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Research Goals

Who were the Lenape that lived in Indiana from 1790 to 1820? How would they be represented in the archaeological record? Using archaeological and ethnohistoric data these specific questions will be addressed. A summary of the major events in Lenape history will provide the historic context for interpreting the archaeological record and the ethnohistoric data. A summary of archaeological work on Lenape sites will provide comparative data for determining how the Indiana Lenape may be represented in the archaeological record, as well as how historic events may have influenced their material culture. Ethnohistoric information focusing on the day-to-day life of the Lenape will complement the archaeology and provide information concerning their lifeways during their time in Indiana.

The Lenape identity and culture during the time they were settled within Indiana reflected a tumultuous period of time, shaped by many factors which should be reflected in their material record. However, no Lenape sites in Indiana have been confirmed possibly due to the inability to decisively provide cultural affinity for previously located sites. This study will show not only that the Lenape were a complex people, persistent and adaptive, but also what could be expected in the archaeological record from a Lenape site in Indiana.
Background

The indigenous people of the Great Lakes Region greatly influenced the early history of the United States. Prior to contact with Europeans, they created, shaped and transformed social, economic, cultural, and political landscapes through encounters with other indigenous peoples (Nassaney and Johnson 2000:6). The strategies that allowed them to accomplish this enabled many Natives to also successfully navigate the differences that arose between themselves and Europeans, pursuing their own agendas despite European coercion and force. These strategies allowed Algonquin-speaking people and their neighbors to be the primary force in shaping the history of the Great Lakes region not only prior to contact, but also throughout the contact period to the 1830s (Edmunds 2008:8-9). The indigenous people living in this region were adaptive and persistent, characteristics observable in any of the unique groups, though it is the Delaware who will be more thoroughly examined here.

While many refer to the Lenape today as the Delaware Indians, this term was only applied to the people from the Delaware Valley after they had migrated out of the region and actually encompasses three groups: the Munsee, Jerseys, and the Lenape. In fact, the term did not even exist prior to the latter part of the eighteenth century, and then it was used to refer to all the people along the Delaware River (Becker 1989). Oftentimes, Europeans assigned names to people without any knowledge of the organization of the people as is seen in this case (Shoemaker 2004:8). Members of these groups today refer to themselves as Lenape, as it became more convenient after 300 years for external and political purposes for the group to have a common name (Becker 1989:116).
The name Lenape is actually short for Lenni Lenape, which has a variety of different meanings including “original people,” “men among men,” and “men of our kind.” Lenape alone may be translated as “common people,” with the addition of Lenni reinforcing that meaning. This is why they most commonly refer to themselves as just Lenape, the name that will be used throughout this thesis (Weslager 1972:31). Individual Lenape will also be referred to by their Lenape name as well, as opposed to their European given name, when information allows.

The Lenape living in Indiana from 1790 through 1820 experienced many episodes of contact and migration for almost 200 years prior to their arrival there. Generally, the contact period suggests only the time period during the first encounters between Europeans and Native Americans. However, contact was not a single event, but “an extended process of mutual discovery and cultural change” (Rogers and Wilson 1993:3). It was an ongoing process that stimulated adaptation and restructuring of identities. The arrival of Europeans triggered a new process, which was then characterized by many small and large encounters between the various European and Native groups (Loren 2008:2).

The contact period was a span of time where ideas and goods were exchanged and incorporated, with neither side left unaffected, triggering multiple shifts and reconstructions in identity and tribal definitions. A summary of the historical background of the Lenape will demonstrate these many encounters, as well as the continued effect they had on Lenape culture. Relevant literature will be introduced at the beginning of each chapter to more clearly encompass the large variety of sources used.
Understanding the history of the Lenape, and some of the effects it had on their culture, will help in the interpretation of the archaeological record left behind during this particular period of time. A brief summary of Lenape archaeology is provided for the contact period to further illustrate the impact important historical events had on their material remains. Tying together the history and archaeology of the Lenape prior to their arrival in Indiana will demonstrate connections between the two, as well as possible trends that may then be applied to their presence in Indiana.

Specifically, trade goods will be focused on to demonstrate these ties. Reasons may be found why certain trade goods were adopted at particular locations. Trade dominated European-native relations during this period, and this would heavily influence the archaeological record (Minderhout and Frantz 2008:61). This will also aid in determining some of the possible artifacts that may be recovered from a Lenape site in Indiana as well as the reverse, what particular artifacts could be found today that would designate the cultural affiliation of an archaeological site as Lenape. In part, the archaeology of the Lenape will demonstrate the effects the political atmosphere would have on Lenape material culture while also showing how this atmosphere encouraged cultural trends towards change or continuity in material culture, which may be further represented in the material record. The trade goods and other artifacts found at a Lenape site can then only be accurately interpreted given some knowledge of the prior history of the Lenape as well as the political atmosphere surrounding the artifacts’ deposition.

While the historic context and previous archaeological data may aid in predicting other Lenape sites, the most beneficial data for determining what a Lenape archaeological site in Indiana may resemble is ethnohistoric. Ethnohistory refers to the study of cultures
using primary sources, oral accounts, and material culture in order to document the past for those groups that have been underrepresented, for a variety of reasons, in the historical record. Ethnohistorians frequently rely on documents created by non-native observers, which may be biased and therefore must be used critically (Nance et al. 2003:330-331). Ethnohistoric data provide information on the daily lives of the Lenape including food procurement and processing practices, clothing and adornment, and health and medicinal practices that may be visible in the archaeological record. While historic context and the identification of archaeological trends towards change and continuity are beneficial as well, ethnohistoric data will provide the most information regarding what may be specifically visible in the archaeological record.

In order to begin to understand who the Indiana Lenape were from 1790 to 1820, their historic background will be summarized from the first recorded contact with Europeans through their migration to Indiana. This background will provide the cultural context for the archaeological record throughout the same time period, illuminating trends in change and continuity and the effects of the political atmosphere on the material record. Finally, ethnohistoric data will be discussed to present Lenape daily material culture, which should be the most prevalent in the Lenape archaeological record. By examining their history, life, and material culture, predictions will be made regarding the composition of a Lenape archaeological site in Indiana from the early 1800s.
Explaining Contact and Its Material Remains

Archaeologists attempt to reclaim the past by excavating and analyzing data, which may include features, artifacts, organic remains, or even the soils that contain the objects (Tull 2004:323-324). Theory is applied to help create plausible and scientifically acceptable abstract thought which may be used to explain these data. Simply quantifying the data will only add lists of artifacts, unless we operate under a research design that offers further direction (South 2002:32) and a theory that offers some explanation. In the case of the archaeology of the Lenape in Indiana, the application of theories used previously to explain Lenape archaeological sites may contribute to predictions for archaeological sites in Indiana. However, more accurately predicting the material remains for the Lenape that lived in Indiana may require adaptations of these previous theories, possibly even the use of several different approaches.

Historical archaeology has seen a diverse flood of theory that has constantly changed the way the sub-discipline is practiced. This is echoed in particular by Olga Klimko (2004:169) as she describes the history of studies on the fur trade in Canada. She found that when a new theory emerged, it supplanted or expanded on the previous one to explain the same data. Looking back on other studies such as this throughout different
geographical regions and time periods (Brenner 1988; Nassaney 1989; Rubertone 1989; Thomas 1979; Trubowitz 1995), one constant has emerged: different conclusions and interpretations have shown that no one single model can account for all the motivations that initiated and directed exchange between Native people and Europeans (Nassaney and Johnson 2000:14). As no one theory is sufficient for interpreting the range of topics covered here, several different theories and approaches will be taken. Several archaeological theories will be examined, along with some alternate strategies for more accurate interpretations. Each will be used to explain a particular aspect of Lenape culture and material culture. Brief descriptions of each are provided here.

The theory of cultural ecology ties cultural change to material culture based on changes in environment. As put forward initially, this theory seeks to explain the origin of cultural features and patterns that are characteristic of different environments as well as the extent to which behaviors used for exploiting the environment affect other aspects of culture. How the group exploits each of the different environments they come across may have varying effects on the culture (Steward 1955). This approach has been expanded upon through time by many others (Cronon 1983; Dove and Carpenter 2008; Netting 1986), though the foundation remains the same. One such expansion states that “though natural constraints remain important, they matter for cultural (political, ethnic) reasons” (Dove and Carpenter 2008:17). Cultural ecology may be further explained by William Cronon:

all human groups consciously change their environments to some extent . . . Environment may initially shape the range of choices available to a people at a given moment, but then culture reshapes environment in responding to those choices. The reshaped environment presents a new set of possibilities for cultural reproduction, thus setting up a new cycle of
mutual determination. Changes in the way people create and re-create their livelihood must be analyzed in terms of changes not only in their social relations but in their ecological ones as well. [1983:13]

The definition of environment has been expanded upon as well. As Fredrik Barth states, “the ‘environment’ of any one ethnic group is not only defined by natural conditions, but also by the presence and activities of the other ethnic groups on which it depends” (Barth 2008:181). Tim Ingold expands upon this thought further, exclaiming that the environment “is that which surrounds, and can exist, therefore, only in relation to what is surrounded” (Ingold 2008:463).

Environment as it will be used here will include not only the natural world, but the natural world as used and manipulated by the various groups in a given area and the political, economic and social circumstances that led to these interactions. However, studies on cultural transmission have found that while the environment may guide change and variation, the real agent of change is the human ability to make decisions (Heinrich 2001). These decisions, and how they differed from other groups in similar environments, may be better explained by referencing specific cultures and working backwards, such as with the direct historical approach.

The direct historical approach works from the known to the unknown (Steward 1942). The assumption behind this approach is that pre-contact populations had a historic counterpart that could be used for making interpretations about the past, assuming cultural continuity from prehistoric times to the ethnographic present (Steward 1942). As revitalizations of this approach have focused on the alterations of Native American culture resulting from contact, it may be useful (Rubertone 2000:429). However, these interpretations usually imply a very linear trajectory of cultural change (Rubertone
The direct historic approach is beneficial if there are data from the ethnographic present with which to work, as there are in a few instances for the Lenape.

Cross-cultural studies using a cultural ecology approach are also a good methodological tool for analyzing relationships and processes of change (Steward 1955:97). Across cultures in a given environment, a particular trait may emerge for all cultures in that environment, which can be used to track relationships and processes of change (Peregrine 2001:3). Similarities between groups in that environment would be due to the environment, while differences would be cultural. These variations in adaptation are much more distinguishable using cross-cultural studies, especially between groups living in similar environments (Netting 1986:88). Cross-cultural studies between tribes are beneficial, though little comparison has been done to draw upon between the various tribes living in Indiana during the early 1800s, such as the Miami, Potawatomi, and Wea (cf. Hickerson 1970, Jones 1988). As all the groups living in Indiana during this time would have been living in the same physical environment, differences observed between them would be cultural and a key to understanding the Lenape during this time and how they may be represented archaeologically.

Relationships between places, things, and people are in the end determined by cultural meaning. Constructing cultural meanings from historical accounts is difficult; indigenous points of view are often not recorded or translated, which may skew interpretations. Reconstructing a viable version of events may depend on non-Indigenous records, common sense, oral history, and speculation (Pesantubbee 2003:216). To aid in this reconstruction, several cultural theories and strategies will be used.
All groups had ways of dealing with foreign cultural systems (Arkush 2000:215; Rodgers 1990; Spicer 1961). How each group negotiated these dealings often depended on how they identified themselves and how they constructed those identities. Identity is constructed and reconstructed around difference and in the in-between spaces between cultures (Trigger 2007:482). Richard White (1991) refers to this same area as the “middle ground,” a place in-between where cultures meet, exchanging knowledge, ideas, and items freely, in “a search for accommodation and common meaning” (White 1991:ix). When a group could not be subdued by force, the middle ground allowed people to adjust their differences (White 1991:x). This area was where throughout Lenape history interactions took place, new technology was introduced and borrowed, new resources were exploited, trade agreements were made and broken, boundaries were disputed, and warfare occurred, each interrupting everyday life. Each time, day-to-day living was reconstituted, and the society continued forward (Tull 2004:326). The Lenape defined themselves based on these experiences: what happened between themselves, the Europeans, other tribes, and the Americans (Wellenreuther 2008:47).

In this middle ground, cultures are blended into a cultural amalgam where people take on values from both indigenous and European cultures without questioning their origins (Edmunds 2008:2). This blending is also where new cultural forms arise that may enable both groups to subvert or bypass colonial pressures. Perhaps a better notion of what goes on in the middle ground would be that of entanglement, where each side is entangled with the other and the concepts of Self and Other are transformed in complex ways (Murray 2004:10). The middle ground was used by many indigenous groups to
fight the European tendency to create them as the other (White 1991:xiv). There, they could assert their own unique identity while sharing a common world and humanity.

Native American and European interactions may be characterized by this theme of the Self versus the Other, or the familiar versus unfamiliar. This topic is looked at in more detail in Karen Ordahl Kupperman’s (2000) book, *Indians and English: Facing Off in Early America*. Negotiating these differences invoked a process of recreating identities and redefining the Self as the world around them changed (Loren 2008:3). As the Other changes, so too must the Self to maintain the dichotomy between the two. Reminiscent of Edward Said’s (1979) Orientalism, the Other is *made* Oriental, as part of “a political vision of reality whose structure promoted the difference between the familiar and the strange” (Said 1979:43-44). The approach of the newcomers was incorporated into the Lenape world as the Other, both as clients and suppliers of trade goods (Ordahl Kupperman 2000:175).

Similarities between the two groups enabled them to see the differences between them in sharp relief, and over time they constructed new identities that exaggerated those contrasts between them while ignoring their commonalities (Shoemaker 2004:3). By the end of the eighteenth century, Native Americans and European-Americans had together created new identities for themselves based on “the fiction of irresolute difference” (Shoemaker 2004:11). Understanding the Lenape means understanding these in-between spaces, as well as how the Lenape negotiated their identity in opposition to European cultures.

Motivations for technological change and the adoption of trade goods were also based in part on this group identity, but there were many other factors as well. Factors
that affected the interactions and subsequent restructuring of the Lenape identity include attitudes towards economic resources, technologies and methods for collecting resources, attitudes and policies towards Lenape religious beliefs, military policy towards Lenape groups as well as other European groups, potential for competition, access to renewable and nonrenewable resources, involvement in village life, and the intensity and duration of episodes of contact between the two groups (Fitzhugh 1985:8).

These factors, as listed above, that contributed to material and cultural change were also influenced by a variety of motivations, which were the direct result of the Lenape belief system at that particular time (Renfrew 2007:112). These motivations were not strictly economical but based on cultural systems and group welfare, as may be reflected in Lenape beliefs. However, there are many variations and consequences of contact, and to accurately assess the process is to view both sides of the issue carefully (Rogers 1993:74). Even then, we may never fully be able to understand the process.

Many have assumed that rapid change occurred immediately after contact due to acculturation, however this is not accurate (Ferris 2009:10). The concept of acculturation has been deeply entrenched in the construction of indigenous pasts and assumes that indigenous people were enveloped in the process that was imposed by the supposedly “culturally and materially superior” Europeans. This process would mean changing to something from something else, which would imply that without contact there would be no change, which goes against the archaeological evidence that change within groups was and is a continuing process (Ferris 2009:11).

Instead, some approaches have emphasized cultural resistance over acculturation (Mann 1999:403). This approach views continuity of traditional practices as a form of
cultural resistance. Both approaches tend to essentialize cultural identities, which limits their ability to get past this dichotomy of acculturation and resistance (Mann 1999:403).

Before proceeding further, a few common assumptions should be dismissed as they can have a dramatic effect on interpretations. Not every group behaves in a strictly economic mode. Many of the European trade artifacts recovered from sites were “nonproductive” in nature and mostly related to adornment, such as beads, bangles, and rings. This pattern contradicts the economically motivated trading goals that might be anticipated in some scenarios (Rogers 1993:84-85). Again, the researcher cannot assume that European goods were adopted solely due to economic benefits. It should already be well known that European cultural meanings of artifacts are not somehow transferred with the artifacts themselves. These artifacts would have been understood in the Native context and worldview (Ferris 2009:24).

Rapid technological changes can also not be adequately explained using the assumption that there is an obvious benefit to switching, such as from stone tools to metal ones (Bamforth 1993:49). Contact between Native Americans and Europeans was marked by multiple factors as previously mentioned: major population declines, resettlement of many Native populations, incorporation into the European-dominated economic system, increased conflict between Europeans and Natives, and conflict among Native groups as well (Bamforth 1993:49). This disruption of the normal cultural pattern would undoubtedly alter many aspects of Native life, possibly even their capabilities of maintaining their previous way of life. In this regard, taking up metal tools would not have occurred because they were “better,” but out of necessity because their previous stone quarries were unavailable or the stone-toolmaking specialists were now dead. So
when acceptance of new technical innovations did occur, it was most likely the result of many complex factors such as the communities’ need, the fit between the innovation and current cultural practices, the innovations’ cost and the communities’ ability to pay that cost, as well as any perceived effects of dependence on the innovation (Bamforth 1993:56; White 1991:134).

