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A LATE ARCHAIC HOUSE PATTERN ON LONG ISLAND

Gretchen Anderson Gwynne

Long Island Chapter

INTRODUCTION

In the absence of virtually indestructible architectural features such as the remains of walls and floors that characterize ancient habitation sites in some parts of the world, northeastern North American archaeologists must rely on postmolds to provide their clearest evidence of prehistoric structures. In some parts of the northeast, these marks are readily identifiable in clayey or loamy soils (see, e.g., Ritchie and Funk 1973:44 ff.; 166 ff.). On Long Island, however, postmolds - especially those clearly referable to dwellings - are not common, no doubt due (at least in part) to the sandy, crumbly texture of local soils. Many a Long Island archaeologist has had the frustrating experience of attempting to cross-section what appears to be a postmold, only to have the suggestive dark stain diffuse and disintegrate in the sandy soil. Thus it was with some surprise that we were recently able to identify a contiguous series of seven postmolds at a Long Island habitation site dating to the Late Archaic period. To my knowledge these are the only clearly-defined Late Archaic postmolds found to date at a habitation site on the North Shore of the island.

The site lies within a large, privately held parcel of land abutting Long Island Sound in southern coastal New York. This property, totaling more than seventy acres, has been owned jointly by members of a real-estate partnership for several generations, and hence has not been subject to the intensive residential development that has characterized other, similarly attractive areas near the water's edge. Judging from the cultural materials found plentifully scattered on the surface, it has seen intensive human use in both the prehistoric and historic periods.

For many years the remains of these activities attracted arrowhead collectors and treasure-seekers to the property. Having suffered repeated invasions of their privacy, its owner/residents are understandably anxious to protect themselves against further trespassing. Indeed, several years ago they went so far as to call in a bulldozer to eradicate from the property all signs of an early historic period dump that had become a drawing-card for bottle collectors. Because of their strong desire for complete anonymity, the owners requested that I not reveal more than the general location of the archaeological site described in this paper.(1)

The site was located on gently-rising, wooded ground on the east side of a northward-flowing stream emptying into an estuary and thence into Long Island Sound. It was in many ways physically analogous to the very fruitful Pipestave Hollow archaeological zone at Mount Sinai Harbor, Suffolk County, Long Island, where earlier fieldwork had revealed plentiful Late Archaic remains (Gramly 1977; Gramly and Gwynne 1979), and I therefore hope to be able to recover evidence of Late Archaic habitation at this similar site. I was especially interested in finding osteoarchaeological remains to compare with those in the extensive Pipestave Hollow assemblage, an assemblage that had strongly suggested the possibility of year-round residence on the North Shore in the Archaic period. Because of poor faunal preservation this hope was not to be realized, but in our search for faunal remains we were rewarded by the discovery of a partial house outline that is the subject of this report.

TESTING OF THE SITE

After negotiating with members of the landowners' association, I gained permission to survey a small but potentially productive section of their property adjacent to the above-mentioned stream. The area is a long, narrow, curving strip of wooded land, approximately 550m in length, bounded on the west by the stream and on the east by a meadow in which several horses grazed. Because of the animals we were required to limit the area of the survey to the narrow, wooded section.
With a small field crew, I spent four weeks in intensive archaeological survey and testing in this area. Using the transect interval sampling design (Chartkoff 1978)(2), we laid out and excavated a total of ninety-four test pits at three separate loci, with results that were both rewarding and disappointing. The nearly ubiquitous appearance in the test pits of quartz debitage and broken quartz artifacts, and the occasional discovery of an intact, diagnostic object of quartz or, more rarely, jasper or chert, showed that the area had seen considerable prehistoric use. My hope of finding one or more habitation sites dating to the Late Archaic period was encouraged by the discovery, at two loci, of diagnostic stone tools of well-documented Late Archaic types and copious amounts of fire-shattered rock. In fact, although an occasional diagnostic tool referable to the Terminal Archaic and later Woodland periods was unearthed, it was clear that the Late Archaic was the period of the most intensive aboriginal use of the whole western edge of the habitation zone.

However, my hopes of recovering faunal remains comparable to those recently unearthed at Pipestave Hollow were frustrated. Organic preservation was so poor throughout the area that no prehistoric bone and only small amounts of badly eroded bivalve shells were discovered. Only one feature (a cooking feature) was located in this preliminary phase of the fieldwork, but in view of the fact that we were testing at ten-meter intervals I did not take this to be an indication of sparse prehistoric use of the area.

In general, the results of this fieldwork were sufficiently rewarding to warrant taking an archaeological field school back to the area in the following field season for more survey work and some test excavations.(3) By the end of this season, we had sunk an additional thirty-two test holes at two more loci, completing the survey of the narrow, wooded strip in which we were permitted to work, and had cleared ten two-meter squares, located in the three most promising loci of what was obviously a culturally-diffuse prehistoric habitation zone. At one of these loci, pinpointed by the relatively high frequencies of quartz chips and flakes and an occasional partial stone tool in the previous year’s test pits, we had the good fortune to discover seven postmolds, together with cooking features and stone tools diagnostic of the Late Archaic period.

EXCAVATIONS AT THE POSTMOLD LOCUS

After test-pitting had revealed the sub-surface presence of Late Archaic cultural material, four test squares (A-D) were laid out at what I shall call the Postmold Locus (see Figure 1). Square A at this locus proved to have been badly disturbed in the historic period. It contained fragments of glass, nineteenth century crockery, and brick, plus rusted nails and mussel shells (a bivalve of which the very frangible shell is almost never encountered in Late Archaic shell middens along the North Shore). Fragments of aboriginal stone tools were also present, and together this mixed assemblage persisted, in a test pit dug into the center of the square, to subsoil, 68 cm below the surface. Further excavation of this square was not attempted.

Squares B, C, and D, in which historic-period materials were not encountered below the bottom of Level 2 (approximately 22 cm below the surface), contained culturally mixed prehistoric materials, with stone tools typical of the Late Archaic period predominating among the diagnostic artifacts. Although excavation of these squares proceeded in natural stratigraphic layers differentiated by soil color and texture changes, no clearly-defined cultural stratigraphy, associable with these changes, was evident in any of the three squares after completion of the excavations.

