax was "grown only in small patches for
home use." Feature 1 had the widest variety of plants presented in
its assemblage. Herbs like Agrimony were found along with apple, fig,
radish and squash remains. Both species of Solanaceae, Apple of Peru
and Ground Cherry, are found most often in association with gardens.
This list of species is the strongest evidence for household gardening
of any of the three feature assemblages.

CONCLUSION

The assemblages from the three features taken as a whole contains
many Old and New World species which by the mid-eighteenth century were
completely naturalized. This aspect of the European colonization of the
New World, vividly reflected in these floral remains, adds to our
knowledge of the ecological ramifications of European settlement. The
rapidity with which this transformation took place and the scope of the
impact point to the totality of the colonizing process.

This analysis may also suggest some answers to the nagging question
of how to discern household level differences archaeologically which
might be due to growing social stratification within a society. The
possible cultivation and use of plants as narcotics by merchants is one
example. The prevalence of home gardens among artisans, but not
merchants, and possible ways to discern this difference in the
archaeological record is a second line for further inquiry. If nothing
else, the results will hopefully begin to fill an immense void in our
knowledge of this period.
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When asked to write this essay on Bruce Trigger's article, American Archaeology as Native History: A Review Essay, I must admit I was a bit hesitant. After all, why write a review essay of an article which is already explicitly a review essay? Will someone come along in a few months and write a review essay of my review essay, and later, will someone write a review of the review of my review? Perhaps, through a series of reviews of reviews we can eventually distill the essence of Trigger's arguments to a paragraph, then a sentence, a phrase, and finally, a single word (plastics?).

In any event, Trigger's essay outlines a history of the development of the construction of "pre-histories", or cultural historical sequences within the broader context of the development of archaeology in the Americas. Within this broader context, Trigger's primary focus is on the contribution, if any, the archaeological reconstruction of culture history can make to social science. The following assertions summarize Trigger's argument:

1) Early unilineal evolutionists saw American Indians as being "stuck" in the earliest stages of human cultural evolution.

2) Because of this implied lack of significant developmental evolutionary "history", it was assumed that archaeologists could provide little in the way of explication of cultural evolution through the study of Amerind prehistory.

KEN FEDER
Ethnologists could much more easily study a living Indian culture. Since there was so little difference, and certainly no evidence of significant development between the extinct and the living, why bother?

3) Through the work of archaeologists it was determined that, in fact, the archaeological record of North America indicated great variation and sequences of change through time. While initially these changes were ascribed to diffusion, eventually, through the efforts of archaeologists constructing regional culture histories, the inventiveness of native American cultures was recognized. American Indian cultures were finally understood as having significant evolutionary histories.

4) The New Archaeology played an important role in getting rid of the last vestiges of the inherent racism behind the assumption of a static condition of Indian culture.

5) However, the philosophy of the New Archaeology emphasized using the archaeological record to test general social scientific propositions about human behavior at the expense of the construction of local sequences. Archaeological data are herein viewed as being of importance only insofar as they can be used to test such general propositions about human behavior. Thus, there was a decided anti-historical bias in the New Archaeology; "Ironically, at the same time that the New Archaeology encouraged a more dynamic view of the native past, its desire to establish its credentials as a nomothetic social science caused it to oppose the idea that the past was a worthy subject of study in its own right" (Trigger 1983: 429).

Thus, in Trigger's construct we have come full circle. Social scientists did not write culture histories of American Indians in the 18th and 19th centuries because Indians did not have culture histories worth writing about. Today we again eschew culture history, this time in its own right, as a particularist enterprise which provides little if anything of social scientific import. Thus, while we have overcome the inherent racism of the past, the results are effectively same. We again ignore the history (in its broadest sense) of the native peoples of the Americas, but now for ostensibly valid scientific reasons.

Indeed archaeologists have had varied opinions of the value and role of culture history and its reconstruction. Extreme opinions range from Clark's enthusiasm; "Conversely, it is in the reconstruction of prehistory, the unwritten history of all but a comparatively brief span of all humanity, that archaeology can render its greatest contribution to human understanding" (1939: 22), to Binford's skepticism; "We know much too little about both archaeological data and processes of cultural development to make 'reading of the archaeological record' anything but a shallow and suspicious pastime" (1968: 11-12).

Trigger recognizes the ambivalence with which the profession currently views culture history. He characterizes the present professional consensus on works that focus on cultural historical reconstruction as being between the two above presented extremes when he states, "The current view that such works are merely a form of popularization reflects the striking devaluation of a historical approach..." (1983: 438).

So, it seems quite simple. Cultural historical reconstruction is either the most important thing we as archaeologists can do, a pointless enterprise that we should avoid entirely, or a dirty little job, but one that the public demands, so we have to do it.

So where does that leave us? Trigger devotes much of his article summarizing a number of attempts at the writing of "histories" of prehistoric Indian groups in different parts of the country—both when they were considered state of the art (Ritchie 1944; Cole and Deuel 1937) and more recent attempts, produced after culture histories had fallen from fashion (Haviland and Power 1981; Snow 1980). Trigger is critical of some, it is clear that he views culture history as one of a series of important contributions archaeology can make both to social science and to "plain old folks." He particularly notes that in terms of the modern day descendants of the people whose activities resulted in the archaeological remains which we study, i.e., American Indians, there is a certain obligation on the part of archaeologists to produce culture histories. It is hard to argue against Trigger's supposition that contemporary American Indians expect archaeology to provide them with their unwritten histories. American Indians have been exploited in various ways by those of us who are not native to this hemisphere. The "use" of archaeological data just to satisfy our own scientific curiosity, and to produce results which are only of marginal specific interest or relevancy to American Indians is clearly exploitative. But, the question remains, is culture history science? Trigger thinks it is and I will here agree with this general assessment.
Indeed, culture history can be and has often been, a non-scientific, particularistic enterprise. Just as historians can be seduced by the overwhelming flurry of particulars that the written record can provide, archaeologists can be and often have been seduced by the particulars of interesting cultural sequences, particularly where those sequences have shown tremendous amounts of change. But neither written history nor reconstructed culture history should be rejected because some historians and some archaeologists became misdirected.