**Predicting the Intensity of Change and its Effects on Identity**

Bruce Trigger (1980:672) claims that “change and re-adaptation have characterized all periods of Indian prehistory. It also seems that in many instances Native responses to the challenge of European contact were shaped by experiences of cultural change in prehistoric times.” Many of the strategies the Lenape employed when they first started interacting with the Europeans were designed, consciously or not, prior to European arrival and were most likely responses to situations dealt with during interactions with other native groups. Prior to actually meeting Europeans, the Lenape would have already had systems in place for responding to their presence.

As the introduction to the Lenape of many ideas, trade goods, diseases, and technologies often preceded European contact, when the two groups did finally meet the Lenape had already been affected and responding back to the European presence (Deetz 1991:5-6). James Deetz (1991:6) even goes so far as to speculate that it was highly unlikely that Europeans ever met a group of Native Americans completely free from prior European influence. Long before many Natives ever saw these newcomers, they had heard stories about them or saw some of their goods (Richter 2001:11). The amount of
prior interaction with European ideas or objects would have had a significant effect on the outcome of the initial encounter between the two groups.

Contact scenarios may also be different depending on the types of societies contacted. Segmentary societies such as the Lenape, groups more prone to factionalism and thus less able to present a united front, may have been more strongly affected and perhaps even dominated by the effects of culture contact. Differentiated societies, on the other hand, or societies that were more united such as the Iroquois confederacy, would have had a greater capacity for institution building and maintaining uniformity. These societies could have potentially resisted European influence and retained their precontact culture longer (Rogers 1993:76).

Another factor that will determine the intensity of change is that of internal cultural homogeneity (Parisi et al. 2003:172). The less internal homogeneity a culture has the more probable it will be that a site within the given culture will change when it comes into contact with another culture. This is due to less pressure from the rest of the culture to maintain uniformity. Change within a culture will occur when the pressure to change from outside the culture is greater than the pressure within the culture to remain the same. The rigidity of that cultural boundary may be reduced when a culture experiences internal random changes that cause less internal homogeneity and reduce the pressure to not change (Parisi et al. 2003:176). From this, it is possible to predict how the Lenape would react in certain contact situations.
Change and the Lenape

The cultural values, practices, and material items Europeans or American settlers deemed important were not necessarily important to the Natives. Each group had a unique set of values and cultural practices. Despite these differences in perceived benefits, interaction continued between the groups and continues to this day. In the case of the Lenape, contact started in the early 1600s (Kraft 2001:362; Schutt 2007:1-2) so that by the time they arrived at the locations where the Indiana villages such as Wapicomekoke would be built, they had already experienced almost 200 years of contact (Gipson 1938). They experienced two centuries of change, adaptation, and renegotiation of their identity while yet remaining “Lenape.” Understanding this experience means examining the environment surrounding Wapicomekoke, the history and identity of the Lenape that would have influenced life and thus material goods at this specific time and place in the past.

Thus, we return to the goal of this thesis, to analyze the consequences and long-term effects that this type of continuing contact with the Europeans would have on the traditional cultural lifeways of the Lenape, and more importantly how this would be reflected in the material record (Perttula 1993:89). The previous theories and strategies will be used to combine the data in order to determine what would have been left behind at a Lenape archaeological site in Indiana.

Methods

In order to become familiar with whom the Indiana Lenape were and how this would be reflected in the material record, several types of data will be examined. The
historical accounts from time of initial contact in the sixteenth-century to the early
nineteenth-century are important in understanding the Lenapes’ motivations when
moving westward, as well as the mentality that they brought with them to Indiana when
they arrived there in the late eighteenth-century. These accounts are a composed of a
variety of primary and secondary sources. When a primary source had previously been
translated or transcribed and published, this was used to limit author error in
interpretation. This was also done as making trips to archives around the country was
impractical for the purpose of this study, as the historical data is meant as a backdrop and
is not the focus of this research. Primary historic accounts were also collected from the
Ball State University Archives and the Delaware County Historic Society. Secondary
sources used were those that offered good summaries of specific periods of history, or
because of their author’s affiliation to the Lenape.

Archaeological data were then examined. Lenape sites in New York, New Jersey,
Pennsylvania, Ontario, Ohio, and Indiana were used to demonstrate the extent of the
Lenapes' interactions with Europeans while supporting or contradicting the historic
accounts. They also help fill in gaps in historical data. The information from these sites
also provides comparative data for determining what a Lenape archaeological site in
Indiana would look like, identifying trends in change and continuity in the material
culture. It also helps demonstrate the effects the political atmosphere has on their
archaeological record. Primary site reports and final reports were examined from the
Archaeological Resource Management Services lab at Ball State University. Final
reports were also used for sites in Ohio, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey. Another primary
source used to collect data included NAGPRA reports, which detailed the numbers and types of artifacts located at certain sites being returned to the Lenape.

When final reports or site reports were unavailable, secondary sources were used to gather information on the sites. These secondary sources include books published by the principal investigators at the sites, as well as articles comparing the data from the pertinent sites to others in the area. Unfortunately, some site forms could not be located and thus the only information available on them was through secondary publications.

Lastly, ethnohistoric accounts were considered. These accounts portray Lenape daily lifeways, which should lend clues to what types of artifacts may be found at Lenape sites. This data was pulled from several accounts that have been previously translated and published, primarily the *White River Mission Diaries* translated and published by John Gipson (1938) and John Heckewelder’s (1971) *History, Manners, and Customs of the Indian Nations Who Once Inhabited Pennsylvania and the Neighboring States*. John Brickell’s account from during his captivity among the Lenape also provided some data. Accounts from the missionary David Zeisberger were also used, as well as information collected from interviews with contemporary Lenape in the Duke Archives. Another primary source was the recently published *Long Journey Home* (2008), a compilation of interviews and oral histories from contemporary Lenape. The early ethnographic work of M.R. Harrington (1908, 1913) was also consulted. The primary sources were complemented with secondary sources that could elaborate on topics, specifically from scholars with known affiliations with the Lenape.

The historic data will then be compared to the archaeological data, to see if changes in the Lenapes' situation historically are reflected in the material remains. They
will also be compared to decipher the extent of the influence European trade goods had on the Lenape throughout their multiple migrations, in order to predict the amount of influence these goods would have had on the Lenape in the early nineteenth century. This comparison should also provide some preliminary data concerning the types of artifacts to expect from an archaeological site in Indiana culturally affiliated with the Lenape.

The ethnohistoric data concerning settlement patterns, foodways, dress and adornment, health and medicine, alcohol, and other data on trade goods were then compared to the preliminary results, in order to validate and expand upon them. These categories were used as they would be the most likely to be represented in the archaeological record. The results of these comparisons should offer a predictive summary of the archaeological impact the Lenape living in Indiana from 1790 to 1821 would have had.

The historic background will provide context, the archaeological data will provide material for making comparisons, and the ethnohistoric data will describe the daily life of the Lenape as it would have been in Indiana in the early 1800s. From this, a predictive summary of what one would expect to find on a Lenape site in Indiana will be developed. This will answer the research questions concerning the Lenape identity as they were living in Indiana, as well as how this would be reflected in the archaeological record.
Chapter 3: The Lenape History of Contact

From Lenapehoking to the Indiana Territory

Many primary and secondary sources (see below) provide a good general history of the Lenape since their first contact with Europeans. This historical context is necessary in order to allow a fuller interpretation of the material and ethnohistoric records, as well as providing insight into the environment surrounding Wapicomekoke. This is meant to provide a summary of the major events that affected the lives and subsequently the identity and material record of the Lenape, however several books are available that give more detailed accounts of the history of the Lenape and their neighbors (Anson 1970; Edmunds et al. 2007; Hickerson 1970; Kraft 2001; Nichols 2008; Rafert 1996; Roeber 2008; Schutt 2007; Warren 2005; Weslager 1972).

The Lenape homeland is located along the east coast of North America in the vicinity of present-day New Jersey, southern New York, northern Delaware, and eastern Pennsylvania. This area was labeled Lenapehoking by tribal member Nora Dean Thompson in 1984, which means “Land of the Lenape” and designates all the areas from which the Lenape first originated, as seen in Figure 1 (Kraft 2001:9). The tribe itself was composed of at least three groups of dialects: the Minsi (or Munsee), Unami, and
Figure 1: Lenapehoking
© Copyright 1992, Cotter et al. All Rights Reserved.
Used in accordance with Section 107, Fair Use, of the Copyright Law, Title 17 of the United States Code.
Unclachtigo (Newcomb 1956:5). These are often associated with the Wolf, Turkey, and Turtle, however these were not necessarily clan groups or totems just group identifiers, though they have been referred to as phratries (Thurman 1974:112). As Marshall Becker (1976:25) indicates, the use of the phratries Wolf, Turkey, and Turtle may have been the result of European inspired political organization as these terms came into usage long after 1700. They may have been a European attempt at organizing the multiple bands of Lenape throughout Lenapehoking.

Regardless of the accuracy of those specific distinctions, the Lenape were comprised of multiple autonomous villages, spread throughout Lenapehoking. Each band was comprised of an extended family of thirty or forty people living in communal longhouses forming multiple small villages four to five miles apart from each other (Becker 1982:11; Cotter et al. 1992:19). Each village was politically independent and self-reliant (Weslager 1972:32-33). Despite their autonomy, kin and community groups were still tied together through their sachem, a leader whose authority lay in providing rituals for the health and welfare of the community and who would help make collective decisions for the group (Becker 1982:11; Cotter et al. 1992:19; Schutt 2007:7).

The sachems were designated by succession matrilineally (Hearth 2008:19). The sachems were counseled by a group of elders, and anything that was to be undertaken such as war, peace, or the selling of land was not to be done without advising the elders first, as well as conferring with the entire village (Myers 1970:36). It was also the role of these individuals to persuade and influence. The sachems could speak well using “chiefly language,” a special ritual address. They also advised, counseled, and mediated disputes, as well as acting on behalf of their people (White 1991:496), representing the
Lenape to outsiders (Schutt 2007:26). Sachems had a counselor, or second chief, who would aid them and take charge in their absence, as well as a war chief who recruited and led war parties (Harrington 1913:211). The war chief was often referred to with the title of “Captain” by the Europeans (Nichols 2008:16-17). The village chiefs and the war chiefs would share in authority, however when war became necessary power would then be delegated to the war chief (Weslager 1978).

There are no histories or accounts concerning events in Lenapehoking in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and early eighteenth centuries from the Natives’ points of view. The historical information that is available is shallow or biased, as many people simply had no reason to discuss the Lenape culture (Kraft 2001:21). Much of the following history is taken from secondary sources and meant only as a summary. For more detailed information, consult the sources listed.

Staten Island saw the arrival of Europeans as early as 1524, while the Delaware Bay area was discovered by the Dutch in 1609 and named for the governor of Virginia, Sir Thomas West, Lord de la Warr (Hearth 2008:2; Schutt 2007:3). The river leading out of the bay was subsequently named Delaware as well. The Dutch were the major influence on the Lenape from 1610 to 1637, including influencing future foodways for everyone, bringing with them such things as apples, pears, cherries, peaches, apricots, plums, almonds, figs, currants, gooseberries, roses, tulips, marigolds, violets, cows, horses, hogs, and sheep (Van der Donck 1968).

Even with the introduction of the Swedish settlements in 1638, the atmosphere in Lenapehoking remained fairly calm as neither group saw benefit in the disruption of the native life style (Becker 1976:27). The Swedish government maintained that as long as
the Lenape were a valuable source of furs for export to Sweden, it was beneficial to not disrupt their village life. As the Swedish colonists quickly became self sufficient, there was little cause for additional interaction (Weslager 1972:120).

By the 1650s, through continual interaction with the Dutch and the Swedes, the Lenape had begun to wear European garments and to use European utensils and tools. They were becoming increasingly reliant on the Dutch to supply them with these commodities, including parts for the guns which they had introduced to the younger Lenape hunters. The Lenape were first exposed to European firearms in the 1650s. Originally, the European governments had forbidden the sale of firearms to the Natives; however the English broke this pact, quickly followed by the Swedes. The Dutch were also eager to participate in the trade, and the competition between the groups may have led to relations between the Natives and the settlers turning sour (Zimmerman 1974:64). The further competition between the Dutch and the English may have exacerbated things, as both had started trying to acquire Lenape land, the English generally without asking permission (Weslager 1972:113).

In reaction to these political and social disruptions, villages and bands started to come together in new political groupings, more closely resembling what could loosely be termed a tribe. In fact, the tribes may have grown even more as a response to the growing number of Europeans and their demands to have certified representatives to speak with (Ordahl Kupperman 2000:36).

In the 1650s and 1660s, smallpox took its toll on all of the Native populations, causing many Lenape to begin fleeing their homeland, leaving it open for possession by

As much as they may have liked to, those Lenape who remained could not strike back against these early settlers due to the influence of the Covenant Chain, formed in 1677 under the sponsorship of Governor Andros. Andros, and his partners the Five Nations, offered the Natives genuine protection in New York (Salisbury 2000:18-19). The alliance excluded the Lenape despite the tribe’s presence there (Jennings 1974:90). Since the Lenape were not directly included in these proceedings, they could not speak for themselves and instead had to go through the Five Nations. The implication was subordination to the Iroquois Five Nations (or Haudenosuanee as they referred to their confederation), as to attack either the colonies and their settlers or any of the Five Nations tribes without approval would bring down the full wrath of all (Jennings 1974:90; Shoemaker 2004:7). This relationship with the Iroquois and the Five Nations would haunt the Lenape for some time.

The 1680s saw Quaker William Penn’s first land acquisitions in Pennsylvania, especially around the area of present day Philadelphia (Schutt 2007:63). Penn worked with the Lenape to purchase these lands, as opposed to just taking them. Penn, and then his sons after his death, also gradually worked to add Pennsylvania into the Covenant Chain in an alliance they termed a “Chain of Friendship” (Jennings 1974:96). The alliance gave the Iroquois rights to police Pennsylvania’s woods in return for the government’s recognition of their sole right to do so (Jennings 1974:96).

As before, the Lenape were excluded from this alliance in any form, despite Lenape people moving into the Susquehanna region and some residing around
Conestoga, Pennsylvania (Schutt 2007:64). This alliance was completed in 1736 (Jennings 1974:96). The Lenape were allowed to remain, however they were at the mercy of both the Iroquois Five Nations and the incoming settlers. As more settlers started to encroach on the area that they believed was theirs, the tribe began to become more destitute, not having sufficient resources for hunting or horticulture. Discontent rapidly spread through the tribe.

The Lenape believed that William Penn, a previous defender of Lenape rights, had supposedly reserved the land they were living on for their use; however his sons and the Iroquois denied this after his death and subsequently denied all Lenape claims to the land. In truth, the Lenape had a rightful claim, however Penn’s sons had sold some of the land out from under the Lenape to pay off debts to creditors (Hearth 2008:174; Weslager 1972:187).

With their hunting grounds rapidly decreasing, the Lenape could no longer obtain the deer pelts they needed to trade for the European goods they had become dependent on (Weslager 1972:185). Many of the tribes were beginning to experience overall feelings of tension and betrayal (Schutt 2007:66). These feelings of betrayal helped construct the Lenape attitude towards the newcomers in their country, as well as future interactions with and among them.

In 1737, the Penn brothers used their influence to carry out the Walking Purchase. This was a major influence in pushing the Lenape further west, as it purchased all the land that could be covered by walking for a day and a half, all of which had been Lenape land (Dowd 2002:35; Jennings 1974:96). Based on a lack of written documentation from the initial sale in 1686 of Lenape land to William Penn for his colony, his sons
constructed a new document. Cultural differences in meaning for the phrase “amount of land covered by walking a day and a half” resulted in some very upset Lenape, as the new treaty took away all their land (Shoemaker 2004:61).

The Lenape turned to the Iroquois for help in the matter, only to have them scold the Lenape and treat them as subordinates (Schutt 2007:90). When the Lenape protested this, the Iroquois responded as per their agreement but instead of helping them, threatened the weak Lenape that remained, backed by the full support of Pennsylvania. Being too few and too disjointed to further protest, the displaced tribe began to move out of Pennsylvania to the unoccupied lands north of the Ohio River (Ferguson 1972:21). These lands had been previously cleared of their inhabitants by the earlier Iroquois expansion in the late 1640s. This had caused many of the tribes to disperse, leaving the region uninhabited (Edmunds 2005:26). This behavior by the Iroquois pushed both the Lenape and the Shawnee toward further resentment of the Iroquois claim to authority (Dowd 2002:38).