Of fourteen diagnostic or possibly diagnostic projectile points from Squares B, C, and D of the Postmold Locus, six were typical Late Archaic narrow-stemmed forms (Lamoka or Wading River types). One of these was made of grey-black chert, while the other five were all of indigenous white quartz. A seventh point might have been the base of a Late Archaic Sylvan Side-notched type, or possibly a large Lamoka (cf: Ritchie 1961:83, no. 25); in any event, it was definitely a Late Archaic stemmed type. The eighth was the basal portion of an (early?) Late Archaic Vosburg point, a type that Ritchie (1961) assigns Middle Archaic provenience but which is not uncommon in Late Archaic Squibnocket Complex assemblages from North Shore sites. The five remaining points with possible diagnostic utility were a (Terminal Archaic) Snook Kill broadpoint from 30 cm below the surface of Square C (a depth exceeding that of several of the narrow-stemmed points); a partial (probably Early Woodland) contracting-
stemmed point from Feature 1 in Square D; two (probably Late Woodland) triangular types, one from Feature 1 in Square D (perhaps a Woodland period feature) and one from the disturbed Level 2a of Square B; and two additional triangular types from Level 3 of Square C, the square that also contained the postmolds.

These last two projectile points are illustrative of a common problem in prehistoric archaeology on Long Island: the fracturing properties of the native quartz are such that fine distinctions in chipping techniques are not discernible, making typologies unreliable at best. Stemless, triangular projectile points are found in various cultural contexts in the coastal northeast: the early to middle Late Archaic (the Laurentian phase Beekman triangle); the middle Late Archaic (the Squibnocket triangle, a common accompaniment to narrow-stemmed points in Long Island assemblages); and the Late Woodland (the narrow, delicate Madison and rather larger, equilateral, Levanna triangles). To complicate matters further, a wide range of untyped but uniformly narrow triangular points also occurs (Ritchie 1961:117, Plate 35).

The two triangular points from Level 3 in Square C most closely resemble one of Ritchie's untyped narrow triangular points (1961:117, no. 6) and a Levanna type (1961:87, no. 12) respectively, although the latter might possibly be a Beekman triangle (1961:729). Their cultural provenience must remain
problematical. If these dubious triangular types are eliminated from consideration, the number of diagnostic projectile point types from the locus is reduced to twelve, of which nine, or 75%, are Late Archaic types. As a statistical sample, this small handful of objects from only twelve square meters of a site of unknown proportions is obviously inadequate. It does suggest, however, that the most intensive prehistoric use of the area took place in the Late Archaic period.

I believe that Level 3, 23-40 cm below the surface, represents the Late Archaic use of the Postmold Locus, despite the presence in this level of several objects attributable to other, later, prehistoric periods. In Squares B, C, and D, this level contained badly-eroded oyster shells (a species typical of Late Archaic sites on the North Shore), fire-shattered rocks, four of the six narrow-stemmed Lamoka or Wading River points referred to above, dozens of non-diagnostic bifaces, and literally thousands of quartz chips and flakes. The anomalous objects from Level 3 were one piece of aboriginal ceramics from Square B, two aboriginal ceramic fragments from Square C, and a small piece of brick from Square D. Because of the heavy predominance of markers for the Late Archaic period in Level 3, these few disparate objects were considered to be intrusive.

Two cooking features, extending through Levels 2 and 3 of Square B and levels 3 and 4 of Square D, consisted of concentrations of heat-shattered rock and charcoal which probably represented baking pits. One of these (Feature 1, Square D) contained a Late Archaic narrow-stemmed point at the bottom (43 cm below the surface), together with several bifaces, numerous chips, and 56 pieces of fire-shattered rock, but as it also contained a Late Woodland triangular projectile point and an Early Woodland contracting-stemmed point, it may be attributable to the Woodland period. The other cooking feature contained no diagnostic artifacts.

The series of postmolds of probable Late Archaic date became evident in Level 4 of Square C. Earlier, at Levels 1 and 2, this square had produced an intact narrow-stemmed point and the base of a second, together with the base of a Vosburg point, plus numerous bifaces and chips and a generous scatter of heat-shattered rock, all attesting to Late Archaic use of the area (Figure 2: 1 and 2). At Level 3 (23-40 cm below the surface), more fire-shattered rock and quartz chips, and yet another Late Archaic narrow-stemmed projectile point, an untyped triangular point, a possible Beekman (or Levanna?) triangle, and a Snook Kill projectile point were found (Figure 2:3), although two fragments of aboriginal ceramics in Level 3 showed that this level, like those above it, had suffered some cultural mixing.

The postmolds, first encountered in Level -1 at approximately 11 cm below the surface in orange-yellow, sandy-textured soil, appeared as dark, circular stains, c. 10 cm in diameter (the range was 9-12 cm). When the entire surface of the square was cleaned for mapping and photographing, nine such geometrically-regular stains, plus numerous smaller or amorphously-shaped stains probably resulting from tree roots and/or animal burrows, were evident (Figure 3). Later, upon cross-sectioning, it was felt that the shape of two of these (Figure 3: D and E) was not characteristic enough of postmolds to designate them as such.

The seven definite postmolds, each tapering to a point at the bottom, fell into a roughly semi-circular pattern. Within the confines of the postmold area, but all between 41-45 cm (Level 4) in depth, twenty-two quartz flakes, a partial bifacial scraper, one chert flake, and one Late Archaic narrow-stemmed point were found (Figure 2:4). Outside the postmold feature, in the southeast corner of Square C, a concentration of quartz chips was unearthed at 11 cm below the surface. The darkly-stained soil that constituted the postmolds themselves contained four large quartz flakes, seventeen quartz chips, and one chip of grey-black chert. These objects must have been contained in the sandy soil with which the original postholes were backfilled to support the posts.

In Square D, approximately 20 meters distant, the same yellowish, sandy soil was encountered at about the same depth below surface (43 cm). Here, however, no ten-centimeter, round, soil stains were observed. The appearance of these stains in one square and the lack of them in identical soil conditions in a nearby square at the same level strengthens the contention that the stains were indeed postmolds.

DISCUSSION

Our discovery of postmolds almost certainly associated with Late Archaic human habitation at the Postmold Locus was fortuitous, not only because relatively few postmolds had previously been
recognized on Long Island, but also because by no means all Long Island postmolds have been ascribable to residential structures. Salwen, for instance, found "about two dozen postmolds" of Woodland period vintage at Muskeeta Cove 2, but no clear pattern could be discerned (1982 [orig. 1968]:145); Latham (1957) recognized postmolds at the multi-component Smith site on Shelter island, but their cultural provenience was problematical. Solecki (1982:91 ff.) found fourteen small postmolds associated not with a dwelling but with a burial pit at Aqueduct on the South Shore of Long Island.(4)

Aboriginal house patterns have been identified occasionally at post-Archaic Long Island sites. For example, two (probably lost-contact) wigwam floors were discovered at a Shinnecock site on Sebonac Creek on the South Fork of the island (Harrington 1977 [orig. 1924]: 36), and postmolds representing a Late Woodland structure were identified at the Popolizio locus of the extensive Pipestave Hollow habitation zone at Mount Sinai Harbor (Gramly and Gwynne 1979). Werner (1982:206) reported a Late Woodland (possibly post-contact) house floor surrounded by what appeared to be postmolds left by
saplings at the Strong's Neck site on the North Shore, but, to my knowledge, no definite postmolds referable to a Late Archaic period dwelling had been recognized at any North Shore site prior to our find at the Postmold Locus.