At the same time, Trigger's review points out a hidden assumption on the part of those who view culture history as useful, but only insofar as it satisfies the public’s desire for such reconstruction. The assumption seems to be that culture history is terribly interesting to non-archaeologists, while explanation is of little interest. In other words, "prehistoriography" may be a thankless task, but it is what the public wants. We have to give the public what it wants because they pay for so much of our research.

The assumption that culture history is by definition more interesting to non-scientists than general explanations of human life is almost certainly spurious. Of course, if we make only culture history intellectually accessible to the general public and at the same time erect barriers of jargon and technical complexities around explanation, the public will prefer culture history.

How much of the public gets most of its archaeological information from museum or monument pamphlets? In a recent perusal of about two dozen archaeological monument guides from the midwest and southwest, the bias was clear. Almost all had sections on the local environment, and the place of the site in question within the local cultural historical sequence. In not a single pamphlet or guide however, was there even the briefest discussion of why the archaeology of the particular site in question might be of general interest to social scientists. Are questions of the general human response to environmental change, the causes and effects of warfare, the impact of a radically new technology, and so on, really of so little interest to the public that the more general implications of the archaeological record need not be directed to them at all? Or do we mistake cause and effect? Is it not more likely that the public seems most receptive to culture history because that is what we provide them and that is what they come to expect? Don't we define our own discipline to the general public? If they then are misinformed about the various scientific contributions of archaeology beyond culture history, is it not our own fault?

There are important exceptions to this professional bias. A series of very good examples of attempts at "nomothetic archaeology for the people" were published under the heading "In Praise of Archaeology" in the late lamented popularly oriented Journal Early Man (Rathje 1981, 1982a,b,c,d).

In these pieces, explicitly labeled "A series of essays that apply the findings of archaeology to topics of popular interest in modern society", Rathje (1981) attempts to use the general lessons of the past to examine questions that relate to modern life and, at the same time, attempts to show how lessons of the present can help us better understand the past. Rathje considered topics such as the role of the "great man" in history (1982--comparing Egyptian pharaoh Akenaten with Anwar Sadat), and the reality of cannibalism (1981). He examined the popularity of Holiday Inn and other national chains (comparing them to the Omec Tradition (1982d)) and he analyzed the bankruptcy of Braniff International Airlines, comparing it to the rather sudden demise of the Mayan civilization (1982c). Finally, he attempted to assess the scientific validity of sociobiology through the use of archaeological data (1982d).

Rathje emphasized using data with which he is most familiar--the culture history of Mesoamerica. Nevertheless, each piece represents a dialectic in which the past and the present are used to explain each other. In each, Rathje uses the archaeological record to derive some general conclusions about "people" rather than about "a people". It is hard to believe that the general public might not be just as fascinated by these more general applications of the record of prehistory as they are by specific cultural historical sequences.

In conclusion, I must agree with the key assertion of Trigger's essay that there is a place for different kinds of archaeologies within the discipline of archaeology. At a minimum, culture history fills a need or desire on the part of many non-archaeologists, particularly Native Americans. At best culture history provides valuable information about ways of life for which there are no written records and which can then be viewed as one important step in archaeological analysis where local sequences of change through time can be established. These sequences of change must then be analyzed and explained in terms of general human behavior. Clearly, then, culture history has a rightful place in the study of the past.
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The enclosed questionnaire was prepared by a committee formed after the last CNEA meeting to consider employer-employee or labor relations, as well as more general labor practices in New England archaeology. Its purpose is twofold. First, the composition of our membership, and, therefore, the nature of common work environments, must be determined. The reduction of academic employment and the rise of compliance archaeology, and with it of archaeology for profit, have affected what it means to be an archaeologist. Second, the degree of concern of members over the changing nature of this work, and the resultant change in the ordering and evaluating of the work, must be assessed. We need your response to identify the issues and problems to be addressed by the committee. The more answers we receive, and the more complete the answers, the more reliable the information will be. They are of course designed to remain anonymous. We ask your cooperation.

Please remove the questionnaire and return it with your answers to:

Myron O. Stachiw
562 Pleasant Street
Pawtucket, R.I. 02860

Claire Dempsey
168 Pearl Street
Cambridge, MA 02139

Should your answers require more space than a sentence (we hope so), please attach additional sheets.

CONFERENCE REGISTRATION
AND
MEMBERSHIP DUES

1984

Membership dues for 1984 are $7.50. Membership covers the period from March 1, 1984, through the end of February, 1985 and includes two issues of the Newsletter.

The Conference registration fee is $8.00 and covers registration and lunch.

NAME ____________________________

ADDRESS __________________________

1984 membership @ $7.50 $____

1984 Conference Registration @ $8.00 $____

*Special Discount for preregistration and 1984 Membership @ $15.00 if mailed before February 29, 1984 $____

Total amount enclosed $____

Make checks payable to: CONFERENCE ON NEW ENGLAND ARCHAEOLOGY

Mail to: Kevin McBride
Treasurer, CNEA
Dept. of Anthropology
University of Connecticut
Storrs, CT 06260