Thus by 1740, Lenapehoking had been completely lost to the immigrants (Newcomb 1956:87). Most of the Lenape villages on the Susquehanna waterways and in Ohio were now composed of families of mixed affinity: Shawnee, Mahican, Wyandot and other tribes were all intermingled with Lenape. Cultural traits were borrowed from each other (Becker 1976:52; Weslager 1972:208; Wheeler-Voegelin 1974). The Lenape continued to maintain many different relationships with other Lenape bands as well as other tribes. They were still not politically unified, as they maintained their past styles of leadership (Schutt 2007:94). This is important for archaeological purposes as any site dating to after this point has the potential to exhibit traits identifiable with several tribes.
Missionary interest in the Lenape began with the Presbyterian missionary David Brainerd in 1758 (Kraft 2001:24). The success of these missions may have been due to a population drastically affected by warfare and disease. The remaining Lenape were brought closer together and may have had more cause to rely on the missionaries for help than they would have originally (Weslager 1972:42-43). Whatever the cause, Brainerd succeeded in his missionary efforts and created several successful Lenape/missionary communities. Under the tutelage of the missionaries, the Lenape tended gardens and assisted in sawmills, gristmills, and orchards (Weslager 1972:211).

Spurred by Brainerd’s success, the Moravians, led by David Zeisberger and then John Heckewelder, took an abiding interest in the Lenape as well and joined with those Lenape who had migrated to Pennsylvania and Ohio (Kraft 2001:24; Olmstead 1991:7). The missions were situated near the Lenape villages originally, but eventually the two would become intertwined (Thompson 1937:20, Thwaites 1912:48-49). This influence is important to note, as it had effects on Lenape culture for many years to come.

After a century and a half of cultural disruption and trade, the Lenape had fully incorporated European trade goods into their society (Kraft 2001:24-25; Weslager 1972:216). While they had learned some new skills from the Moravians, they had not learned how to manufacture any of the needed trade items and had lost many of their own skills (Weslager 1972:217). As non-Moravian Lenape moved into Ohio, they also congregated themselves into towns, many around the Moravian missions. Even though most of these Lenape had no desire to convert, the missionaries did teach them agriculture, craftsmanship, and writing as well as providing them with land to live on and protection from abuse (Kraft 2001:480,482). The mission towns offered the Lenape
economic support as well as help in legal matters (Kaiser 2008:146). The communities provided stability and protection, a factor that influenced some to join to serve the best interests of their families, especially their children (Merritt 2008:168).

By the late 1750s, more of the tribe had relocated to the Ohio Valley (Newcomb 1956:87). Despite removal from the direct influence of the Iroquois, the Lenape were still viewed as subjugates. Tensions were mounting, and many were ready to settle old scores against the English, which they could not accomplish while still under the Iroquois (Weslager 1972:216-217). While some Lenape still had hopes that the English would grant them some land somewhere, after the defeat of the English General Braddock by the French and in view of his insulting attitude toward the Lenape warriors who would have assisted him, the majority of the Lenape, along with the Shawnee, became completely alienated from the English and defected to the French (Weslager 1972:226). This militant response may have come as a cumulative reaction to past traumas and as a violent response to past removals. They were determined not to become migrants again (Barr 2006:26).

Not being aware of what was transpiring among the Lenape bands and their defection to the French, the Oneida representative of the Six Nations sent the Lenape the signal to go to war, a belt of black wampum, to send them to join the English against the French. Instead, they helped the French, raiding multiple settlements throughout Pennsylvania and Ohio (Weslager 1972:227). However, since the Lenape were still composed of many of the original autonomous bands, the tribe was still not completely organized or in agreement. This war, dubbed the French and Indian War (also known as
part of the Seven Years War), was fought mostly by the western faction of Lenape (Barr 2006:30; Edmunds et al. 2007:137).

The warfare conducted throughout Ohio and Pennsylvania by both the Lenape and the Shawnee began to tear apart Pennsylvania’s Indian policy. The tribes continued to put up resistance to the squatter encroachments on their land (Anson 1970:77). Both groups were also greatly dissatisfied with the Six Nations and their Grand Council, and their refusal to help (Schutt 2007:111). The continued warfare even caused two members of the Six Nations, the Cayuga and the Seneca, also to defect to the French side (Weslager 1972:231). The Pennsylvanian government could no longer ignore their resistance and declared war on the Lenape and their allies (Barr 2006:37). However, after their French allies were defeated by the English, Teedyuskung, the self-proclaimed Lenape king, worked independently of the tribe to negotiate peace with Pennsylvania, which was accomplished the following year in a treaty with Fort Pitt (Weslager 1972:232-233,238).

It was a tenuous peace, as the Lenape had no desire for continued subjugation under the Iroquois. However, the English were cutting off the French ports, and supplies to the Lenape were dwindling. They took the practical approach and ceased hostilities so that they could acquire the supplies they needed (Weslager 1972:237). With the French defeated, they were at the mercy of the English, who pushed them back and forth, until by 1763 almost all of the Lenape were in Ohio. The Lenape had more reason than any to doubt the British. Their past peace with Pennsylvania had lost them both their land and their autonomy, and they had felt directly the expansiveness of the colonial population
and the intricacies of the Covenant Chain. They had also become extremely familiar with the mobilizing capabilities of the British Army (Dowd 2002:90).

From 1763 to 1764, expressing their disdain against the British, many Lenape became involved in Pontiac’s Uprising. Pontiac, inspired by the Lenape prophet Neolin who preached a return to the old ways, mounted an offensive against the British (Dowd 2000:380; Edmunds et al. 2007:143). Natives from the Seneca west to the Illinois and the Chippewa (Ojibwa) in the north to the Lenape attacked eight British posts, including Fort Pitt, and took them all. The British reinforcements raised sieges of the remaining two forts and eventually suppressed the rebellion (Dowd 2002; O’Brien 1989:46; White 1991:269). The unintended result showed the Native Americans that there was more success to be had by terrorizing and intimidating civilians and noncombatants in the frontier, as opposed to military battles (Barr 2006:40). Neolin’s revival also reminded Natives that despite their rivalries, they were all Native and had a common goal (Richter 2001:180-181).

After Pontiac’s rebellion, the colonies turned their attention back to the looming Revolutionary War. The decision by the Lenape to take part in the American/British Revolutionary War was made by individual bands, including which side they would back. Each group looked out for their own interests (Tanner 1987:81). This segmentation was further visible among those not involved in the war, as they continued to live in the Ohio Valley. The Lenape again tried to bring peace to all the tribes, allying with the Moravians to help promote their positions as mediators (Schutt 2007:145). The warriors of the group were less than thrilled with this proposition, believing that Moravian Indians were not allowed to kill people (Schutt 2007:146). Others tried returning to the idea of
the “Chain of Friendship,” linking the Lenape with the English (Schutt 2007:149). As they began to realize how far apart they were falling, the Lenape began to work again to consolidate their people and overcome the divisions that were threatening to destroy any hope of a strong Lenape coalition (Schutt 2007:154).

In 1776, the Lenape, still trying to justify their possession of land in the Ohio country, finally directly disputed the Iroquois. However the Revolutionary War had caused drastic changes to the Iroquois federation; in the lead-up to the hostilities, the Confederacy could not agree on a course of action and the Council fire was extinguished, effectively disbanding the strength of the Six Nations (Ferris 2009:124). Following the war throughout 1777, war parties comprised of Shawnee, Lenape, Wyandot, and Mingo warriors took advantage of this and regularly raided frontier settlements throughout Pennsylvania (Hurt 2002:17).

The Lenape, revising their strategy, worked to form relations with the United States and renew them with the Quakers. This resulted in the Treaty of Fort Pitt of 1778, which supposedly gave the Lenape rights to their territory as long as they would abide by the “chain of friendship” that they were entering into (Schutt 2007:162-163). It was only possible due to the Moravian influences of David Zeisberger and John Heckewelder (Prucha 1994:31). This treaty, the first formal document written in diplomatic and legal language with the newly formed United States, agreed that the United States military could travel through Lenape land, while also allying the Lenape with the Americans (Prucha 1994:3, 32; Wilkins 2007:52). Early United States policy was based on the notion of paternalism, that the government genuinely wanted to aid the “inferior” and
“dependent” people and bring them Christianity and civilization. This quickly turned instead to aggression (Prucha 1985).

The 1780s saw many of the Native Americans and Americans in an undeclared war (Hurt 2002:108). Around 1781, despite forming relations with the United States, many Lenape bands were still divided. Many saw the Moravian Lenape as part of the reason their nation remained divided, even though the Native American Moravian converts were actually made up of several tribes apart from the Lenape, including the Shawnee, Mahican, Nanticoke, Conoy, Mingo, and Cherokee (Thompson 1937:18).

The Lenape war chief Buckongahelas wanted to incorporate the converts back into the tribe and, arriving at the Moravian town of Gnadenhütten, urged the group to unite with them and join him and his warriors at a place on the Maumee River where they could find abundant crops and cattle. Most declined (Schutt 2007:170). Unfortunately for those who remained, the Pennsylvania militia had received information that the Moravian Indians were the cause of recent raids on settlements. In 1782, they reached Gnadenhütten and took all its inhabitants captive. Instead of transporting them to Fort Pitt as prisoners, they massacred the town saying that it was God’s will (Schutt 2007:172). Despite past differences between the Moravian Lenape and those Lenape associated with Hopocan (“Captain Pipe”), the war chief avenged the slaughter by capturing and killing the U.S. Colonel William Crawford (Tanner 1987:81). The situation did not improve relations between the United States and the Lenape.

The remaining Lenape spread out, some joining the Shawnee and some moving up to where Buckongahelas had originally promised them land, along the Maumee near the Miami towns at Kekionga (Schutt 2007:173). The attack had the affect of eliminating
most of the neutrality among the Lenape and directing their support towards the British. This also caused other missions to disperse, as well as pushing some of the Lenape further west (Ferris 2009:81). Many Lenape were much less receptive to the Moravian preaching later on as well (Miller 1994:246).

The new United States government realizing the predicament they were in took Indian policies seriously at this time. The government was still trying to pay war debts incurred during the Revolutionary War and encouraged land sales along the frontier (Hurt 2002:104; Rafert 1996:45). From 1783 to 1787, under the Articles of Confederation, Congress rapidly acquired and sold land to ease the war debt. The quickest way to get this land was to operate under the premise that Native Americans were conquered people, and the British had ceded all the land in the Old Northwest, the land west of Pennsylvania and northwest of the Ohio River, to the American government at the end of the Revolutionary War, angering many Native tribes (Hurt 2002:104; Rafert 1996:45). For the Lenape, this meant a significant loss in land as many were residing in the territory known as the Old Northwest.

By 1785, the first Lenape town was formed around Kekionga, the Miami village located near present day Fort Wayne, Indiana (Rafert 1996:38; Schutt 2007:177). Two more Lenape towns were formed by 1787 (Rafert 1996:38; Snow 1968:6). The Miami and Shawnee also had multiple villages in this area. This convenient grouping of tribes made a coalition against the incoming settlers much more plausible, and this time in the Ohio Valley region saw not only the Lenape, but many of the other tribes taking an active role against American newcomers. With the English supplying them with ammunition and other supplies (in hopes that they would defeat the Americans for them), the Lenape
and other tribes residing in the region continued their raids against the American settlers (Downes 1940:254).

There could be no peace without the consent and goodwill of the Native Americans, but there could be no permanence to that peace without the government controlling its unruly frontier citizens (Nichols 2008:3). In 1785 the Treaty of Fort McIntosh attempted to ease the situation by allowing Congress to purchase Native lands by issuing an exchange of hostages. The Native Americans were placed under the protection of the United States, however they lost their sovereignty (Prucha 1994:50). This was further aggravated by the Northwest Ordinance in 1787, which opened most of Ohio for settlement (Hurt 2002:105; Rafert 1996:46).

A series of treaties at Fort Harmar through 1789 ceded most of the Native lands in Ohio and some in Indiana, however they were conducted under dubious circumstances, and the Natives actively disagreed with their proclamations (Prucha 1994:38). In outrage against the forced treaties, white captives taken by the Natives were increasingly put to death and torture became more common, as was the case with Charles Builderback, who was found partially responsible for the Moravian Lenape massacre at Gnadenhütten by the Pennsylvania militia in 1782 (Sword 1985:76). Article III was eventually added to the Northwest Ordinance, reversing the American government’s conquest theory and recognizing the Natives as the owners of the land (Hurt 2002:108; Rafert 1996:46).

Relations were still tumultuous, as the United States militia often provoked the Natives to violence by slaughtering them without having received orders to do so. Major Hardin was a good example of this when he marched to the Wea Towns along the Wabash in 1789 to intercept a war party. Discovering a peaceful Shawnee hunting camp
of men, women, and children on the way instead, he attacked and killed all of them (Sword 1985:77).

Dubious exchanges through 1789 and 1790 incited further provocation and caused the Secretary of War Henry Knox, who had previously worked to maintain peace on the frontier, to instead take a militaristic path (Hurt 2002:108; Rafert 1996:50). Despite the government’s war preparations, Congress issued a series of laws to regulate trade with the Natives. The first declared the purchase of Native lands invalid unless authorized by the United States. Provisions were also made to help punish settlers for crimes committed against Natives (Hurt 2002:108; Rafert 1996:50).

War preparations continued with Knox’s recommendation that a chain of posts in the Ohio territory be built, and the many Native groups, such as the Miami, Lenape, and Shawnee, at Kekionga be punished by destroying their towns and crops. General Josiah Harmar was to help defend the frontier and the settlers by building military outposts throughout the frontier, especially at Kekionga which was viewed as the center of Native hostilities (Rafert 1996:50-51; Sword 1985:101).

Despite not having received federal orders to do so, General Harmar left Fort Washington in 1790 with almost 1500 soldiers (Sword 1985:95). However, his army was poorly trained and poorly supplied and arrived at Kekionga only to fall into a trap set up by Little Turtle of the Miamis (Sword 1985:97). He and his Native forces comprised of Shawnee, Miami, Ottawa, Sauk, and Lenape warriors attacked the Americans, causing them to flee (Edmunds et al. 2007:168; Hurt 2002:109; Snow 1968:5-6; Sword 1985:106-112). Harmar fled back to Fort Washington in November of 1790 having lost over 180 men with over 250 casualties total, while the Native loss was minimal (Edmunds
2005:34; Nichols 2008:117-118). While his expedition itself was not a tragic defeat as far as loss of life, it had the affect of advertising to the Natives the incapacity of the American army. This stimulated the Native forces to increasing resistance and renewed hostilities against the settlers (Barnhart and Riker 1971:283-284; Sword 1985:128-130).

After Harmar’s failure, a new general was appointed in his place to try again in March 1791 (Sword 1985:121). Arthur St. Clair took up where Harmar left off (Sword 1985:145). St. Clair assembled his forces at Fort Washington and then marched north. He did manage to construct two forts; Fort Hamilton and then Fort Jefferson (see Figure 2). The army came to a halt on November 3, 1791, on the east bank of the upper Wabash. The next day, the Natives attacked. Chief Little Turtle again provided expert leadership, out-maneuvering and out-gunning the American army despite the fact that many under his command did not even speak the same language (DeRegnaucourt 1996:75; Edmunds et al. 2007:170-171; Hurt 2002:111). The entire American army retreated or was killed (Barnhart and Riker 191:286-293). St. Clair lost 630 men, while 283 were wounded. It was the largest single loss of life ever sustained by the United States army in its warfare with the Native Americans (Edmunds 2005:34). This does not even take into account the 100 women and children camp followers who also died (Rafert 1996:52). Only twenty to thirty Native Americans were lost (Nichols 2008:139).

Again, the American forces had been beaten by the Natives led by Little Turtle (Snow 1968:5-6). Following his defeat, St. Clair resigned his post. Revolutionary War General Anthony Wayne was named commander-in-chief in his place, again to continue
Figure 2: Forts built by St. Clair and Wayne
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the campaign of building forts along the frontier and defending the settlers (Barnhart and Riker 1971:294).

Wayne proceeded to build Fort Greenville in 1792 and then Fort Recovery at the scene of St. Clair’s defeat. He advanced the bulk of his army to Fort Recovery in 1794 (Barnhart and Riker 1968:300). Wayne continued with his mission and built Fort Defiance at the mouth of the Auglaize. He offered peace to the Natives, but still fresh from defeating Harmar and St. Clair, they rejected it (Barnhart and Riker 1971:300). A small band of Lenape tried to make peace with Wayne, however they did not have the backing of the majority of their tribe, and Wayne refused their proposal (Sword 985:256-257). Little Turtle took a small force against Wayne at Fort Defiance, to test his strength. Deciding he could not develop tactics to counter the general, he pled for peace. Unable to convince his allies, he gave up command to the Shawnee chief Blue Jacket (Rafert 1996:53-54).

Spurred on by their success against the two military generals, the Native coalition began to push harder against the incoming Americans. Their violence continued until the decisive Battle of Fallen Timbers. Wayne was headed towards the multiracial complex of villages at “the Glaize,” the confluence of the Auglaize and Maumee Rivers (Nichols 2008:145). The Lenape had three villages in “the Glaize” (Tanner 2000:405). While many of the Native tribes abandoned the area, Buckongahelas and a sizeable group of Lenape warriors did remain to protect their villages and to help in beating back the Americans (Sword 1985:270-271).