It was not possible to reconstruct structure size or shape from our seven postmolds with any confidence, but their placement relative to one another suggested a dwelling either round or oval in shape, and slightly more than two meters in width (the distance between postmolds C and H in Figure 3). The postmolds may represent the end of an oblong structure with rounded ends, which, depending on its length, could have been quite roomy inside. With no other Late Archaic house patterns from Long Island, it is difficult to assess this suggestion, but we do know that, in the much later Late Woodland period, structures with this general shape were in use at Mount Sinai Harbor (Gramly and Gwynne 1979).

Whiting and Ayres (1968) have attempted to relate house shape and size to aspects of non-material culture including settlement type, in which we were particularly interested—in a sample of 136 ethnographically-recorded societies around the world. According to their definitions, the Postmold Locus house pattern would be classed as "curvilinear," but unfortunately curvilinear floor plans are not useful for predictions of settlement type (Whiting and Ayres 1968:124; see also Flannery 1972: 7). In 65% of their sample, curvilinear floor plans were associated with nomadic groups, but "a substantial number are found among sedentary peoples, and no good prediction can be made about the permanence of settlements where curvilinear floor plans are in use" (Whiting and Ayres 1968:125). There are numerous ethnographic examples of sedentary groups residing in curvilinear dwellings; for instance, coastal hunter/gatherers on Little Andaman Island in the Bay of Bengal lived "almost permanently" in
bands of five to ten families that occupied circular huts (Cipriani 1966), and circular huts inhabited by sedentary cultivators and herders are "widespread" in Africa (Flannery 1972:8).

Whiting and Ayres found no connection between house shape and the availability of trees as building materials; those sedentary peoples who constructed curvilinear houses lived in forested areas in which rectilinear houses made of wood could also have been constructed. Neither were there correlations between curvilinear house shape and social structure. Whiting and Ayres concluded that "given a society with curvilinear houses, one cannot tell whether there are status distinctions, extended families, or (unless it is one of the few societies with round houses in treeless environments) nomadism" (Whiting and Ayres 1968:126). Thus the finding of a probably curvilinear, possibly oval, house outline in a Late Archaic context on Long Island fails to shed any direct light on prehistoric social organization, settlement type, or mode of subsistence. However, the size of the supports that left the postmolds (all fell between nine and twelve cm in diameter) shows that the structure had been substantial-one that could support walls and a roof of any of several different materials (thatch, wattle and daub, and/or animal hides) of sufficient thickness and durability for winter as well as summer residence.

CONCLUSIONS

Prior to our discovery of Late Archaic postmolds on the North Shore of Long Island, one of the most obvious counter-arguments to the notion of prehistoric year-round residence in the southern coastal northeast had been the lack of evidence for structures substantial enough to house human beings through the cold winter months (see Ceci 1977:81; Wyatt 1977:76; Solecki 1982:94). Although a great deal more evidence must be added to these seven small soil stains before the Late Archaic subsistence and settlement system on Long Island is well understood, the fact that this kind of indirect evidence still exists in Long Island's sandy soil will, I hope, encourage area archaeologists to be vigilant in their search for evidence of coastal settlement patterns. For the writer, the discovery was personally significant: the seven postmolds were instrumental in any decision to continue the search for evidence of Late Archaic year-round occupation on Long Island, a search that ultimately yielded very specific evidence for fall and winter residence at two other North Shore sites where spring/summer residence could also be documented (Gwynne 1982).

ENDNOTES

1. I would like to express my sincere thanks to the members of the land-holding association for their cooperation and interest in the project described here. I regret that I cannot thank them by name.

2. This survey method is well suited to wooded areas in which there are known find-spots (such as stone tools, concentrations of stone chips, or shell debris on the surface) but for which the geographical limits of the area of occupation or use are unknown. In this method, sub-surface samples are collected with the use of shovels or post-hole diggers at regular intervals along transects radiating away from a known find-spot. Testing continues along these transects until no more material remains are encountered. In this manner, artifact variability and density, as well as the boundaries of the activity zone, can be very precisely defined.

3. My able co-director for this project was Dr. Elizabeth C. Stone of the Department of Anthropology, SUNY/Stony Brook.

4. We ruled out the possibility that our postmolds were the remains of a burial structure such as that found at Aqueduct on two grounds: first, no burial was encountered, and second, Solecki's Aqueduct burial structure was somewhat smaller than our house pattern and the structure had been supported by less substantial uprights.
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A LATE ARCHAIC CACHE FROM THE OSSINING ROCKSHELTER

Stuart J. Fiedel                      SUNY at Purchase
Photographs by Victoria Lamas

The Ossining Rockshelter is situated approximately two miles east of the Hudson River, in Ossining Township, Westchester County, New York. The site was originally tested, unsystematically, by avocational archaeologist Leslie V. Case in 1929. He was apparently deterred from extensive excavation by a layer of heavy fallen rocks that lay close to the surface. Nevertheless, Case reported his discovery of a number of artifacts, including a fragmented clay pot, which had been tempered with crushed shell, a very unusual trait in the Lower Hudson region.

I conducted excavations at the rockshelter in 1982, and continued working there into the spring of 1983 (Figure 1). My crew consisted of archaeology students from SUNY at Purchase. The new excavation revealed a single undifferentiated layer of dark brown soil, in which most of the cultural material was found. The types of projectile points recovered from this layer indicate occupations during the Late Archaic, Transitional, and Woodland periods. These points include several Vosburg, numerous "Taconics" (Sylvan Stemmed, Lamoka, Wading River points), a Normanskill, a Susquehanna-like

Figure 1. The Ossining Rockshelter; crevice, not visible, is in lower right hand corner
point, a Snook Kill basal fragment, an Orient Fishtail and a Levanna. Numerous potsherds, some of them shell-tempered, like Case's specimen, attest to Middle or Late Woodland occupation of the rockshelter. The hundreds of bone fragments recovered are still being analyzed. Deer, turkey, turtle, snake, fish and various small mammals have been recognized. Many oyster shells were also present as were a few fragments of ribbed mussel shell, and very rare pieces of scallop and clamshell. Charred hickory nutshells are the only remnant of the vegetal portion of the diet.

Near the end of the Spring 1983 field season, we made the exciting discovery reported here. Excavation had been proceeding southward along the base of the rock wall that forms the shelter. A few areas here had been severely disturbed, either by Case or latter arrowhead collectors, but generally, each meter square we excavated yielded two or three projectile points, plus debitage, bone, shell, and fire-cracked rocks, all randomly dispersed in a matrix of dark brown soil. This layer was about one meter thick; below it was a sterile layer of yellow to reddish sandy soil of varying thickness, which overlay bedrock. In Square 24, laid out at the mouth of a narrow crevice formed by a pile of large fallen rocks that lean against the rock wall at a sharp angle, the distinction between the brown and yellow layers was not as clear as it had been elsewhere. Probing into the yellowish soil within the crevice, we discovered two large flakes and a stemmed point. On our next visit to the site, further exploration of the back of the crevice revealed a cache of points, bifaces, and flakes-seventeen artifacts in all (Figures 3-4). They lay together in a pocket of yellowish soil, roughly 30 cm in diameter and 10 cm deep (Figure 2). The pocket was situated at the far end of the crevice, about 10 cm from its mouth. At its mouth, the roof of the crevice rose about 80 cm above the base of the debris-rich layer. The rocky flour of the crevice sloped upwards toward the rear, so that the cache of artifacts lay above the level at which artifacts had been found elsewhere in the shelter.

There can be little doubt that these artifacts had been intentionally deposited in this spot. The extraordinary concentration of so many artifacts in so small an area presents a sharp contrast to the

Figure 2. Interior of crevice; ruler marks site of cache
dispersed distribution of artifacts elsewhere at the site, and can hardly be accidental. The absence of the usual dark brown layer of occupational debris within the crevice is also noteworthy. I had originally suspected that the fallen rocks that form the crevice had been shaken loose from the overhang by blasting in the recent past. However, it now seems more likely that the rocks fell much earlier, and that the crevice must have existed in essentially its present form 4000 years ago, when the artifacts were deposited there. If a Late Archaic toolmaker did not put the objects where we found them, the only alternative is to suppose that some recent collector dug them up and, instead of bagging them at once, left them in a very inaccessible spot for safekeeping until his anticipated return to the site. One can readily understand why projectile points might be treated in this way, but what collector would be so concerned about mere flakes, which comprise the bulk of the cache? The internal consistency of the cache of artifacts, flakes all of about the same size, and made of the same kinds of lithic raw material, and points all of Late Archaic style - also weighs against the hypothesis of recent deposition. In my opinion, we can safely assume that the cache was hidden away by a Late Archaic toolmaker some 4000 years ago.

I am indebted to flint knapper Jeff Kalin and archaeologist Roberta Wingerson for their assistance in analysis of the artifacts described herein. Kalin has recognized in the collection four successive reduction stages in the manufacture of stone points: unmodified flakes, slightly retouched blanks, bifacially thinned blanks, and finished points. The raw materials employed, grey, brown, and red slate, siltstone, brownish chert, and quartz, could all have been obtained either locally or on the western side of the Hudson. One biface (Figure 4, #4) retains some of the outer cortex of the waterworn chert pebble from which it was chipped.

All of the finished points are stemmed specimens, referable to Late Archaic types (Figure 3). Although generally similar at this level of analysis, the points differ considerably in specific attributes.

![Figure 3. Points from the cache](image-url)
Most unusual is the long, thin point (#1), which has been identified as a Lackawaxen Straight Stem. Points of this type are reportedly rather common in Late Archaic assemblages from the Delaware Valley (Kinsey 1972), but only a few have been found at sites in the lower Hudson region. It is noteworthy that, as a group, the points from the cache resemble typical Late Archaic specimens from the Delaware Valley, as illustrated by Kinsey (1972:333, figure 103). On the other hand, point #2, with its oddly angled stem and un-retouched base, which retains pebble cortex, is similar to several illustrated specimens of Ritchie’s (1965) Lamoka type. Point #3 has a nearly side-notched base, and the stem of a result of found at the length, width, point #4 is somewhat contracting. Point #5 is markedly asymmetrical, probably as re-sharpening. Points #3, #4, and #5 are very similar to selected “Taconic” points Hanotak rockshelter, which was situated about 1 kilometer from the Ossining site. The end thickness of the points are, in cm:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Thickness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cache points are larger than most of the other Late Archaic points found at the site.

If, as we may reasonably suppose, the cache results from the activity of a single individual, we seek an explanation of the degree of stylistic variability that is represented by the cache points. Although the points are similar in width and thickness, they differ considerably in length, stem shape, and abruptness of retouch. These are some of the most critical attributes according to which typological must
distinctions are made, whether by archaeologists or by ethnographically observed makers of projectile points (Wiessner 1983). Given the evident simultaneity of deposition of the points, stylistic change through time is an inadmissible explanation. It is possible that the differing attributes reflect only the intractability of the raw material that the prehistoric knapper had to work with, or his own lack of skill. However, the differences between the most extreme examples, #1 and #5, strongly suggest that the knapper started out with different intentions, or "mental templates" (Deetz 1967), in each case, and realized these goals rather effectively in the final products. Having rejected these possibilities, we are left with only two credible alternatives: 1) the morphological variations reflect functional, not stylistic differences, i.e., the points were made by one person, but for different uses; or 2) points made by several people had somehow come into the possession of the individual who placed them in the cache.

Obviously, the case for a functional explanation rests primarily on the peculiarity of the Lackawaxen point. It is so long and thin, and appears to be so brittle, that it is hard to imagine its being used for the same tasks as the wider, shorter Archaic points. One might suggest that many of the Late Archaic stemmed points in archaeological collections started out as much longer points, and only reached their present size after repeated breakage and re-sharpening. However, those points from the Lower Hudson region that have been classified as Lackawaxens differ from other "Taconics" not so much in length as in their parallel blade-edges, the abrupt retouching of those edges, and the grainy raw materials from which they were made. So, Lackawaxens are not simply unbroken Taconics. If they did differ in function from other Late Archaic points, one must ask what activity was being performed so much more frequently in the Delaware Valley than in the Hudson Valley, which could account for the apparently much greater frequency of Lackawaxen points in the former region. Abler (1971), in his study of presumed projectile points from Rodgers Shelter, Missouri, found wear traces indicative of three different functions: 1) heavy-duty cutting, sawing, and cleaving; 2) light-duty cutting and piercing; and 3) use as projectiles. Points used for light-duty cutting generally were narrow-bladed and lacked notches for hafting (Alder 1971:107). Perhaps Lackawaxen points belonged to this functional class. In any case, the lifeways of the inhabitants of the Delaware and Hudson valleys must have entailed about the same amount of cutting, cleaving, piercing, etc. Furthermore, the similarity of the riverine environments precludes the possibility that the Lackawaxen was a specialized projectile point, used against an animal or fish that was an inhabitant of one area but not the other. All things considered, the greater frequency of Lackawaxens in the Delaware Valley is more readily explained as the result of stylistic factors, reflecting distinct cultural traditions, than as an indication of the performance of different tasks in each area.