When the battle finally occurred, there may have been thirteen hundred warriors, representing the Lenape, Wyandot, Shawnee, Miami, and Ottawa (Barnhart and Ricker
1971:300; Downes 1940:334-335). Led by the Shawnee Chief Blue Jacket, they supposedly challenged Wayne at a spot where a tornado had torn up many of the trees, forming natural breastworks. Wayne attacked and the whole battle lasted not even three hours. The Natives retreated, possibly after seeing the loss of several prominent Ottawa war chiefs. They may have believed their losses were far greater than they actually were. Afterwards, when they realized that they had not lost many warriors, many of the Natives were ready to restart the fight, but the Americans were already marching on the British Fort Miamis (Edmunds et al. 2007:171-173). Wayne had actually suffered more fatalities, totaling 143 dead while the Native coalition had lost only 40 (Nichols 2008:164-165).

Not only did the British at the fort refuse to surrender, they refused to offer any aid to the Natives who were fighting for them at Fallen Timbers (Barnhart and Riker 1971:301; Downes 1940:335; Sword 1985:304-306). Buckongahelas especially was blatantly insulted by this, and the subsequent chaos that ensued from being denied access to the fort after the battle may have increased the disorganization and decreased the chances of the Natives continuing the battle (Sword 1985:306).

Having been defeated by the Americans led by Wayne, they now knew that they could not rely on the English for backup and that to stand up to the incoming Americans under their new general would mean being much better prepared (Ferguson 1972:38; Weslager 1972:322). Wayne took advantage of the British’s refusal to fight, and subsequently raided and burned everything surrounding the settlement (Downes 1940:335). Despite the outcome, many of the Natives were still divided on whether to make peace or continue fighting Wayne. They had not suffered a harsh defeat, but
without support from the British they would get no supplies. The British were reluctant to accept official defeat until treaty negotiations in London between the United States and England were complete but did not want to fight and risk ruining the negotiations. Eventually the Natives gave up waiting on the British for military assistance and approached Wayne for peace (Barnhart and Riker 1971:303; Hurt 2002:114).

The Natives’ defeat at the Battle of Fallen Timbers by Wayne, and subsequent rejection by the British, led to the Treaty of Greenville in 1795. Peace had been officially declared between the British and the United States in Jay’s Treaty, which stipulated that the British would abandon their settlements in the United States. Since the Natives could no longer expect aid from the British, they had to assent to an agreement with the United States. The Wyandots, Lenape, Shawnee, Miami, Ottawa, Chippewa, Potawatomi, Kickapoo, Wea, Eel River Miami, Piankashaw, and Kaskaskia tribes all took part. Jay’s Treaty had almost as large an impact on the Old Northwest as the following Treaty of Greenville (Barnhart and Riker 1971:303-304; Edmunds 2007:164-165; Hurt 2002:114; Rafert 1996:61). Even Little Turtle, who had fought hard to limit concessions to the Americans, realized that further militaristic resistance would be futile (Mann 1999:399).

With the Treaty of Greenville the Natives agreed to cease warring upon the American settlements and accept a new boundary line between their territory and that which was to be opened up to the settlers. The treaty ceded two thirds of Ohio and part of southeastern Indiana to the United States but left the rest of Indiana to the Lenape and other Natives, which led to the decision to unite the tribe along the west fork of the White River, see Figure 3 (Barnhart and Riker 1971:304; Cayton 1998; Ferguson 1972:40; Newcomb 1956:89).
Figure 3: Greenville Treaty Line
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As part of the treaty, the tribes were to receive an annuity. Initially, $20,000 in goods was divided between the tribes. Every year after that, all of the tribes taking part would receive $19,500 collectively, with the Lenapes' share equaling $1000 (Barnhart and Riker 1971:305). The treaty also allowed the Americans access to the Ohio Valley and further displaced the Lenape into central Indiana. While the Lenape may have resided in Indiana prior to this point, it was not until after the treaty that significant settlement took place along the west fork of the White River in central Indiana (Newcomb 1956:89; Wepler 1992:73). The Piankashaw chiefs claimed that they had set land aside for incoming Lenape as early as 1770, though it was recorded by the government that the Lenape had permission from both the Miami and Potawatomis to settle on the lands on the White River (Weslager 1972:332).

With the relative success of the Ohio mission, the Moravians planned another for the settlements in Indiana. It was the hope of both the Lenape leaders and the missionaries to consolidate the independent bands along the White River though their agendas differed significantly (Wepler 1992:73). The new Lenape communities were strung out along the White River, through present-day Indiana counties of Delaware, Madison, Marion, and Hamilton (Schutt 2007:180). A few Lenape moved back to Ohio to Greentown, a village consisting of 60 cabins and a council-house (Schutt 2007:181). Some villages were also spread throughout Southern Indiana near the forks of the White River (Cochrum 1907).

Whether just after the Treaty of Greenville, or after they were invited by their fellow tribesmen, it was during this period (1794-1799) that the majority of the Lenape migrated into Indiana to settle along the west fork of the White River (Newcomb
Regardless of when they initially took up residence in Indiana, the Lenape played an active role in its early history, which shall be seen in the following section.

The Lenape in the Indiana Territory

The Lenape occupation in Indiana started by at least 1773 and may have occurred much earlier. As early as 1770 the Lenape had received permission from the Piankashaw to occupy the area between the White River and the Ohio River (Thompson 1937:41-42). Chief White Eyes made the first known claims to land in Indiana in 1775. Claims were made again on the southern portions of Indiana at a treaty conference in Vincennes in 1776 (Wheeler-Voegelin et al. 1974:261-262). Some records indicate that there were Lenape living at the forks of the White River prior to the 1770s (Allison 1986:43).

Apart from these early land claims, there is little record of the Lenape occupation for this time from any source, until the government officially recognized their claims from the Miami in 1795 just after the Treaty of Greenville. This may be due to a relatively small population, or a very spread out population, as well as a lack of preserved written records from the Lenape. The Treaty of Greenville, and urgings from the sachems Tetepachsit and Buckongahelas, resulted in a large migration of Lenape from Ohio (Ferguson 1972:39). Buckongahelas and some of the Lenape warriors had already been residing around Kekionga since the early 1780s (Schutt 2007). The large influx of Lenape to the Indiana territory affected not only the Indian Agency, who was responsible for distributing the annuities guaranteed through the treaty, but caused a rapid expansion
of Kekionga and other Native cities forcing the governor of the Indiana territory to quickly develop policies to deal with the incoming groups.

The Lenape chiefs had hoped to conjoin all the migrant bands into a cohesive whole by trying to relocate as many Lenape as possible to the area. There were, by 1800, several Lenape villages, along the west fork of the White River in Indiana. Anderson’s town, Killbuck’s town, Wapicomekoke, Hockingpomsga’s Town, and Lower Delaware Town are just a few. The mission diaries discuss nine villages in all along the west fork of the White River; however some of these may have been the home of other tribes such as the Shawnee (Gipson 1938:11,16). These towns were “thickly populated” (Gipson 1938:104) and many of the groups that resided along the White River were able to maintain their cultural identities despite their multiple displacements, even managing to hang onto several distinctive traits (Becker 1982:19).

The Moravian missionaries John Kluge and Abraham Luckenbach arrived in the White River area in 1801. Despite suffering what they deemed as multiple hardships and Natives they characterized as constantly drunk, only minor mishaps ever befell the missionaries. They proceeded to build a Moravian Mission on a hill overlooking the White River in the vicinity of the modern day city of Anderson and would preach to whoever stopped by (Gipson 1938).

In 1802, multiple Lenape died due to the rapid spread of disease throughout the villages. As a result, many Native people expressed their dissatisfaction with the situation exclaiming that the spirits were unhappy with them, and by 1803 a nativistic movement began to grow and spread among the Lenape. It started with a woman named Beade (or Beate), who had a vision that they needed to return to the old ways (Gipson
Her visions, which continued through 1805, were shared with the entire tribe while she admonished them to follow her words (Grumet 2001:42-43). Beade talked of going back to the old ways as was the case with similar movements in the Eastern Woodland and forbade evil, drinking, fornication, stealing, and murder (Gipson 1938:339). A new hall was built in Wapicomekoke specially to hold the sacrifices she claimed were necessary to return to good health and the old ways (Miller 1994:252).

The Fort Wayne Treaty of 1803 ceded the Lenape lands in Indiana to the government, however this was later revoked when the then Governor Henry Harrison recognized the Miami as the rightful owners of the land the Lenape were inhabiting, giving the Lenape no right to transfer its ownership (Anson 1970:147; Rafert 1996:69).

When Buckongahelas died later in 1805, followed by an epidemic of fever, suspicions were raised among many of the Lenape. Widespread discontent, loss, and social confusion led to frequent charges of poison and sorcery, which were investigated by the Shawnee (Gipson 1938:358-361; Rafert 1996:71). Miller (1994) attributes these witch hunts as being social mechanisms for maintaining equilibrium and relieving social pressure. Of course, they had the added benefit of markedly inhibiting any types of European cultural changes. The military and missionaries were attempting to wear away the Lenape culture from the outside, and the disease and dissension were threatening to wear it away from the inside. Purging witches allowed the Lenape to establish new cultural boundaries and strengthen their culture (Miller 1994:248).

In July of 1805, suspicions continued to rise, and the people deposed the old Chief Tedpachsit. The young people of the tribe rejected him, refusing to listen to him (Gipson 1938:369). They had also decided to abolish poison use, and thus banded together,
deposed their old chiefs, and followed the teachings of the Prophet (Gipson 1938:412). Stress from the inability of the missionaries to solve any of their problems, such as the repeated epidemics, caused a lot of animosity towards the Christian converts and the missionaries (Cave 1995:454).

The Shawnee prophet and his brother Tecumseh appeared in 1805 as well. The two had probably resided on the White River since 1798, living in the village of Wapicomekoke, but it was not until later that the Prophet started trying to stir up followers. In 1805, missionary records mention the rising of a Shawnee Indian who draws crowds of both Shawnee and Lenape and preaches against sins and for the “ancient heathenisms” (Gipson 1938:392; Thompson 1937:45). In January of 1806, the Prophet announced that he had received a vision from God. Beade as well continued her visions, claiming that she also spoke the word of God, perhaps mimicking the Shawnee prophet to gain followers back (Gipson 1938:402).

The Prophet attempted to rally the Shawnee to join him at his location at Prophetstown, near Greenville, Ohio, and may have been moving back and forth between the two villages (Green et al. 1994). The Shawnee prophet preached against alcohol and for a return to the old ways. He told the Lenape to cease wearing European clothes and buying trade goods, abandon the use of metal implements, stop raising domestic animals, and forsake polygamy. He also banned certain traditional shamanic practices and the use of money and private ownership of land (Cave 1995:452). His religion spread like wildfire throughout the Lenape camps (Edmunds 1983).

The Shawnee Prophet was also the source of considerable trouble for some Lenape starting in February of 1806 as he preached against those Lenape who had made
use of poison. In the traditional Lenape belief system, poison could only be used through witchcraft. To be a witch, the individuals had to receive black magic in their dreams and offer the life of their closest relative. The belief was that no one was as powerful as a witch and that their spells were unbreakable by humans. If caught, witches were burned to death (Kraft 1986:185-186).

The prophet accused three people of having used poison against other Lenape, and these accusations led to the death of Chief Tedpachsit, an old Indian Sister, and Indian Brother Joshua, two of the mission’s few converts. To make matters worse for the missionaries, these people were murdered by being struck repeatedly in the head with a tomahawk and then burnt in the front yard of the mission (Edmunds 1983; Gipson 1938:407,556-558). The Prophet blamed Tedpachsit for the loss of Native American culture, because he had been one of the signers of the Treaty of Greenville. It was also rumored that he participated in the alcohol trade (Warren 2005:25). Rather ironically, while the prophetic message on the surface advocated returning to the “old ways,” many of the elements contained in it were pulled straight from Christian doctrine, such as the concepts of God, sin, and a last judgment leading to heaven and hell (Cave 1995:448).

Lenape Missionary John Heckewelder credits these prophets with attempting “to bring them back to independent feelings, and create among them a genuine national spirit” (1971:290). The prophets were one of the main obstacles that many missionaries faced in their teaching and attempt to convert the Natives. It was largely due to the actions of the Shawnee prophet that the missionaries began to feel less and less secure and safe, causing the abandonment of the missionary effort in September of 1806, not long after the murders in their town (Gipson 1938:454).
Sometime between 1806 and 1811 the two Shawnee left the White River area for the land around the modern town of Battle Ground (near current West Lafayette), where they constructed a new Prophetstown. The witch hunt had failed to grant Tenskwatawa the support he had been expecting for many reasons. The witch hunt had violated traditional Lenape cultural practices, which incurred opposition from the traditionalists, while those who favored accommodations with the whites were already opposed. The Prophet had also endangered many Lenape lives, for if they were to start blaming themselves for witchcraft no one was safe. Thus, they eventually disregarded the Prophet and turned back to their traditional ceremonies to restore the community (Cave 1995:459). However, the witchcraft anxiety had helped to curb pride, greed, and self assertion while promoting social cooperation (Cave 1995:465).

The Treaty of Fort Wayne in 1809 ceded land along the southern Indiana/Illinois border and east central Indiana. The treaty pushed Tecumseh and his allies into believing armed resistance was the only way to stop American encroachment (Warren 2005:36). Tecumseh and his brother continued to gain considerable influence with the Native tribes until they were defeated in the Battle of Tippecanoe in 1811 (Thompson 1937:62). It was a struggle for the chiefs of the Lenape during this time, especially Chief Anderson, as they had to maintain neutrality so that they could continue to receive their annuity payments guaranteed by the Treaty of Greenville (Thornbrough 1961).

Their neutrality had a cost though, especially with the end of the War of 1812. The government had decided that it was time to get rid of the Native threats. By June of 1813 the Lenape were forced to move into the Shawnee towns in Ohio to avoid the military (Esarey 1924:228). Knowing the threat, in March of 1813 the Shawnee invited
the Lenape to join them in Piqua (Thornbrough 1961:187). A military expedition, led by Colonel Joseph Bartholomew, was sent to the White River and found the towns deserted and everything burned. Anything that was left they destroyed (Barnhart and Riker 1971:405; Esarey 1924:227; Thompson 1937:86), their cabins were plundered, belongings were taken, and the crops were destroyed (Thornbrough 1961:192-193). They were able to return to the White River shortly after the Battle of the Thames, when Tecumseh and the Indian alliance were defeated, ending the government’s fears of any more Native uprisings (Rafert 1996:75; Thompson 1937:79-80).

Large annuities, available credit, and whiskey had major effects on the Lenape and the Miami (Rafert 1996:102). John Johnston lists their numbers in 1815-1816 as 1,050 living on the White River, and 45 on the waters of the “Lands of Sandusky” (Hill 1957:92-93). At a council in 1817, it was estimated that the population of the White River settlements was somewhere around two thousand Natives (Thompson 1937:95).

With the Treaty of St. Mary’s in 1818 the Lenape ceded the rest of their lands to the government, though no date was actually given for their removal (Ferguson 1972:189). According to McCoy, they were still situated along the White River in 1819 when he passed through in his missionary efforts (McCoy 1970:50-52). In his entry for December 17, 1818, McCoy discussed his stay with Chief Anderson. At that time, just over half of the Lenape were living in small log cabins, while the rest were still residing in bark huts (McCoy 1970:53). When he returned on June 1, 1819, the town was much the same as he had left it. He commented on the filth and vermin in the cabin he was offered for the night, as well as the drunken debauchery that kept him from sleeping most of the night.
In the late summer of 1820, most of the Lenape gathered at William Conner’s trading post and began their migration out of Indiana led by Chief Anderson (Thompson 1937:124). According to Pima Pen Okwe, her grandmother Ma Wah Taise was a Lenape living in Indiana at the time of the move and was part of the group of some 1300 Lenape, horses, and wagons to leave Indiana in 1820 to head off towards Illinois, then eventually Missouri, Kansas, and Oklahoma (Perry and Skolnick 1999:26-27). Some Lenape, living with the Shawnee in the Ohio village of Wapakoneta, remained until as late as 1832 (Warren 2005:19-20).