Having thus rejected the functional explanation, we are left with the alternative theory, that at least some of the points may have been made by persons other than the one who placed them in the cache. Three ethnographic analogies illustrate possible ways in which this situation might have arisen. Among the Dani of New Guinea, arrows shot at the men of a village by their enemies in battles are collected and taken back to the village to be re-used (Heider 1967). The !Kung San of southwestern Africa constantly exchange arrows, among other items. In fact, when an animal is killed, distribution of its meat amongst the members of the band is the prerogative not of the hunter, but of the man who made the arrow (Marshall 1976:379). The third example comes from Chagnon's (1983) monograph on the Yanomamo. He notes that the Yanomamo trade lanceolate bamboo points that are used to hunt large game such as tapir. "These (points) are often painted with red, black, or purple pigments and some of them acquire a reputation and history if they have been used to take many animals or have killed men. These histories are recited in some detail when the point is traded to another owner, and much raising of eyebrows, clicking of tongues, and expressions of amazement accompany the transaction as the new owner praises his trading partner's generosity in divesting himself of a property so valuable and lucky" (Chagnon 1983:48).

At sites such as Indian Knoll (Winters 1968) and Frontenac Island (Ritchie 1965), there is evidence of long-distance exchange of marine shells, copper, and other goods between Late Archaic bands. At a more local level, the practice of interband exogamy doubtless necessitated maintenance of amicable relationships through periodic feasting and gift exchange. It is not difficult to conceive of a point made by a member of a Delaware Valley band being exchanged through perhaps three or four intervening bands, and ending up in the Hudson Valley.
Plausible though this exchange hypothesis may appear, there is some evidence in the cache that argues against it. The lithic material from which points #1 and #4 were chipped, a laminar grey slate, seems to be very similar, perhaps identical to the material from which two of the blanks were made. This might well imply that both the points and the unfinished blanks were chipped by the same person, who also deposited them in the cache. On the other hand, this lithic material may simply have been widely available and frequently used by point-makers throughout the region. The apparent similarity of the lithic material of the points and blanks weakens the case for importation of the Lackawaxen, but does not render it untenable.

We can only speculate about the intentions of the prehistoric toolmaker who secreted his collection of points and flakes in the dark recesses of the crevice. It seems unlikely that the artifacts accompanied a burial, because no trace of bone or red ochre was associated with the artifacts, nor would there have been enough soil in the crevice to bury a body. However, decomposition of an exposed corpse placed in the crevice is conceivable. Another remote possibility is that the cache was an offering to a supernatural being; but the unfinished state of most of the artifacts hardly seems appropriate for sacrificial objects. Furthermore, in view of the repeated use of the shelter as a habitation, it appears highly unlikely that it was regarded as a particularly sacred place. A third, more mundane but most plausible explanation of the cache is that it was left behind by a departing toolmaker, who planned to finish his work when he returned to the site. The evident care taken to conceal the location of the artifacts seems a bit excessive, if protection from animals or from the elements was the only consideration involved. Did the owner of the cache perhaps fear that a hostile group might visit the site in his absence and discover his handiwork?

Whatever the circumstances of deposition may have been, this find has extraordinary significance, as one of the few examples from the Northeastern Archaic of an artifact association that resulted from a single activity that occurred at one moment in time. The implications of this discovery for existing projectile point typologies remain to be fully explored.
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INTRODUCTION

Interest in old clay tobacco pipes led to the excavation of a rubbish pit which was used between c. A.D. 1660-1700. The owner of the site on which the pit was located, Mr. C. Douglass Buck, Jr., knowing of the writer's interest in clay pipes, invited him to look at some artifacts he had collected from the surface of the field adjacent to his summer home.

The collection from the Buck site consisted of approximately three hundred pipe stem and bowl fragments which the writer recognized as dating to the third and fourth quarters of the seventeenth century along with some North Devon Inventory sherds. Having examined the surface material, we walked over the field to where the artifacts had been collected. The refuse covered an area approximately 40 feet by 180 feet, containing an abundance of scattered oyster shells, more pipe fragments, pottery sherds and nails. The observation that, other than in this area, there were no oyster shells in the field of 30 acres suggested the presence of an underlying rubbish pit. With the agreement of the owner, the author undertook all archaeological investigation of the area.

Approximately ten inches below the surface a compacted and undisturbed layer of oyster shells was uncovered, establishing the bottom of the plow zone. The shells ranged in thickness from two to nine inches and spread over almost the entire pit. This turned out to be a most helpful feature of the dig--the shells providing a barrier to intrusive material and therefore assuring that the latest artifact recovered from beneath them would establish a terminus ante quem for the contents of the pit which, after the excavation was completed, measured sixteen by twenty feet with the depth varying from ten to thirty-four inches below the surface (Figure 1).
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The site is located in Kent County, Maryland, U.S.A. in an area known locally as Quaker Neck. Approximately nine miles southwest of Chestertown, it stands on a bluff on the east side of the northeast branch of Langford’s Bay which flows into the Chester River and thence into Chesapeake Bay. It is on a tract of land, originally consisting of six hundred acres called "Tully's Fancy" and later Hosier's Farm. The tract was granted to Captain John Tully of London, on February 12, 1663 in "consideration for his transporting twelve persons into the Providence of Maryland."(1)

Tully sold his land to Henry Hosier April 11, 1671.(2) If Tully ever lived on his grant it was for only a short time since Henry Hosier occupied it in 1679, and was visited by one Jasper Danckaerts of Holland on December 7th of that Near.(3) Danckaents came to America hopefully expecting to find a suitable place to establish a colony of his sect, the Labidists.(4) Maryland was undoubtedly selected because of its reputation for being most tolerant of those seeking refuge from religious persecution.(5)

According to Karinen (1965:98-99) in 1660 and 1670, only ten persons lived in the area where the trash pit is located (6) and Herrman’s map of 1670 (7) shows three settlements in the same area, one possibly Hosier's property. In 1700, the suggested termination date of use of the pit, Karinen still shows only ten persons living there. They were possibly Hosier's slaves or indentured servants as deduced later from the artifacts recovered.

We know Hosier had slaves as revealed in his will where he stated "My wife, Rebecca shall have Isaac and Nanna. My son Henry Hosier shall have Negroes Will and Peter, my daughter Rebecca Hosier have the Negro Girl Crankee and My Negro Robin shall be free immediately after my decease."

DESCRIPTION OF ARTIFACTS

The variety of artifacts recovered from the pit is comparatively limited but they do shed considerable light on the life of those who threw away broken and therefore useless items not realizing that three hundred years later their refuse would be carefully excavated in an attempt to learn how they had lived.