By the 1830s, the villages were no more than a legend. In particular, Wapicomekoke was the subject of many legends and tales. One such tale described it as an Indian burial ground where treasures were buried. Treasure hunters frequently raided Samuel Cecil’s property searching for these treasures (Cecil 1905). According to Cecil (1905), their efforts eventually led to the farm resembling a poorly plowed field. Silver buckles and brooches and once a brass kettle were supposedly found in the field. Cecil and his friends were able to put a stop to the looting by dressing up as ghosts and rigging a lantern to a pulley, scaring off the late night looters (Johnson 1976). The ghosts of Old Town Hill continue to haunt through tales of spirits seeking their buried treasure (Greene 1954:13).
Chapter 4: Lenape Archaeology

A Note on the Material Record

Archaeological excavations have helped to fill in many gaps in the historical record, especially concerning Lenape history prior to written records. In fact, the majority of the information about these early Lenape prior to and shortly after contact comes from archaeological excavations, such as those done by Marshall Becker, Herb Kraft, and Barry Kent (Becker 1980). While artifacts made from stone, bone, shell, and clay are found in abundance in many of these early sites, many artifacts suggest a European presence as well (Cotter et al. 1992:20). These artifacts are generally trade goods of various types, and their presence helps illuminate the change that was taking place. This section is intended to summarize highlights in contact period Lenape archaeology, which can be drawn upon when considering the kinds of artifactual assemblages the Lenape may have left behind in Indiana at the turn of the nineteenth century. By later relating the political history to these early sites, the effects political events had on the material remains may be deciphered and projected forward onto the sites in Indiana. This may also help identify trends and continuity in Lenape material culture through time.
Archaeological Sites

New York

Mariners’ Harbor, Old Place, was determined by Alanson Skinner (1909) to be a village site, as evidenced by the considerable size and depth of the refuse pits uncovered. This is an early historic period site located on Staten Island as determined by the brass arrow point, gun flints, lead bullets, pipe fragments, a perforated piece of a brass kettle, and a pewter ring recovered from the site. Guns were adopted quickly after contact with Europeans, and gun parts and paraphernalia are found at many subsequent sites.

The next Staten Island site of Bloomfield, or Watchogue in the Lenape language, was termed a site not by the presence of a specific settlement area, but by the proliferation of artifacts across the dunes and sand hills. Artifacts include a stone plummet, grooved axes, pottery, pipes, arrow points, different types of beads, a yellow chipped gun flint, and a perforated brass arrow point (Skinner 1909). The presence of the brass arrow point and the gun flint crafted of local material would suggest this location is an early historic period site. This site also demonstrates the continued use of some more traditional technologies, the stone plummets and axes. This could be due to differences in the needs of the various bands and communities in the area.

Rossville, as with the previous sites, is located in the sandy fields adjacent to the Staten Island shoreline. Brass thimbles have been found, along with pitted hammerstones and many arrow points. Alanson Skinner (1909) claims that the style of arrow point recovered is often found in significantly older contexts, which would suggest this site has been used by the Lenape for one reason or another for a long time up to the contact
period. Brass artifacts show up frequently in the Staten Island assemblages, which may suggest a desire among the Natives for the metal for augmentative purposes (as necklace pendants), as it is most often found perforated.

At the village site of Bowman’s Brook, Mariner’s Harbor, charred corn, beans, and hickory nuts have been found (Skinner 1909:43). This indicates the Lenape were practicing horticulture prior to the arrival of the Europeans. This site, as well as the site at Old Place previously mentioned, has provided enough material for faunal analysis. The Lenape in this area at the time these sites were inhabited relied mostly on white-tailed deer, with bobcat, muskrat, beaver, rabbit, dog, wolf, and fox all being fairly common and only a few occurrences of raccoon. Wild turkey is also abundant, along with several species of turtle and fish. Lobster and crab are rare, despite the location. A variety of shellfish were also used (Skinner 1909:46).

These Staten Island sites all seem to exhibit similar characteristics in that each is located on a sandy hill or knoll. Artifacts range in time from pre-contact to post-contact. As contact with the Europeans in this area occurred in the early 1520s, most of the sites in this area probably date to this period as well. A few trade goods are seen throughout the assemblage. Pipes, though they are not necessarily trade goods, seem to be popular in one of three forms. The first is a straight plain type, with a tubular stem expanding to form a bowl. The second is roughly the same size, except the bowl bends off from the stem at a slight curve. This type is often highly decorated and generally the most abundant. The last type found has a broad, flat stem with a bowl set at a slight angle (Skinner 1909:26-27). Perforated brass arrow heads are also prevalent throughout.
During his survey of New Jersey, Skinner (1909) also examined Lenape artifacts held in collections, and one of the more intriguing pieces found was a human head carved in stone, which he ties to the wooden masks that were still worn by the Lenape in medicinal ceremonies at that time. These wooden masks seem to have spawned from early stone artifacts with engravings of human faces on them found at some sites. These will be discussed in more depth later.

New Jersey

Moving west from Staten Island, in the New Jersey Highlands on the Maple Grange property, is the Black Creek Site. This is a habitation site that’s later components contain European trade goods in an otherwise Late Woodland context. The beads found at the site date from 1620 to 1675 (Santone 1998). It is located in an open meadow, on several low rises. Thousands of artifacts have been recovered from the site, and it is listed on the National Register of Historic Places due to its importance to Lenape and New Jersey history (Phalon 2005; Vernon County Historical Society n.d.).

The Lenhardt Site in Burlington County, New Jersey, was a small cemetery with eight flexed burials, five of which were accompanied by trade goods such as glass beads, metal objects, and clay tobacco pipes (Pietak 1998:146-147). Despite the presence of trade goods, the bodies were still in a flexed position. Pietak (1998) claims that an extended burial is a signifier of European influence, and thus that burial in the flexed position signifies minimal contact with Europeans. Ian Hodder, however, claims that the burial patterns are not a direct reflection of the social patterns (Brenner 1988:148).
Despite this, the definite change in burial position itself can be a signifier of some type of external influence.

The Kingston Site, a habitation site along the Hudson drainage, is another site that combines trade goods with Late Woodland ceramics. Trade goods recovered include glass beads, sheet brass, brass triangular projectile points, and gunflints (Santone 1998). Unfortunately, more detailed information could not be located and thus the value of the Lenhardt Site and Kingston Site is limited.

Post molds for the longhouses still survive at sites such as the Miller Field Site and Harry’s Farm Site in New Jersey, as seen in Figure 4 (Kraft 2001:223). Metal trade goods have also been located at these sites including iron axes, kettles, and nails (Kraft 2001:376-377; Kraft 1975). Again, these sites date to the early historic period.

The Minisink Site is another cemetery with ninety-one burials located in the Upper Delaware Valley. Both flexed and extended burials were recovered, as well as a wide variety of both indigenous and European grave goods. The orientation of the burials was with the head pointing to the southwest, a characteristic of Munsee groups. A large number of these burials proved to be early historic (Pietak 1998:149-150).

The Van Etten Site is also in the Upper Delaware Valley and was probably the site of a village as well as a place of burial. Thirty burials were excavated, all but one being in the extended position. The richest burial at the site was that of a child, whose grave contained numerous European objects (Pietak 1998:150). This burial could indicate that grave goods were not due to individual status in the community, but to some other factor.
Figure 4: Postholes at Harry’s Farm Site
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The Pahaquarra Site dates to 1750 and is located in Warren County, New Jersey. This site is comprised of three graves: a man, woman, and child. Beads are plentiful in each grave. The man’s grave contained some beads and a small shell disk around his neck, two tubular wound metal spirals on either side of the head, and the remains of a gun. The woman had an elaborate assortment of various types and colors of beads scattered over her entire person. She was also wearing 11 rings. A jewel box at her feet contained more beads (presumably from necklaces), scissors, a packet of needles, a mirror, and two knives. The child’s burial contained beads about the neck and several knives (Kraft 1986).

Further information recovered from Pahaquarra indicates that the longhouses were quite substantial. They were constructed with both an inner frame and an outer frame covered with bark shingles. The framework was composed of posts 3 inches in diameter closely spaced, drilled into the ground 12 to 18 inches (Kraft 1974:35). A gun with a bifacially worked gunflint, necklaces of hair pipes, a filled jewel box, and wampum and imitation wampum beads were also found (Becker 1980:25).

Some of the archaeological remains from Lenape settlements in New Jersey are quite substantial. Increased amounts of trade goods are also visible, including the continued preference for guns and brass. Beads of various types are also considerably more prevalent. It is possible that there was an increase in their use due to increased availability and decreased cost (in manufacturing them as well as in trade) with the advent of European contact.
Pennsylvania

The data from Pennsylvania indicate there is a large amount of historic documentation concerning Lenape sites, but hardly any archaeological sites have been found. Table 1 further demonstrates this. The Lenape towns in Pennsylvania are some of the best historically documented towns, unfortunately most have not been confirmed archaeologically, though this may be due to many of the Lenape living in scattered hamlets surrounded by cornfields (Kent et al. 1981). It could also be in part due to the fact that for many of the reasons the Lenape found a particular area desirable, European builders also found them attractive. Many of these towns have become modern towns and cities (Kent et al. 1981:3). In towns such as Shamokin, the Lenape lived there with the Iroquois, and this mixed tribal affinity may have resulted in some archaeological sites not being designated as Lenape (Merrell 1998). Ethnohistorical data to complement the majority of this information is sparse, and that which is available will be discussed further in the following section.

The Lancaster County Park Site (36LA96) was a multicomponent cemetery site, and while the early components were probably not associated with the Lenape, its historic component would have been the result of a mixed group of refugee Natives including Conestoga, Conoy, Lenape, and Shawnee. This site was in existence at the same time as Conestoga Town (1700-1743) and Conoy Town (1718-1743), and may be one of multiple “Indian Towns” referred to in historic documents (Kinsey and Custer 1982:55). Neither Conestoga Town nor Conoy Town is associated with the Lenape. Ten burials containing thirteen individuals were uncovered, interred with an assortment of seventeenth and eighteenth century European and Native artifacts. These artifacts include quartz flakes,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Site #</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Site #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aquetong</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Bucks</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mohulbuteetam</td>
<td>1751-1770</td>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td>36Ar12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assarughney</td>
<td>1756</td>
<td>Lackawanna</td>
<td></td>
<td>Montgomery Site</td>
<td>1730s</td>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>36Ch60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assunepachta</td>
<td>1731-1740</td>
<td>Huntingdon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Murdering Town</td>
<td>1753</td>
<td>Butler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bald Eagle's Nest</td>
<td>1779-?</td>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>36Ce72</td>
<td>Nescopeck</td>
<td>1755-1756</td>
<td>Luzerne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Island</td>
<td>?-1763</td>
<td>Lycoming</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nippenose Old Town</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Lycoming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Leg's Town</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td></td>
<td>Northbrook Site</td>
<td>1720s</td>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>36Ch61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candowsa</td>
<td>1755</td>
<td>Luzerne</td>
<td></td>
<td>Okehocking</td>
<td>1701-?</td>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>36Ch120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catfish Camp</td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ontelaunee</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Berks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinklacamoose</td>
<td>1751-1760</td>
<td>Clearfield</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paunacussing</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Bucks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clisowackin</td>
<td>1742</td>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paxton</td>
<td>1707-1718</td>
<td>Dauphin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conemaugh Old Town</td>
<td>1731-?</td>
<td>Cambria</td>
<td></td>
<td>Playwicky</td>
<td>?-1683</td>
<td>Bucks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cussewago</td>
<td>1750s</td>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pochapuchkug</td>
<td>1737-1742+</td>
<td>Carbon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custaloga's Town</td>
<td>1750s-1762</td>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td></td>
<td>Punxsutawney</td>
<td>1755-1757</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equinunk</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pymatuning</td>
<td>1764-1780</td>
<td>Mercer</td>
<td>36Me11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goshgoshing</td>
<td>1769</td>
<td>Forest</td>
<td></td>
<td>Queonemmysing</td>
<td>1690s</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>36De6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goshgoshing</td>
<td>1765-1769</td>
<td>Forest</td>
<td></td>
<td>Redstone</td>
<td>1744-1746</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goshogoshing</td>
<td>1767-1770</td>
<td>Forest</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sakhauwotung</td>
<td>1740s</td>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Island</td>
<td>1741-1770</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>36Cn7</td>
<td>Shackamaxon</td>
<td>1680s</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickory Town</td>
<td>1769-1770</td>
<td>Forest</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shamokin</td>
<td>1718-1756</td>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockendauqua</td>
<td>1730s</td>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shannopin's Town</td>
<td>1751-1760</td>
<td>Allegheny</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Town</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Chester</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shenango</td>
<td>1756-1770</td>
<td>Mercer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob's Cabins</td>
<td>?-1756</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sheshquevin</td>
<td>1769-1772</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiskiminetas</td>
<td>1731-1740</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shingas Old Town</td>
<td>1748-1756</td>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kittanning</td>
<td>1730-1756</td>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tioga</td>
<td>1751-1760</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuskuski</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tiquamingy Town</td>
<td>1759</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuskuski-New</td>
<td>1755-1778</td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td></td>
<td>Towanda</td>
<td>1763-1779</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuskuski</td>
<td>1763-1776</td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>36Lr11</td>
<td>Tulpehocken</td>
<td>1705-?</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lackawaxen</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Pike</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tunkhannock</td>
<td>1749-1758</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lechawetkink</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td></td>
<td>Venango</td>
<td>1749-1759</td>
<td>Venango</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manatawny</td>
<td>1707-1730</td>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wapwalloon</td>
<td>1744-1755</td>
<td>Luzerne</td>
<td>36Lu43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maunquay</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wenchquetank</td>
<td>1760-1763</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxatawny</td>
<td>1746</td>
<td>Berks</td>
<td>36Bk450</td>
<td>Wilawane</td>
<td>?-1767</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meniologameka</td>
<td>1747-1754</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wyalusing</td>
<td>1752-1772</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minisink</td>
<td>1694</td>
<td>N.J.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>1742-1756</td>
<td>Luzerne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minguahanan</td>
<td>?-1700</td>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>36Ch3</td>
<td>Wysox</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1: Pennsylvania Lenape Villages**  
(Data from Kent et al. 1981)
vermillion, glass beads, clay pipe fragments, metal tongs, flint possibly originating in England, cut iron nails, shell beads, striped glass beads, a silver cross pendant, pewter rings, and brass bracelets (Kinsey and Custer 1982). Despite the presence of cut nails in a few of the burials, there was no other indication or evidence for the use of coffins, however the extended burials could suggest a European influence (Pietak 1998). The continued use of guns, beads, and brass is further complemented with access to vermillion, silver, and pewter in this later period site which will continue to be popular among the Lenape.

The Montgomery Site (36CH60) is located in Chester County, Pennsylvania. Cotter et al. (1992:25) speculates that this site may have been the last summer station of the Brandywine band of Lenape prior to their move west. This is a cemetery site dating to circa 1730 with evidence of at least twenty-two burials. Interestingly, the graves were found regularly spaced and the adolescents in the cemetery were all interred in coffins of clearly colonial manufacture, possibly reflecting cultural changes of the time period (Becker 1982:16). The number of infants in the cemetery suggests a high mortality rate (Becker 1989:114). The cemetery also exhibits a randomness of interments in that neither age nor gender was considered when placing the graves. Becker (1989) also believes that the variability in grave goods reflects upon the variability of typical foragers. The Lenape have previously demonstrated variability in grave goods, which may be reflective of continuity in food procurement practices.

Grave goods of beads, brooches, bangles, and other decorative objects make up the largest percentage of overall artifacts at this site. Pipes, buckles, sewing implements, knives, and brass thimbles also make up the assemblage. Generally, the artifacts seem to
represent a utilitarian outlook, as many of the items would have been worn or used daily. A silver brooch found at the site bears the maker’s mark of Cesar Ghiselin, the first known American goldsmith, which makes this piece one of the earliest known pieces of trade silver documented (Cotter et al. 1992:27).

Brass thimbles were found in the grave of a 6 year old. Twenty-two of them had been pierced with a cord and were draped around the neck. The last two were found on either side of the head as though they had been used as ear pendants (Cotter et al. 1992). This presents one example of the different ways in which Europeans and Natives perceived the function of trade goods. A solid link between historic lithographs of various Lenape and archaeology was also demonstrated at the Montgomery Site, where white beads (not wampum type) were recovered from several burials that matched those portrayed in the lithographs (Becker 1982:16).

In Luzerne County, Pennsylvania, the Knouse Site (36Lu43), otherwise known as the village of Wapwallopen, is another cemetery site with the remains of 28 individuals and over 11,000 associated grave goods (Pietak 1998:150). Beads, spirals, brooches, rings, bracelets, jinglers, medallions, pendants, and thimbles make up a large proportion of the assemblage. Other goods include a brass bell, mirror fragments, a projectile point, and pipes. This site dates to 1744-1755 (Robbins 2000). Increased access to trade goods is reflected in this site, as is the preferential use of goods associated with adornment.

The Chambers Site (36Lr11) dates to between 1763 and 1776. Seventy burials have been excavated so far; however the site is composed of both a historic cemetery and a Middle Woodland burial mound, so not all the burials can be considered Lenape (Pietak 1998:150). Again, a variety of beads make up the majority of the assortment. Brooches,
rings, earrings, mirror fragments, pendants, brass bells, a brass kettle, and buckles are also present, as are iron tools and ceramics (Robbins 2000).

The Pennsylvania sites demonstrate increased access to and use of trade goods, especially those that served augmentative purposes. Through this, as well as the changes in mortuary behavior, increased interaction and influence from Europeans is evident. However, as most of these sites are burials or cemeteries, these goods may not be indicative of the everyday life of the Lenape, though they do demonstrate some of the available items.