Ceramics

Considering the pit was small, an amazing number of sherds were recovered. By far, the most numerous were North Devon wares consisting of the three types usually associated with the Towns of Bideford and Barnstaple, i.e., gravel tempered lead-glazed earthenware, sgraffito and North Devon plain slip-coated ware. These wares were exported in considerable quantities to the colonists who were hungry to get them and most anxious to sell their tobacco in exchange. In addition to Maryland, pieces of these wares have been recovered in Virginia, Massachusetts, and New York State and undoubtedly there have been finds in other states but as yet unreported.

The gravel tempered, lead-glazed earthenware greatly outnumbered the other two types of North Devon pottery. It is not infrequently of inferior quality compared to majolica, delftware and Westerwald products of the same period. In fact it has been said that much of it was rejected material shipped to America with the full realization that the colonists had little choice but to accept it.

This crude ware was fashioned in a variety of utilitarian forms made from a red clay, generously tempered with coarse, water-worn quartz or feldsparthic gravel (Figure 2). Distribution of the tempering ingredients is irregular, the paste poorly kneaded (sometimes leaving small air pockets) and the product porous on unglazed surfaces. Broken edges are usually irregular and angular. A gray core, due to incomplete oxidation, is invariably present, indicating incomplete firing. Only interiors are glazed and so carelessly applied that rims are sometimes incompletely covered and runs frequently appear on the outside surfaces (Figure 3). Color of the glazes range from rich orange through various shades of brown, olive green and occasionally approximating black. Some are speckled with orange splotches.

Rim sherds are represented in a variety of profiles (Figures 4-6). Vessels ranged in diameter from 6 inches to 19 inches and were originally round flat-bottomed pans, milk pans (Figure 7), pots, some with
Figure 2. Gravel-tempered ware exhibiting temper of water-worn quartz.

Figure 3. Rim and wall of gravel-tempered pot or pan with glare running over the rim and down the outer wall.
Figure 4. Rim profiles, gravel-tempered ware, all with glazed surfaces on left face. Nos. 1-6, 8 and 10-12 from round flat-bottomed pans. No. 7. Thumb-impressed reinforced rim from heavy bowl. (See photo, fig. 10)

Figure 5. Rim profiles, gravel-tempered ware, all with glazed surfaces on left face. No. 1, small pipkin, 2, 3, and 9-12 from round flat-bottomed pans. 4, 6, 7 probably from cooking pots with rims formed to accommodate a lid. Not: 7 is formed to accommodate lid on outside of rim. Nos. 5 and 8 are from small bowls.
Figure 6. Rim profiles, gravel-tempered ware, all with glazed surfaces on left face, 1, from small pipkin. 2, 3, 5, and 8 from small bowls. 4 and 6 from pots with rims formed to accommodate lids, 7 and 9 from large heavy bowls. 9 carries a vertical loop handle and thumb-impressed rim mentioned in the text (see photo – fig. 10.)

Figure 7. Gravel-tempered earthenware. Top and next to top are pans. Next to bottom a shallow bowl. Bottom, deep bowl.
feet (Figure 8) and pipkins one of which carries a pouring lip (Figure 9) and is apparently a rare specimen—a type not previously reported in America. None were connected with the serving of food but certainly important in its preparation.

In addition to the run profiles illustrated in this paper there were at least fifteen more rim profiles which are close but not duplicates, leading to the speculation that the products were mass produced with a modicum of uniformity and may even represent the products of more than one potter.

Three reinforced rim sherds, the added strip of clay applied with thumb pressure, are represented in the collection; one having a portion of a vertical loop handle (Figure 10). Several rims carry an internal flange to accommodate a lid and one an external flange. No flattened eighteenth century-type rims were recovered. Most rims appear to have come from round, flat-bottomed pans, the type one usually associated with milk processing. Others may have been used for cooking or as washbasins. Some cooking pots had large stubby feet and handles. The gravel tempered wall sherds are heavy-bodied, varying from 6 mm to 10 mm in thickness.

Sgraffito sherds, the second type of North Devon pottery found in the cultural rubbish were not as numerous as the gravel ware, but are artistically more interesting. Decoration consists of two basic types, floral (Figure 11) and geometric (Figure 12). It was obviously done with a free hand and the motifs, when similar on the same item, vary in size and execution. Use of the same tool when creating the designs is evident but differences in the amount of pressure applied to the tool leaves the appearance of careless, hasty execution, lacking in sophistication. However, there are some pieces, which show thoughtful design influence from the Chinese (Figure 12). The principle techniques used to acquire the desired designs were accomplished by incising with multiple-pointed tools having three to eight points (Figure 13) and stippling with the same tools (Figure 14). To obtain holder effects, broader tools were used (Figure 13). In general, the designs are rather naive and are reminiscent of decoration found on English and colonial New England furniture and embroideries. The seventeenth century sgraffito from the Buck site apparently differs considerably in style and form from that of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Watkins (1960) in describing the decoration of sgraffito, had this to say: "The design motifs are unique in comparison with those found on other English pottery of the seventeenth century. The geometrical patterns and spiral ornaments, which also occur in Hispanic majolica, have a Moorish flavor. Christian symbols—especially tulips (Figure 11), sunflowers and hearts—are recurrent, as they are on contemporary West of England furniture, pewter, and embroidery and on the carved chests and crewel work of Puritan New England. There is considerable reason to believe that there was a connection between North Devon sgraffito ware manufacture and design on the one hand and the influx of Huguenot Protestant artisans into southern and southwestern England on the other. Low County immigrant potters were responsible for two other ceramic innovations elsewhere in England: stoneware and majolica."

John P. Allen, Esq. (personal communication) commenting on photographs of sgraffito sherds from the Buck site wrote "those with the stabled combing and floral designs (Figure 14) are identical to sherds from the excavations of Mr. Trevor Miles at the North Walk kiln site in Barnstaple and date from c. A.D. 1660-1700. Exeter I have found evidence that the ware ceases to appear in groups after c.A.D 1700." (9)

Sgraffito decoration on the Buck site assemblage encompasses an extensive variety of design elements including hastily drawn spirals (Figures 15 and 23) triple-lined chevrons, diagonal stripes of multiple lines, between which wavy lines are punctuated by small excised rectangles (Figure 13). The floral category includes elaborate and intricate stylized floral and vine motifs (Figure 14), sunflowers (Figures 11 and 11), leaves and tendrils (Figure 14), four-petaled flowers (Figure 11) and some pieces combine the geometric feeling of the first category with the floral qualities of the second (Figure 12).

The same potters who produced the sgraffito also turned out what is known as "North Devon Plain Slip-Coated Ware" or simply "North Devon plain." It differs from the sgraffito only in the absence of decoration and some of the forms. Less than a dozen sherds of this pottery were recovered which emphasizes its rarity on this site. Six sherds of this variant were assembled to determine that the piece was originally a shallow howl with a 5 inch diameter base, height unknown. Color is light brown with a few splotches of orange. Two atypical sherds are glazed on the inside with a rich light brown of even flow but the outside is partially slipped and attempts at decoration made through the slip.
Figure 8. Gravel-tempered ware. Cooking pot with feet.