Other trends at many of these post-contact sites have shown that while there may be sparse surface remains, there may be extensive subsurface remains (Becker 1980:22). Sites such as Conestoga Town and the Leiphart Site had little to no surface remains and yet a considerable number of features were uncovered such as evidence for a stockade, house patterns, and other features. However, for those sites with surface artifacts, information recovered may be indicative of some cultural differences, even between historic sites with predominantly the same kinds of artifacts. Different tribes, depending on their needs, adopted differing types and frequencies of artifacts from the Europeans, and this should be visible in their material record (Jones 1985:113).

Ontario

The history of the Lenape is heavily influenced by their band organization. Oftentimes, bands would go in completely separate directions. One of these bands
travelled to and settled in Ontario, in the towns of Fairfield and Muncey Town (Ferris 2009).

The band of Lenape that resided in the town of Fairfield in Ontario in the beginning of the 1800s lived in a missionary town, and excavations have revealed that they lived in log cabins, both with and without cellars, along with the presence of late 18th- and early 19th-century material remains and extensive Middle Woodland material (Ferris 2009:86). All of the houses had cornerstones, and many also had storage pits along the walls or in corners. These pits were clay-lined and fired by heat (Ferris 2009:87). By this point, many of the Lenape families had relocated and rebuilt multiple times and would have been proficient at constructing houses, with a preferred form that would have been easy to replicate. However, despite the influence of the missionaries, the Lenape houses had a distinct style. Clay-lined floors, moss chinking, side storage features, and deep central hearths without chimneys (probably with a smoke hole in the roof) would all have been reminiscent of Lenape traditional housing (Ferris 2009:88).

The inhabitants of the Muncey town just north of the mission town lived in log cabins and wigwams. They were seasonably mobile, though less so than the Ojibwa who also lived in the area. They farmed intensively and generally had a surplus of corn that would be sold to the Fairfield community (Ferris 2009:105).

Evidence from these two sites shows no indication that the missionaries managed to undermine the Lenape sense of identity or continuity with their past. It suggests instead that changes were a gradual and fluid pattern of response consistent with patterns of the previous centuries (Ferris 2009:106). The Lenape of this community were not pliant to the Moravian missionaries, nor were they reluctant to object, ignore or flaunt the
missionaries’ beliefs. The eighteenth and nineteenth century Lenape knew who they were and easily reconciled their identities with living in the Christian settlement, which shows direct agency (Ferris 2009:112). This community’s sole purpose was to acculturate the Lenape, but despite the intentions of the missionaries, there is no indication from the data that the Lenape lost their sense of identity or were anything other than Indigenous and Lenape (Ferris 2009:113).

Ohio

Thus far, all of these sites have been confirmed as Lenape sites. Moving into Ohio, the various tribes were beginning to blend, with several tribes settling in one area, such as “the Glaize” at the confluence of the Auglaize and Maumee Rivers. As forts began to appear, several different nations would set up camp nearby, for trading purposes and for security. The following sites are those near forts, but whether the artifacts mentioned are specifically associated with the Lenape is unclear. They are mentioned (1) because Lenape were known to be in the area, and (2) because of the similarity of some of the artifacts recovered to those previously mentioned. One other site is mentioned because it is a suspected Lenape site, but this has not been confirmed.

The site at Fort Recovery has yielded an interesting assortment of finds. Artifacts associated with the natives include perforated brass arrowheads, chipped stone points, small spike tomahawks, spontoon tomahawks, and trade axes. Thimbles, brass cut fragments, dark greenish-black spirit glass (used to hold wine and other liquor), clay pipe fragments, and shell buttons also show up. The spirit glass is of the type commonly traded to the Natives (DeRegnaucourt 1996). The brass arrowheads and cut fragments
are also reminiscent of Lenape usage of such material, as many of the same artifact were found at the sites in New Jersey and Staten Island.

At Fort St. Mary’s, brass buttons, pewter buttons, deer teeth, a cow tooth, horse tooth, beaver incisors, rodent incisors, and jaw fragments have all been uncovered. A few beads have been recovered, as well as a small brass pin with a bead on it, a large cut silver brooch, and a small silver ring brooch. This brooch is of the type commonly used to adorn hair or shirts. DeRegnaucourt and Hoelscher (1996) state that forty of this same type of brooch could be purchased for one dollar at the Fort Wayne Office of Indian Affairs. Brass, pewter, silver, and beads are all popular Lenape artifacts, though their presence at this fort may actually suggest that these particular artifacts were popular with many different Native tribes and not just the Lenape.

The first Prophetstown, near Greenville, Ohio, dates from 1805 to 1808. This was originally a Shawnee village, founded by the prophet Tenskwatawa and his brother Tecumseh. This site should not be confused with the Prophetstown that was also founded by Tenskwatawa near present day Lafayette, Indiana, as they are in fact two separate villages. Not long after the founding of the first Prophetstown, Natives from several different nations had taken up residence in the village, including the Lenape. Items attributed to the village include musket balls, cut and rolled pewter, a pewter bracelet, and a silver brooch (Green et al. 1994). In the case of this village, conventional surface survey failed to locate any artifacts associated with the historic-era Native American village. Remote sensing and metal detectors were employed in order to find the metal artifacts, and from there additional methods could be used (Green et al. 1994:3-9).
The silver brooch in particular is interesting since it seems to represent another recurring trend in Lenape archaeology. While it may have been popular among all the Natives, M. R. Harrington (1908) explains that the Lenape had a particular style of brooch that was hemispherical in form, plain, and had a small central opening.

The Morrison Village Site is a multicomponent village and cemetery. It has early Woodland and Fort Ancient components, as well as a historical component. Radiocarbon dating places the historic component of the site at approximately 1744 and historic documents suggest this site was probably a Lenape village at this time. No historic artifacts were recovered to corroborate this statement however (Prufer and Andors 1967).

Indiana

No Lenape sites have been found in Indiana so far, however many attempts have been made. A brief summary of these attempts, along with the author’s current attempts at locating the Lenape village of Wapicomekoke will be given here. The most recent attempt at locating several of the Lenape villages was made by Beth McCord in 2002. McCord (2002) also provides an excellent summary on the current state of each site, including known previous investigations. The approximate locations of the Lenape villages along the White River are indicated in Figure 5.

White River Villages

Wapicomekoke was the easternmost Lenape village in Indiana, also known as Buckongahela’s Town due to the fact that the renowned warrior and war chief of the
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Lenape Buckongahelas resided there (Gipson 1938:611). Buckongahelas was a member of the Munsee division of the Lenape, as well as a leading elder in the Lenape council, which was consistently held near his home in the village (Gipson 1938:32-33,220). Wapicomekoke was the principal village of the Lenape living along the White River. In addition to the councils, it was also the site of many feasts and dances (Gipson 1938:455). Wapicomekoke has also been referred to as Old Town, Old Town Hill, Woapicamikunk, Outainink, or Utenink (Dunn 1909:285-286; Greene 1954:2).

The missionary diaries describe the setting of the town as fruitful and beautiful, with natural meadows and no high hills, only gentle slopes. The Native Americans there had horses, cattle, hogs, and fowl kept in fenced-in enclosures (Gipson 1938:60). Even their cornfields were enclosed with fences (Gipson 1938:338). It was a large village compared to the other Lenape villages in the area. Not only was it the home of some forty Indian families, it contained at least a longhouse forty feet by twenty feet in size (Gipson 1938:611). It was also home to the traders Frederick Fisher and John Connor, who resided there with his Indian wife (Gipson 1938:98-99,273). The traders had a trading post set up close to the village, about forty rods beyond Juber Creek (Thompson 1937:43,198).

It was Samuel Cecil’s (1905:179) narrative describing the finding of an intact torture post and trading post that inspired the first real archaeological work at the first village of Wapicomekoke. The excavation was conducted by Frank Setzler in 1930, though the site report records only items from collections of those residing in the area and no recovered artifacts (Setzler 1930). Collections examined included those of a Mr. A. Reese and Mrs. Gertrude Stevens (Setzler 1930). He also presents those artifacts listed in...
the original narrative on the village by Cecil. B. K. Swartz, Jr., investigated the area in 1965 and 1966, and while he labeled the site as “Burials and Camp,” nothing is listed as having resulted from that survey (Swartz 1965, 1966). Michael Rodeffer (1967) and William Wepler (1980) also reported on the site, but again they summarized the location and identified the artifacts originally reported by Setzler. Reconnaissance and shovel testing was actually performed by Randy Gaw in 1990 and 1994, but there were no diagnostic artifacts uncovered that could be related back to the historic Lenape. Gaw (1991) initially recommended further reconnaissance, but by 1994 after having surveyed multiple areas, the village of Wapicomekoke still had not been located.

The location of the village varies depending on the primary source. The Moravian missionary diaries place Wapicomekoke 20 miles from the missionary town near Anderson, Indiana (Gipson 1938:255). Thompson (1937:196-198) places the village on a hill one hundred feet above the White River, with a deep gully on the southwest side and sloping south eighty rods to Juber Creek. A map of Indian villages in 1800 (Hearne Brothers n.d.) shows the location of Wapicomekoke much further south than previous surveys have investigated, at the bend in the White River where it turns back east. This location is also directly where the archaeological site of 12Dl483 is located; however the site did not produce evidence indicating that it was a Lenape village.

Motivated by the lack of findings thus far, the author attempted to gain permission to do surface reconnaissance and remote sensing in three different areas previously unsurveyed. Spurred by the success of using metal detectors at sites such as Prophetstown where no surface artifacts were found, a remote sensing sweep using a magnetometer seemed promising in revealing hidden deposits. However, permission was
denied from the landowners for two of the areas and no response was received back from the third landowner.

Munsee Town or Tedpachsit’s Town was home to the Chief Tedpachsit and approximately eight families. It was located where the current city of Muncie is located (Thompson 1937:199). The similarity in name to the Munsee clan suggests some sort of tie between the two, however this cannot be verified. Luckenbach says that the village is “four miles downstream” from Wapicomekoke (1938:611). It is sometimes referred to as Woapicamikunk as well, this being derived from the belief that the inhabitants of Wapicomekoke moved to Munsee Town at some point, probably directly after Buckongahela’s death. This has also led to Wapicomekoke being referred to as “Old Town.” However, this is all conjecture as there is no evidence stating that the people living in Wapicomekoke moved from their village to that of Tedpachsit’s Town (Greene 1954:4).

Tedpachsit’s Town was surveyed by both Joseph Gardener in 1970 and Mitch Zoll in 2000 and 2001. Its approximate location, at the site of Minnetrista Cultural Center, revealed no historic information, and it is highly probable the site was destroyed as a result of urban development (McCord 2002:23). A historic account from John Ellis’s (1973:116) county histories for Center Township states that Goldsmith C. Gilbert, a trader and entrepreneur, took control of the south half of section 18 and subsequently the Hackley Reserve and this same portion of land some time after the Treaty of St. Mary’s with the Native Americans. The Hackley Reserve, granted to Rebecca Hackley with the Treaty of St. Mary’s, granted her “one section of land, to be located at the Munsey town, on White River, so that it shall extend on both sides to include 320 acres of the prairie,
where the bend assumes the form of a horseshoe” (Kingman 1874). This section of land is located directly at the present city of Muncie, and was most likely destroyed through urban development.

An unnamed site is mentioned in the *Indiana Journal* from 1836 in an advertisement for the new city of Yorktown, which is located on the ground where the old Indian village stood, below the mouth of Buck Creek. Since this village is not referenced in the mission diaries as being a Lenape village, it may have belonged to one of the other nations that resided along the White River, such as the Shawnee (Thompson 1937:199).

Hockingpomsga’s Town would have been located about nine miles west of Munsee Town, named such as it was the home to that sachem (Thompson 1937:199-200). The missionaries list it as being eight miles upstream from the mission (Gipson 1938:611). Hockingpomsga’s Town was initially investigated by Setzler (1930) and then resurveyed in 1960 by Hornbaker and Rodeffer. Gaw also resurveyed again in 1994. No historic material was found (McCord 2002).

Killbuck’s village, also known as Buck’s Town, shows up on the 1821 government survey. It may have been the village of William Henry Killbuck, whose Lenape name was Gelelemend (Thompson 1937:200). Buck’s Town was initially surveyed by Setzler (1930) and resurveyed by Hobsen and Burkett. It was resurveyed again in 1984 by Stephenson. Nothing was found to suggest that there had been a Lenape village in the area. However, two sites nearby, 12M201 and 12M530, produced an assortment of pearlware, stoneware, whiteware, and glass, including one amethyst glass container fragment with a retouched edge. While the evidence does suggest a historic
occupation most likely around the early 1900s, it does not provide definite evidence for a
Lenape village that most likely would have not been occupying the area at that time
(McCord 2002:42).

The Moravian mission town was the location where the mission was set up in
1801 and was located only a few miles from the next town, Wapeminiskink (alternately
spelled Woapiminschijeck) or Anderson’s Town. The mission town was located on the
north bank of the White River by a stream where the present city of Anderson is. The
Lenape name for the site translates to something along the lines of “where the chestnut
trees grow” (Gipson 1938:56). Surveys were conducted to locate the Mission Town in
2002, however they were done on the wrong side of the river from where the missionaries
describe the site’s location in the White River Mission diaries (McCord 2002:49).

Wapeminiskink, or Anderson’s Town, was home to fifteen to sixteen families,
including Chief Anderson, otherwise known as Kiktuchwenind (Thompson 1937:196,
201). It would have been approximately three miles downstream from the mission
(Gipson 1938:611). Anderson’s Town has not been surveyed, however due to its location
in the vicinity of the modern town of Anderson, it has most likely been destroyed by
urban development.

Four miles northwest of Anderson Town was the site of Nancy Town. It was
recorded on the 1821 government surveys as a Nanticoke town, a tribe who had become
incorporated into the Lenape tribe when they joined them in Indiana in the 1780s
(Thompson 1937:201). The Nanticoke may have assimilated with the Lenape, even
leaving with them in 1820 (Allison 1986:282).
Another Lenape village was believed to be situated at the location of Strawtown, in Hamilton County. However, continuing excavations at this site have revealed mostly prehistoric materials and nothing diagnostic of the Lenape (McCord et al. 2005; Thompson 1937:202; White et al. 2002). Several historic sites have been located in the vicinity of Strawtown, but none so far that suggest a Lenape village (McCord 2002).

Sarah Town was about a mile south and west of Strawtown on the left bank of the White River. It is referred to as one of the largest of the Lenape towns on the White River, but the only evidence of it are in the mission diaries of Luckenbach and Zeisberger. It was said to be the last of the Lenape villages to the west of Anderson’s Town (Thompson 1937:203).

Upper Delaware Town originated after the war of 1812 and was used to designate the spot of William Connor’s trading post. There has been evidence of Native American occupation at this site, though it is not certain when the town was first settled (Thompson 1937:203). Some sources have referred to a Lower Delaware Town as well, saying that it was located twelve miles north of Indianapolis. However, it is also believed to have been the home of only one Lenape and his family. A French doctor supposedly lived just across the way from this family, comprising the “town” (Thompson 1937:204).

Little Munsee Town, possibly Thompson’s (1937) Lower Delaware Town, was surveyed in 1984 and 1991 but only revealed a few historic artifacts. Again, nothing diagnostic of the Lenape was observed, and definitely nothing diagnostic of a Native American village.

An interesting assortment of artifacts has been recovered overall. This is a far from a complete list of the Lenape sites that have been excavated. In many cases, the
data have not been published or are not available to the public. This is the case for several other sites in Pennsylvania and for a few potential sites in Ohio. However, even with the data available, definite trends in Lenape archaeology have been observed. The early adoption of trade goods and their increased frequencies in later Lenape sites indicate preferences towards augmentative or utilitarian goods. The use of vermillion and its presence at a few Lenape sites may indicate continuity of ritual practices. Faunal remains from Ft. Recovery are also consistent with the types of animals that the Lenape would have procured.

While many of these trends seem to be indicative of the Lenape in particular, these trends may also be indicative of many other Native tribes that would have been living in the region. To more accurately assess what a Lenape site would look like, further details are needed and may be provided by looking more closely at ethnohistoric sources for information concerning Lenape settlement patterns and daily life.
Chapter 5: Settlement Patterns and Material Life

While the intention of the previous two chapters was to lay a foundation of Lenape history and archaeology to build upon, the intent here is to provide the framework to build the prediction of the Lenape’s archaeological impact on Indiana during the late 1700s and early 1800s. The goal is to use the ethnohistoric information as a model for what items would be found in the archaeological record, with the history previously provided as a backdrop.

Ethnohistoric sources provide valuable information on Lenape settlement patterns and daily life. Regional, village, and household patterns will be examined along with foodways, clothing and adornment, health, and the alcohol trade and use. During this early historic period, Europeans interacted with the Lenape and produced much of the written documentation available today. Every effort has been made to include indigenous perspectives and oral histories from this time period, however few exist (Brown and Kohn 2008; Hearth 2008; Perry and Skolnick 1999; Tantaquidgeon 1977), and these do not discuss in any depth information regarding the early 1800s.

To counteract European bias that is present in the sources being used here, such as the White River Mission diaries and John Heckewelder’s (1971) account, multiple sources will be used to cross reference the information obtained as well as to ensure
multiple points of view. It is also imperative to critically read each work, and not to take the words of the European missionaries at face value, as they may have unknowingly (or knowingly) misrepresented the events they were depicting.

**Regional Patterns**

Regional Lenape settlement patterns are important because they can help the researcher to locate the geographical position of known historic sites. As no Lenape village has been located in Indiana thus far, the regional settlement patterns will be discussed in order to get a better understanding on not only where the Lenape may have constructed their villages, but also the reasoning behind these decisions. This reasoning can help locate future Lenape sites.

Through their work on Lenape sites in New Jersey, Skinner and Schrabisch (1913:10) came to believe that camp and village locations were usually situated near fresh water on sandy, well-drained bluffs on the north side of streams or shallow lakes. Preference may have been for the western side of the mouth of a river or clustered around the watersheds of major rivers (Spier 1913:677). These sandy bluffs were an especially popular location for cemeteries (1913:14). These characteristics for sites in New Jersey, that they were close to water but usually high and dry and free from inundation, are patterns echoed in the Lenape oral histories as well as the environment that set the stage for how the Lenape picked further habitation sites (Brown and Kohn 2008; Falleaf 1969b; Skinner and Schrabisch 1913:35). A map of historic Native American villages of Pennsylvania (Kent et al. 1981) demonstrates these regional settlement preferences as
well, as almost all of the villages are shown to be situated along rivers. In Ohio, the preference to converge at the confluence of rivers, such as at “the Glaize” at the mouth of the Maumee and Auglaize rivers or along the Muskingum also echoes these preferences.

When the Lenape arrived in Indiana, they continued to pick sites based on these past preferences. The Moravian missionaries Luckenbach and Kluge indicate in their diaries from the White River Indian Mission that when they moved to the west fork of the White River in Indiana intent on building a mission, they followed their Lenape guides’ recommendation, as it would be “suitable for an Indian town” (Gipson 1938:102).

The place where we live at present is on a high hill. In the front of the riverbank, the level space on the top is not extensive because on both sides there are little hills; at the rear, however, there is a wide plain thickly covered with oaks. On the other side of the river, right opposite to us, there is a plain, with high grass, which is our planting land at present. At the side of our place, at the foot of the hill, there is also a plain, overgrown with grass, like meadow, which runs along the river for a mile. [Gipson 1938:103]

This description seems to resemble the interpretation made by Skinner and Schrabisch, while indicating that settlement patterns probably did not change dramatically through time.

Lenape oral histories also describe these early settlement patterns. Curtis Zunigha, a contemporary Lenape, describes Lenape priorities when picking a location for settlement:

the Delaware leaders were looking for, first of all, water, a place to set up a village near water; second, cover, mainly physical protection; and third, I think that they were always looking for a place to grow crops. With those things in mind, the rest of it was really more instinctive. [Kohn and Brown 2008:374]
While those factors may have been the primary reasons for deciding where to live, he goes on to remind us that the Lenape did not forget their past or where they came from, and that this would have influenced their decision just as much as any other factor.

I think they were also looking at “what landscape is here that can help remind me just a little bit of home?” Having lived in the forest with a vast ocean at their disposal back east, and then that pattern coming through Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Indiana with rivers and forests, if no ocean, I think that they were always reaching out for something that would remind them of back home. Plus, to have the resources that they were used to, to do such things as constructing their long house, having enough room to pattern their village structure so it could be like it used to be back home. So, even though the landscape changed I think that they actively sought out something that would, in their own mind, keep them grounded to the memories of the past. [Kohn and Brown 2008:374-375]

In the case of Indiana, it was a river at their back. Annette Ketchum, another contemporary Lenape, similarly describes the setting as a “site right on the river, and the White River was where we were settled up there at Munceytown. We were settled in the forest in a very natural setting. There’s not any paved roads or trails or cart paths that go to the Lenape Village” (Brown and Kohn 2008:394). The Lenape village, located such that it brought back memories of the past before the migrations away from their homeland, had a pattern that was equally important to the Lenape.

**Lenape Villages in Indiana**

The Lenape village was the focus for Lenape politics, ceremonies, agriculture, and trade (Wepler 1992:77). They were divided up into the main village as well as specialized camps. The main Lenape village needed an abundant wood supply, and it
was the missionaries Lenape guide that at one point advised them to relocate, as “there was not as much wood here as they would need for building purposes” (Gipson 1938:103). Since the villages were composed of individual dwellings dispersed throughout a neighborhood, there needed to be plenty of wood nearby for everyone (Wepler 1992:78). The sugar camps, though they were specialized camps, were permanent locations as well, located in correlation to the sugar maple trees. These permanent dwellings would be built on the site and repaired annually (Wepler 1992:78) as described in the January 12, 1803 Moravian journal entry, “Two of our families of Indian Christians went across the river to their sugar plantation to build huts for boiling sugar” (Gipson 1938:209).

Surrounding the villages would have been the communal cornfields, with a patch for each family (Shoemaker 2004:18). Large tracts of land were not necessary though; 500 acres would have been sufficient for one village (Becker 1976:34). A single Lenape family in Ohio in the early 1800s cultivated about seven acres of corn while keeping a few cattle and horses on high ground (Brickell 1842:47). However, the Moravian missionaries observed among the Lenape on the White River that “their farming is for the most part limited to two or three acres of corn for each family” (Gipson 1938:598-599). The Lenape families were linked to their crops by proximity (Schutt 2007:14). These cornfields may have also been fenced in, as is alluded to in the Moravian diaries when, “two Indian brethren Joshua and Jacob went, on the 11th, to Chief Packantschihillas [Buckongahelas] in order to talk with him and to tell him that they were old and decrepit and consequently desired some rails for a fence around their cornfields” (Gipson 1938:332-333).
At the village’s center was a bigger, rectangular longhouse covered in matting.

The long houses were so important that,

in every Indian town there was a so-called long-house, about forty feet in length and twenty feet wide, in which the savages held their sacrifices and dances. It also served as a Council House. These houses were built of split logs set together between dug-in posts, and were provided with a roof, consisting of tree-bark or clapboards, resting on strong pillars dug into the earth. The entrance was at both gable-ends and there was neither floor nor ceiling. Near both ends and in the middle, there were three fires over which hung large kettles in which corn and meat were boiled for the guests and always kept in readiness for them to eat, when finished with the dance. In the roof there were openings over every fire, so that the smoke could escape. Along the inside of the house there were seats or elevations from the ground about a foot high and five feet wide. These were first covered with the bark of trees and then with long grass. [Gipson 1938:612-613]

Upon the center pillars of the long house were “two large carvings of the human face one facing east and one west, which adorn the great central post supporting the ridge-pole.

Similar carvings, but smaller, may be seen upon each of the six posts which support the logs forming the sides, and still smaller ones upon each of the four doorposts” (Harrington 1913:219).

There were anywhere from 16 to 40 families in a village (Gipson 1938). It is possible to predict the total number of individuals in the village by estimating 6 square meters of floor per person. A fourteen-foot-square house (as described by the Moravian journals) would equal 4.27 meters per side to make 18.2 square meters of living space (Peregrine 2001:5). The dwellings in the White River village would hold approximately three people, estimating a typical White River village to have a population anywhere from 48-120 individuals.
Archaeological excavations of Late Woodland period Lenape sites show similar trends in the village setup with the Lenape having resided on farmsteads located near fertile bottom land along the shores of rivers, lakes, and bays. The geography of the area may have been a factor in the proximity of individual dwellings to one another, being tightly packed or more widely dispersed, though the longhouse remained at the center (Kraft 2001). Initially, individual settlements were small, dispersed, and unfortified but the presence of European settlers and the influence of the wars resulting from the fur trade resulted in the settlements becoming more compact and often surrounded by a stockade (Kraft 2001:222-223). While the use of stockades may not have been retained for very long, the more compact villages may have been (Adams 1997). It is possible that the amount of dispersal in a Lenape village was directly correlated how threatened they felt by their neighbors or the settlers. If that is the case, villages during times of war would be more compact while during peaceful times they would be more dispersed. However, they may not have lived too close to one another as they would have needed space for their crops.

While the layout of the Lenape village can answer some archaeological questions, such as the previous hypothesis that villages became more compact during times of war, it is also necessary to take a look at the construction of the individual households as well, such as the building materials and architecture, as these can lend clues to the degree of influence the Europeans were having on the Lenape culture.
The Architecture of Lenape Households

Information on the evolution of the Lenape household in architecture as well as in building materials comes from both ethnohistoric sources and archaeological ones. In the interest of thematic continuity, a brief summary of some archaeological evidence pertaining to the physical construction of the Lenape household during the years prior to the Lenape’s arrival in Indiana, 1750-1790, will be presented prior to the ethnohistoric evidence. The ethnohistoric evidence here comes from several people who had close connections with the Lenape. William Penn worked closely with the Lenape in Pennsylvania, buying the land for Philadelphia from them as well as advocating for their rights (Myers 1970). John Brickell was a captive of the Lenape in Ohio for several years, from 1791 to 1795 when the Treaty of Greenville demanded all white captives be released (Brickell 1842). The Moravian missionaries also worked closely with some of the Lenape along the White River, though their relations with them may not have been as congenial as those of the previously mentioned individuals.

By describing what the typical architecture of the Lenape dwelling would have been, as well as the types of material being used, the archaeological impact of Lenape dwellings can be determined. If a more traditional style is seen to have been preferred, the archaeological impact would probably not be significant. However, if they had fully adopted a more European architecture, it is likely that these dwellings would leave a substantial impact on the soil.

Individual dwellings from the Lenape archaeological site of Pahaquarra, dating to 1750, all had one or more deep storage pits inside the house near one or both ends. Some of these pits are simple depressions while others are often quite large, measuring five to
six feet in diameter and up to 48 inches deep (Kraft 1974:35). It is hard to say for certain whether this feature of the Lenape household would have been retained through the following fifty years with the increased adoption of domesticated livestock, however it may have been to some extent. It has been proposed that the adoption of domesticated livestock led to a decline in the usage of storage pits. Pigs, especially, like to root under the ground and can disturb crops and dig up storage pits if they are not properly confined. This may even extend to storage pits inside of structures (Richter 2001:58-59). This decline in the use of these storage pits may also be due to only the fear that the pigs would get into and destroy the stockpile. Archaeological information recovered from the Lower Ohio River Valley suggests that during the Lenape’s stay in that region, they were erecting rectangular wigwams covered with mats or bark (Muller 1986:264).

The earliest written description of a Lenape dwelling was by William Penn, “their Houses are Mats, or Bark of Trees set on Poles, in the fashion of an English Barn, but out of the power of the Winds, for they are hardly higher than a Man; they lie on Reeds or Grass” (Myers 1970:27). In Ohio, the “cabin was of round logs, like those of the first settlers, except the roof was of bark and it had no floor. It consisted of a single room with a French made chimney of cat-and-clay. The door was made of hewed puncheonous [sic]” (Brickell 1842:47). The dwellings also had a “high-pitched, peaked roof” (Newcomb 1956:24).

In Indiana, “their houses usually consist of small log-huts, about 14-15 feet square, with a chimney from the rafters up, and below an open fireplace, so that their beds may be brought on both sides of it and all in the house may have free access to it” (Gipson 1938:599). This is slightly different from one description in Lenape oral history.
Leonard Thompson, a contemporary Lenape, says that “they had reed houses made out of reed. And the women would take care of the house, and the house belonged to the woman, and not the man” (Brown and Kohn 2008:328). However, another oral history tells of the “traditional” home, a one-room cabin that many still lived in up through the early 1900s (Perry and Skolnick 1999:29). Early ethnographer M. R. Harrington collected oral histories in the early 1900s from Lenape in Canada; these describe the houses as being “rectangular in ground plan, and . . . constructed with a gable like a modern wall-tent, but with a hole in the top to let out the smoke. The framework was of stout poles tied together with bark withes and covered with sheets of elm-bark” (Harrington 1913:217).

By the end of the eighteenth century, many of the Lenape homes were more directly modeled after European styles, as has been described from the ethnohistoric sources (Cotter et al. 1992:21). However, the numerous migrations may have prevented the full use of European style dwellings (Newcomb 1956:92). Unfortunately for the archaeologist, there is nothing to indicate that Lenape huts were different from any other Algonquin tribe in the region. While this may not seem important, being able to determine the cultural affinity of an archaeological site or find is very important for Lenape cultural heritage.

Locating and recognizing Lenape villages is only a small piece of the puzzle in determining the Lenape’s archaeological impact during their time in Indiana. Common, everyday activities can also have a significant impact on the archaeological record. Having described regional, village, and household plans for the Lenape, it is time to take
a closer look at the material aspects of Lenape everyday life in Indiana in the late 1790s and early 1800s.

**Ethnohistoric Evidence of Daily Life**

The activities that took place during the day-to-day activities of Lenape villagers leave behind many clues in the material record. Both ethnohistorical sources and Lenape oral histories were referred to in order interpret what daily life may have been like when the Lenape resided in Indiana. In a few instances, the available information was supplemented with that from more recent studies. These data will provide information as to the types of materials and goods that would have been used on a daily basis. These are the objects that one would expect to find in the material record at a Lenape archaeological site.

*Foodways*

While the food that the Lenape would have eaten would not have changed drastically due to European influence, the technologies associated with subsistence practices introduced by the Europeans had far-reaching effects on Native Americans. From modern-day analogy, dietary patterns and taste change very slowly over time, as do the behaviors and objects associated with the reproduction of those diets (Tull 2004:330). Thus, one would expect to see few changes in what the Lenape were eating, but many changes in how they were gathering, cooking, and eating it (Nassaney and Johnson
Cooking utensils will be discussed first, followed by the specific foods that were being eaten and how they were acquired.

Cooking utensils at the time of the White River mission demonstrate the impact European trade goods had on food preparation. “The household utensils consist of a number of copper or brass kettles, iron pans, wooden bowls, tin-pails and dippers. For eating they usually employ a knife only, their fingers serving them as forks” (Gipson 1938:599). The 1808 inventory of goods at the Fort Wayne day factory lists trade good utensils such as metal pots, pans, utensils, and various types of whiteware. Miami-French trader Francois Godfroy also traded with the Native Americans, and his inventory listings for utensils from 1820 include various types of knives (Glenn n.d.).

Using these utensils, “they commonly make two meals every day, which, they say, is enough” (Heckewelder 1971:193). Along the White River, “as a general thing they eat but two regular meals a day. At the same time, if they have it, the kettle of soup hangs over the fire all day long, from which any visitor who is hungry, as well as the children of the family may help themselves at will” (Gipson 1938:599).

While the utensils may have changed with the introduction of new technology, continuity can definitely be observed in the Lenape diet. As early as the time of William Penn, the Lenape diet was described as consisting mainly of maize prepared in a variety of manners, “Their Diet is Maze, or Indian corn, divers ways prepared: sometimes Roasted in the Ashes, sometimes beaten and Boyled with Water, which they call Homine; they also make Cakes, not unpleasant to eat: They have likewise several sorts of Beans and Pease that are good Nourishment; and the Woods and Rivers are their Larder”
(Myers 1970:27). This account is very similar to that of Moravian missionary John Heckwelder from the late 1700s who claimed the Lenape enjoyed variety in their diet:

The principle food of the Indians consists of the game which they take or kill in the woods, the fish out of the waters, and the maize, potatoes, beans, pumpkins, squashes, cucumbers, melons, and occasionally cabbages and turnips, which they raise in their fields; they make use also of various roots of plants, fruits, nuts, and berries out of the woods, by way of relish or as a seasoning to their victuals. [Heckewelder 1971:193]

Oral histories provide similar accounts of the importance of corn, beans, and squash.

Corn that’s one of their main foods. That is, among the Delawares, and all Indians as far as that goes. Pumpkin.
(Yeah)
Bean.
Third male voice: Kanutchi.
(Squash – static)
Squash and make bread out of it. [Falleaf 1969b:7-8]

Seasonal fruits, nuts, and berries were also gathered, “our Ind. Br. And Sr. Jacob accompanied the Cherokee woman to her camp in the woods, up the river, to hunt wild potatoes and to chop down trees in which there is wild bee honey” (Gipson 1938:288).

“The Indians dry the berries in large quantities and later bake them in corn meal, which to them, is a great delicacy” (Gipson 1938:484). Other foods, such as onions, mushrooms, and sorrel were eaten in various forms.

”Indian Potato” or Ground Nut ($Apios tuberosa$), “wild potato”: The tuberous roots are gathered in large quantities and stored for winter use. . . The roots are either boiled and eaten as the cultivated potato, or dried and ground into flour used for making bread. . .

Sorrel ($Rumex Acetosella$), “sour”: This plant, prepared much like rhubarb, is used as a filling for pies.

Onion: Of the different varieties of wild onions, three are regarded by the Delaware as being edible. The one most commonly gathered for use is the “buttonseed.” These are dried and prepared by frying, or boiling, or added to flavor stews and soups.