Figure 9. Small pipkin with pouring lip.
Figure 10. Reinforced rim sherds (the added strip of clay applied with thumb pressure) Bottom-fragment of rim with portion of vertical loop handle.

Figure 11. Sgraffito. Large platter with floral decoration.
Figure 12. Sgraffito. Top. floral and geometric decoration-sides of bowl show. Chinese influence in design (Wan-li?). Bottom-geometric design.

Figure 13. Sgraffito. Shallow bowl. Note use of multiple-pointed and broad tools.
Figure 14. Sgraffito. Floral patterns-stippling with multiple-pointed tool.

Figure 17. Sgraffito. Platter and plate rims decorated with hastily drawn spirals.
A relatively few sherds of each of the following seventeenth century ceramics were recovered (Figure 16): English delftware, slipware, Staffordshire, tin-enameled earthenware (possibly of Iberian origin), a portion of a red-paste crude storage jar also of Iberian origin and salt-glazed stoneware from Germany.

Of particular interest is a portion of a large salt-glazed stoneware bottle, of Westerwald origin, hearing the coat of arms of one Count Friederich Emich, Count of Leinigen and Dachsburg (Figure 18). An inscription encircling the arms reads "Friederich Emich • Count of Leinigen and Taxburg • Lord of Apprimont •1676." Unfortunately, the (late is missing from the inscription but Dr. Franz Baaden (personal communication) wrote that a number of similar bottles were ordered by Count Emich and probably distributed them among the guests at the wedding of his son Emich XIII on February 24, 1676.(10) A very small sherd from another similar bottle was also recovered.

Other forms of Westerwald stoneware, possibly from Grenzhansen, were excavated and include portions of sprig-decorated jugs, globular drinking mugs and straight-sided mugs (Figure 17).

Individual mention should be made of the approximately 1500 clay pipe bowl and stem fragments coming out of the refuse pit. Although admittedly a humble form they nevertheless are ceramic. The use of clay pipes by archaeologists is becoming more and more frequent in dating sites because, with careful research, many pipes can be dated within a few years of their manufacture. This is particularly true when they carry the initials or name of their maker.

Such was the case at the Buck site. Fortuitous was the recovery of pipes marked "LE," the products of Lluellin Evans 1661-1688/9 (Figure 19), / and ones marked "WE" made by either William Evans I or William Evans II (father and son?) 1660-1697 (Figure 20). The products of these two Bristol pipemakers were recovered with North Devon sgraffito and North Devon gravel sherds, fragments of the Emich bottle mentioned previously and London delftware sherds of the 1650-1675 period. Obviously the pipes support the dates of the ceramics and vice versa. Incidentally pipes made by all three of the Evanses' have been found from Canada to Virginia and Jamaica, West Indies (Oswald, personal communication).

Glass

Glass objects include a base fragment from a small square-sided bottle, a seventeenth century black button with enameled decoration of yellow and white and a few wine bottle fragments including a neck which probably dates from the last quarter of the seventeenth century (Figure 21).

Five of the bottle fragments deserve comment in that they had been fashioned into scrapers, most likely by an Indian. Tell-tale concoidal fractures, refined by secondary pressure-flaking, are identical in execution to stone scrapers of Indian manufacture. Such items were used by Indians as a general wood-working tool and in the preparation of animal skins.

Metal

Metal finds embraced a surprising variety. Personal objects comprised finger loops and blades from scissors, jew's harps, pins, needles, brass rings for curtain or bed hanging, thimbles, a sword belt buckle and parts of three tongs called "smoker's companions," a tool used in picking up coals from a brasier to light a pipe. Most unusual is a small brass object which might be an "ear pick" or a small scoop for removing salve or ointment from a jar. Other metal items are rose-headed nails (with both straight and flattened or spatula points, lead musket balls, shot gun pellets in three sizes and several metal objects so badly oxidized that identification is impossible (Figure 22).

In the cutlery and spoon category are portions of three table knife blades, one with a spiked tang, two pewter spoon handles with acorn finials and a latten spoon bowl (Figure 22). The bowl carries a touch "three spoons SN," a mark associated with "split end" or "Pied de Bich" (sometimes called "trifid") handles, a form which gained popularity about 1663. Inasmuch as the bowl carried neither a tongue nor a "rat tail," which device was introduced about 1670, it must date prior to that date. Furthermore, after 1650 "makers of latten spoons were in the habit of tinning them which gave them a
Figure 16. Top left three London delftware fragments from small dish. Next two, portions of shallow bowl. Left center and bottom, Tin-enamed earthenware, possibly Iberian, seventeenth century. Center row middle, English delftware bottle, second half of seventeenth century. Center right, rim of delft plate, blue and manganese purple on light blue, London c. 1680 (Wan-li pattern?) Bottom row right. Handle from a lead-glazed earthenware shallow bowl, French, seventeenth century.

Figure 17. Salt glazed stoneware, probably from Grenzhausen. Top row, runs of drinking mugs decorated with blue and manganese purple. Middle row, left and center, sprig-decorated jug sherds. Middle row right, three fragments of gray stone ware decorated with incised lines-blue and manganese purple. Bottom row, wall sherd of large bottle or jug.
silvery appearance. (11) Therefore, the Buck spoon, being so tinned and without a "rat tail," should date in the period from 1650 to 1670. Recovered with the spoon were sherds of North Devon ware, portions of sprig-decorated globular drinking mugs of Westerwald origin and pipe fragments of the 1650-1670 period. The pewter spoon handles were recovered in association with London delftware sherds of the 1650-1675 period, sgraffito and clay pipe stems which fall in the 1650-1680 time span.

Two bone handles, fashioned for use with either knife blades or forks, were recovered (Figure 22). Although bone knife handles of the period sometimes exhibit inlaid decoration and were the property of the affluent, these were merely shaped with a slight taper, without decoration, indicating the owners to be less than "well-to-do." Both handles were broken in half, longitudinally, exposing the hollow area fashioned to accommodate a tang.

Coins
These were startling finds because in the third quarter of the seventeenth century coins were in such short supply in the colonies that in 1671 the Assembly of Maryland passed "An Act for the Advancement of foreign Coynes" to encourage people to bring money into the Province and all were forbidden to export any coins out of the Colony. This was necessary because so many items needed by the colonists were of such a relatively low value that tobacco could not be used in payment.

In the lowest level of the hit, lying on otherwise artifactually sterile soil was a rare discovery—a halfpenny of Charles II of England, bearing the date of 1673 under the exergue. Halfpennies of Charles II were issued only in the years 1672, 1673 and 1675. (12) Ivor Noel Hume, Resident Archaeologist of Colonial Williamsburg, advised that whereas many farthings are recovered, he has no record of any other halfpenny of Charles II being found in the United States.
Figure 19. Clay pipe bowls and stems of Lluellin Evans – 1661 – 1688/9. Typical shape of Bristol “Export type” pipes, i.e., no heel or spur on base of bowl.

Figure 20. Clay pipe bowls and stems of the two William Evanses probably father and son – 1660 – 1697. Both were Bristol exporters.

Figure 22. Top row: 1. blades from a small pair of Scissors without finger loops. 2. portion of finger loop from scissors. Second row: 1. Brass object, possibly an "ear pick." 2. jew's-harp, 3. brass ring for bed or curtain hanging, 4. thimble. Third row: 1 and 2 largest smallest pins from the excavation, 3. iron needle, 4. three shot gun pellets, 5. pewter spoon handle with it a corn finial, 6. latten spoon bowl with touch "3 spoons SN," 7. Sword belt buckle, 8. main spring from colonial firearm. Fourth row: 1. musket ball, 2. "Smoker's companion" 3. portion of table knife blade. Fifth row: Bone knife handle with table knife blade exhibiting a spiked tang, three wrought rose-headed nails - spatula point on left, straight points on other two.
Figure 23. Sgraffito: rims of plates and platters except second row center - a portion of a porringer, a type heretofore not reported in America.

Some colonists were not above cheating when the occasion arose and they resorted to trimming the perimeters from silver coins and melted down the removed pieces to be sold as bars or ingots. This became so prevalent that the Maryland Assembly on "Fryday, October the fifth 1683" voted to punish anyone guilty of defacing coins by reducing their size. Punishment in Maryland was severe: "for the first Offence, Stand in the pillory Three hours and be fined Ten pounds-and for the second offence shall stand in the pillory Three hours and have his Eares Crop,t and fined Twenty-and for the Third Offence perpetuall Banishment." (13)

The second coin is a sixpenny piece bearing the date of 1573 and the royal portrait of Elizabeth I. This coin was deliberately cut in half, a not uncommon practice at the time and not to be confused with the defacement of coins mentioned previously. The cut edge is worn smooth indicating extensive circulation. Nearby the coin lay decorated pipe stem fragments usually associated with Bristol in the seventeenth century, two sherds of sgraffito and a portion of the Emich medallion mentioned before.

The third coin is a silver two-reales piece with two portions deliberately snipped off. A Spanish coin of Carlos II (1616-1700), it was struck either at Lima, Peru or Mexico City, Mexico and is one of the celebrated "pieces of eight" about which much has been written. It was found in association with a pipe stem fragment marked "WE," a William Evans pipe which, as mentioned before, dates from 1660-1697. Unlike the other two coins, these "pieces of eight" are more likely to be found in colonial site excavations.

Faunal
In addition to oyster shells, bone debris was plentiful, well preserved and collectively important in reconstructing the colonial diet. The faunal remains include bones of cattle, hog, deer and fish, all.
obviously, contributing to a varied diet. No oyster shells were burnt thus permitting the speculation that the settlers preferred to eat them raw or possibly made into stews.

Unexplained is the absence of waterfowl bones, only four having been recovered the dig. This is perplexing because today thousands of ducks and geese settle on Langford's Bay in the fall and remain there over winter.

Stone

Most of the stone finds are of Indian origin including projectile points, scrapers (see reference to scraper in the section on glass), the cutting edge of a crude ax and an unfinished knife blade. They date from the occupation by the Euro-Americans back through the ages to perhaps 3000 B.C. (Indians are known to have used stone objects lost or discarded hundreds and even thousands of years earlier). Gunflints complete the stone collection (Figure 21).

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

There is no doubt that other pits were also dug and used inasmuch as the artifactual recoveries are not completely representative of a seventeenth century dwelling. The excavated assemblage point to a narrow, singular and unpretentious life-style of a humble household subsisting on a modest level. The absence of a quantity of sophisticated brown and gray stoneware, delftware and porcelain, common in the time span of the other finds, supports this postulation. One can readily visualize the trash being discarded from a "rude structure of logs and boards which were the early habitations before the advent of manor houses.(14) Also, conspicuous by their absence, were cups, drinking glasses, chamber pots, window glass and flattened rims, a diagnostic trait of eighteenth century North Devon gravel tempered ware, on the pots and pans.

Dating the pit's contents was attended with little difficulty inasmuch as the marked clay pipe fragment of known date, the Emich bottle and the North Devon sgraffito ware, types generally accepted as dating no later than c. 1700, married well in establishing a terminus ante quem of c. 1700 and the Elizabethan coin, with the date of 1573 the terminus post quem; the latter not indicative of the date of trash disposal - it merely suggests that after about one hundred years such coins were still around.

In summary, it is important to remember that the dates c. 1660-1700 concern themselves with the content, of the pit and not the occupancy of the land, which based on surface finds, has been lived on intermittently even to the present day.

The author is deeply indebted to C. Douglass Buck, Jr. for permission to excavate on his property and for his generosity in making his summer home my headquarters during the many days spent excavating the pit.

Special mention should be made of Mr. and Mrs. Ivor Noel Hume for their encouragement and for the identification and dating of many of the artifacts referred to in the manuscript.

Also appreciated is the valuable assistance of John P. Allen, Dr. Franz Baaden, Phillip Curtis, the late John Dick and his wife Marion, Harvey S. Farrow, Jr., Don Fennimore, Edgar Hare, Jr., Norman A. Nielsen, Adrian Oswald, Arlene Palmer Schwind and Dr. Ing H. Spiegel.

The following institutions gave much appreciative assistance in the retrieval of historic information: Eleutherian Mills-Hagley Foundation Historical Library. The Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum Libraries and the State of Maryland Hall of Records.

Finally, thanks are due to my late wife, Emily, for her helpful suggestions in the preparation of this essay.
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ENDNOTES

5. The Labidists, followers of the French mystic Jean de Labadie (1640-74), theologcally were Calvinists. They were independent of church discipline and held their goods and children in common. A group settled in Maryland in 1683 and another in New York at about the same time, but the colonies failed before 1730. The Oxford Companion to American History, Oxford University Press, New York, 1966, p. 454.
7. "Virginia and Maryland As it is Planted and Inhabited this present year 1670 Surveyed and Exactly Drawne by the Only Labour & Endeavor of Augustin Herman, Published by Authority of his Majesties Royal Licence and particular Priviledge to Aug. Herman (sic) and Thomas Withinbrook his Affignee for fourteen years from the year of our Lord 1673."
10. Dr. Franz Baaden, Dokumentationszentrum - Kannenbackerland e. V. Hoehr-Grenzhausen, West Germany.
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