A species of mushroom ($Agaricus campestris$), “tripe form,” is fried in hot fat, or salted and boiled. [Tantaquidgeon 1977:59-60]
Many unique dishes were made by adding dried meat, dried pumpkin, beans, or chestnuts to a corn meal mush. Their principal bread was made from finely pounded corn and may have had any number of additives such as pumpkin or berries (Falleaf 1969b; Heckewelder 1971:195).

Their bread is of . . . grain when fully ripe and quite dry. This . . . is pounded as fine as possible, then sifted and kneaded into dough, and afterwards made up into cakes of six inches in diameter and about an inch in thickness. . . . In the dough of this kind of bread, they frequently mix boiled pumpkins, green or dried, dry beans, or well pared chestnuts, . . . dried venison well pounded, whortleberries, green or dry, but not boiled, sugar and other palatable ingredients. [Heckewelder 1971:195]

A meal in general was “very simple and generally consists of cornbread, corn or bean-soup boiled with or without meat. For corn-soup, the corn is first crushed into small pieces” (Gipson 1938:599).

Fruits and berries were often preserved through drying and eventually canning and the production of jelly and jam. “They make an excellent preserve from the cranberry and crab-apple, to which, after it has been well stewed, they add a proper quantity of sugar or molasses” (Heckewelder 1971:194). A boiled pudding was also made out of cornmeal and flour, “a boiled pudding is composed of dough made of cornmeal and flour, or flour only, to which any variety of berry, except strawberries, may be added. This dough is then placed in a cloth bag and boiled” (Tantaquidgeon 1977:59).

During the winter months, they would process maple sugar. Maple sap was gathered yearly, with the Lenape leaving their main camps in January to get ready to collect and process the sap in February and March (Gipson 1938:140,209,276,331; Wheeler-Voegelin 1974:129). January 18, 1802: “Our Indian brethren and sisters for the
last few days have gone to their sugar camps, where they made the necessary preparations for sugar boiling. They come home every evening until the sugar boiling begins” (Gipson 1938:142). This was used to sweeten their corn bread or sassafras tea (Gipson 1938:100).

A limited amount of food was also available through trade. In 1808, at the day factory in Fort Wayne, sugar, spices, tea, coffee, medicines, alcohol, and tobacco were all popular. In later years, 1820, the trader Francois Godfroy also provided pork, bacon, flour, and bread along with the previous commodities (Glenn n.d.).

While much of their food was obtained through horticulture or gathering, the Lenape also relied heavily on hunting for variety in their diet. Hunting was also important during the winter months, when corn supplies needed to be rationed out to last until more corn could be planted.

_Hunting Methods_

Hunting was important for subsistence, even with Lenape horticulture. Crops could not be grown all year round, and the meat also provided additional variety. “Clean pure animals” were preferred, referred to “in terms of human relationship” (Tantaquidgeon 1977:60). The spirits of these animals needed to be appeased before they could be hunted for food. Of these clean pure animals,

The Delaware consider the bear and the deer to be the greatest of all animals. The bear is also called “Our Grandfather.” Both animals are considered closely akin to the Indian, but the Delaware believe that the bear has the most human-like traits. . . Of the water animals, the otter is regarded as supernaturally the most powerful. [Tantaquidgeon 1977:60]
When hunting, “the hunter is careful not to unduly excite the game pursued, since the flesh of such an animal is apt to cause illness when eaten” (Tantaquidgeon 1977:60). Meat could be preserved for future use by smoking or immersing it in grease, or it could be eaten immediately in a soup or stew (Tantaquidgeon 1977:61). Other wild game consisted of wild cats, panthers, foxes, beavers, and raccoons (Falleaf 1969b; Gipson 1938:484). Opossums would not have been used for food (Falleaf 1969b; Weslager 1978).

Meat would be boiled, roasted, or broiled. Heckewelder claims that they were very neat and clean in their cooking and that “they often laugh at the white hunters, for baking their bread in dirty ashes, and being alike in careless of cleanliness when they broil their meat” (1971:196). The validity of this claim is questionable, though.

The missionary Zeisberger mentions that a single Lenape during the period of 1772-1777 killed anywhere from 50 to 150 deer each fall (Murphy 1975:29). However, this hunting was not just for food. The Lenape in particular were wasteful hunters during this period of time, as observed by David Zeisberger, and they killed the deer mainly for their hides and only so much flesh was used as could be consumed during the hunt. Most of the meat was left in the woods (White 1991:490). This wastefulness caused the Miami to deny the Lenape their initial requests to move on to Miami land. “In 1787, the Miamis denied the Delawares access to their land “for the Delawares shot the deer for the sake of the skins and leave the flesh lying in the bush. The Ojibwas similarly resented the Moravian Delawares for destroying their game” (White 1991:490). Direct evidence of this particular situation can also be seen in the Moravian missionary diaries from the White River mission,
During this time they had killed 7 deer and one bear, but they brought back not much more than the skins; only a little meat. Most of the meat they threw away, because it was too much trouble to bring it home. We told them that in the future they should not throw away good meat, but should rather let us know, and we would bring it with our horse, since we and our brethren are usually short of meat. [Gipson 1938:315]

Generally, deer hunting did not occur as frequently during the spring months as it did during the rest of the year so that the deer could foal. During this time, fish could provide the desired meat.

Fishing Methods
To catch fish, the Lenape built fish weirs, which were stone dams in the shape of a V, laid across a stream with an opening at the center. People wading in the stream would drive the fish to the dam where others would spear or catch them in nets (Weslager 1972:60). Fish traps could also be made “in rivers by running a close fence of poles driven firmly into the bottom from bank to bank, but leaving a narrow aperture in the center with a net behind so arranged that the fish could enter but not escape when driven downstream by beaters above” (Harrington 1913:222).

Food can leave behind a significant amount of evidence that can detail the daily eating habits of a site’s inhabitants. Corn can leave behind carbon residue in burnt pots, or kernels in storage pits, as can beans, squash, nuts and berries. Deer, fish, and other game can leave behind bones. The utensils used to obtain, prepare, and cook the food can also remain in the archaeological record. Gun flints, lead balls, knives, kettles, and other dishes are all prevalent trade items during this time, as well as likely to remain in the archaeological record (Glenn 1992).
Another aspect of Lenape daily life that would leave evidence in the archaeological record is that of clothing and adornment. The beads that decorated their garments as well as the buckles, brooches, and other metal clasps and fasteners could all be left behind to be found later.

**Clothing and Adornments**

Through the missionary John Heckewelder’s conversations with the Lenape during the late 1700s, he was told that, “in ancient times, the dress of the Indians was made of the skins of animals and feathers. This clothing, they say, was not only warmer, but lasted much longer than any woollen [sic] goods they have since purchased of the white people” (Heckewelder 1971:202). This did not stop them from wearing European trade garments that consisted of blankets, shirts, and petticoats (Thompson 1968). “The present dress of the Indians is well known to consist in blankets, plain or ruffled shirts and leggings for the men, and petticoats for the women, made of cloth, generally red, blue, or black” (Heckewelder 1971:203). The calico cloth that they received through annuity was also used to make objects such as coats, skirts, and shirts (Gipson 1938:295).

Oral histories provided by Nora Dean Thompson describe women’s clothes as an overlapping skirt made out of Stroud or trade cloth. The bottoms of the skirts were beaded. “and then we wore leggings with a strip of ribbon work down each side. And our moccasins were the one seam type, originally, with beaded toes and the ribbon-worked cuffs” (Brown and Kohn 2008:65). Men’s shirts were ruffled and were
decorated with either quill or ribbon work but were generally not as decorated as the women’s (Brown and Kohn 2008:65; Thompson 1968).

The Lenape retained at least one custom, feather blankets. “The blankets made from feathers were also warm and durable. They were the work of the women, particularly of the old, who delight in such work, and indeed, in any work which shows that they are able to do their parts and be useful to society” (Heckewelder 1971:202-203). Feathers themselves were also popular, and they were one of the few things the missionaries comment on that the Lenape would wear “Indian fashion” (Gipson 1938:381).

They also decorated themselves with silk trimmings and beads, causing the missionaries headaches with their few converts at the White River Indian mission: “the heathen are so loath to put aside their heathenish mode of dress when they move to us. They never object to the request that they must not paint their faces, but they do not want to give up their silk-ribbon trimmings and beads and things with which they love to bedeck themselves” (Gipson 1938:506). Garments decorated with such ribbon work could convey a variety of meanings and were a material symbol of their identity (Neill 2000:165). Their clothes were a part of their identity. Along with ribbons, the Lenape would “adorn themselves besides with ribands or gartering of various colours, beads and silver broaches” (Heckewelder 1971:203). Silver necklaces, arm bands, bracelets, and rings were also very popular (Gipson 1938:108; Thompson 1968). “The Indians were all decorated in the heathen way, with silver rings and bracelets” (Gipson 1938:115). The silver ornaments were so popular that one night as the missionaries on the White River were preaching to a large crowd, they looked out to, “a wonderful sight to see the painted
faces of the heathen, ornamented all over with silver; one of them had $80 in silver of various shapes hanging on his person” (Gipson 1938:181).

Further evidence for the Lenape taking up more European garments can be seen in the Moravian missionaries’ diary, when the prophet Beade first starts preaching to the Lenape, “You notice that the deer and bear and other wild game are constantly growing more scarce. This is your own fault, because you give heed to what the white people tell you and imitate them and keep horses, cows, hogs, and clothe yourselves with the material that the white people bring you. You are not to live that way” (Gipson 1938:262). This becomes a theme later with the Shawnee Prophet, Tenskwatawa. While the cloth from Lenape outfits may not survive in the archaeological record, the beads, silver, and other ornaments would. In order to determine the cultural affinity of an archaeological site such as those that may be found in Indiana, it is important to recognize these ornaments.

Health

It is conceivable that some of the plants may have left behind floral remains that may be identified. Lenape uses of particular plants may yet be visible archaeologically in the floral remains, and may help in determining cultural affinity at an archaeological site. The Lenape used many different wild plants as herbal remedies. Some of the trees whose bark was used include black walnut, honey locust, sycamore, chestnut, sassafras, white oak, pin oak, red oak, black oak, redbud, cottonwood, elm, dogwood, and elder. Many were thought to purify the blood or body or to cure colds, fever, or rheumatism
Plants used included goldenrod for diarrhea, poison ivy, prairie moss for sore throats, nettles for venereal disease, wild carrot for diabetes, catnip, dandelion, and milkweed for epilepsy (Tantaquidgeon 1977:33-39).

Sweat lodges were a curative practice as well and were generally close by the houses (Cotter et al. 1992:21). Early ethnographer M. R. Harrington describes the sweat houses as being “low, dome-shaped structures of poles covered with hides, mats, or anything that would retain steam” (Harrington 1913:218). They were built along the bank of a creek of stones and dirt. Stones would be heated and carried inside through a small entrance hole. Cold water would be poured on the stones to create steam. A person would remain until his pores opened and he was covered in sweat. Then, he would leave and jump into the cold waters of the creek. It was believed that this practice could cure ailments, as well as having religious significance as a purification rite (Weslager 1972:51). Oftentimes, a Native doctor would perform other curative rites while the sick individual was in the sweat lodge, he “prays and sings for a period of time determined by the nature of the sickness and the strength of the patient” (Tantaquidgeon 1977:23). This use of sweat lodges is archaeologically significant as remains of these sweat lodges may still survive today.

**Alcohol Trade and Use**

Many interpretations of Native American behavior revolving around the use of alcohol have considerable shortfalls as they may overgeneralize from one tribe to all Native Americans, conceive of Native deficiencies based on white ideals, or compose
their descriptions based on moral judgments (Holmes and Antell 2001:154). The stereotypical concept of alcohol abuse actually benefited early Europeans, as it provided evidence of Native degeneracy and criminality, lending credence to the European claims that Natives needed to be assimilated and civilized, a preconception many Europeans already had (Fitzhugh 1985:8; Holmes and Antell 2001:154). For example, in Columbus’s journal descriptions of the Native people he encountered, his belief that because they lacked material culture they were without a spiritual or social culture as well was evident. This led to future European beliefs that the people living in North America had no real culture before they had even arrived there (Brose 2001:3-4).

In contrast to European claims, Natives handled alcohol in a variety of ways that could have been incorrectly perceived or judged. Drinking styles varied considerably from tribe to tribe as well as from individual to individual, and overall they probably did not drink nearly as much as the European settlers did. While some Natives probably did abuse alcohol, others attempted to integrate it into existing ceremonies and some advocated abstinence (Holmes and Antell 2001:154; Mancall 2000).

Leaders placed emphasis on cultural regeneration and temperance as means of controlling potential abuse. Revitalistic movements rejected alcohol use as it was associated with assimilation and many have tried to reinstitute traditional cultural patterns to help combat its use (Holmes and Antell 2001:155). With the revitalistic movements among the Lenape, this would suggest there was at least a growing issue of alcohol abuse among the tribe, though it may not have been as bad as missionaries believed.

The Lenape led Heckewelder to believe that the problem of drunkenness did not exist prior to the Europeans, that it was communicated to the New World from the Old
 Heckewelder also says that “the Indians are very sensible of the state of degradation to which they have been brought by the abuse of strong liquors, and whenever they speak of it, never fail to reproach the whites, for having enticed them into the vicious habit” (1971:267). It is the prevailing opinion of even contemporary Native Americans that the blame for this problem should fall on the historical incursions of the Europeans (Holmes and Antell 2001:151). They claim that the introduction of alcohol disrupted tribal life and traditions as well as rupturing the “communal and spiritual fabric of Indian life” (Holmes and Antell 2001:155).

This issue of drunkenness was supposedly quite a serious one for the Native community. If it was as serious as the mission diaries make it sound, the spirit glass that contained the liquor should be clearly visible in the archaeological record. There are several examples throughout the mission diaries of those that, while drunk, committed various “atrocities” (as deemed by the missionaries). One such example is that of a baptized man named Christian, who stabbed his brother while drunk (Gipson 1938:107). The majority of the problems with drunken behavior seem to have occurred in Anderson’s Town. Numerous entries from the White River Mission diaries proclaim that “the heathen in the town 4 miles away are nearly always drunk” (Gipson 1938:158). Even their interpreter, Brother Joshua, would go on drinking sprees there (Gipson 1938:159).

The guzzling of whisky among these heathen is so dreadful that no one can imagine it. One hundred or more gallons of whisky are brought to such an Indian town by the heathen, and then they do not stop drinking till there is not a drop left. [Gipson 1938:165]
Yet another mention of such a spree occurs for July 27, 1803, where they engaged in a “drunken carousel” (Gipson 1938:247). This comes up again on August 8, 1805, August 21, 1805, and September 9, 1805 (Gipson 1938:373,375,378). In the spring of 1806, Luckenbach had a personal run-in with one of the drunks of that town, who took him as his white hostage wildly waving his tomahawk around until the chief finally recognized him as a friend (Gipson 1938:625-625).

Caution needs to be taken in interpreting this behavior. Even though it sounds as if alcohol was a large issue among the Lenape, it is still being referenced from a European point of view. Alcohol is listed in the trade goods from Fort Wayne in 1808 and in much higher quantities in 1820 from the trader Francois Godfroy (Glenn n.d.). Given this evidence, it is highly likely that the spirit glass commonly used to hold these alcoholic beverages would show up repeatedly in the archaeological record at these sites.

This chapter has been designed to hit some of the major points of Lenape material culture in day-to-day life. It is these aspects of culture that one would expect to see revealed in the material record, and these aspects that can help determine the cultural affinity of a Lenape archaeological site. Being able to do this not only enables an expansion of Lenape cultural heritage, but it also brings to light a particularly turbulent period of time in Lenape and Indiana history.
Chapter 6: The Lenape in Indiana, Synthesizing the Data

A summary of a vast amount of information has been presented, and at this point it would be beneficial to integrate this information. The theories and approaches previously discussed will be applied, along with the author’s own interpretations. These are meant to present a possible scenario that can be built upon in the future.

The Lenape of Indiana, 1790 to 1820: Who Were They?

The period in Lenape history along the White River has been called “a critical one in the history of the Delawares, the lowest point in their existence following their first contact with the Europeans” (Weslager 1978:58). Understanding the culture history of the Lenape is imperative to being able to identify their material remains. Unfortunately, only a summary was within the scope of this project, but it is a beginning point for much larger and more holistic projects.

The Lenape in Indiana originated from small autonomous bands that would hunt, fish, gather, and farm. They lived in semi-permanent locations, with smaller camps spread out for seasonal subsistence activities. Structures were highly dependent on the time of year and the function of the building. A summer camp would have several multi-family longhouses, while during winter a single family would make a dwelling (Goddard 1978:218). Clay, wood, gourds, stone, bone and horn were used to construct the
necessities of everyday life (Goddard 1978:217). Clothes and moccasins were constructed from deer hide then decorated with copper ornaments and beads (Goddard 1978:218). European contact brought many changes in this lifestyle, as well as to the identity of the group.

With European contact came not only European goods and diseases, but also colonialism. Made possible by the many stereotypes Europeans had concerning North America’s indigenous inhabitants, Native Americans were subjugated to justify colonization. Seen as the “other” by the Europeans, Native Americans were treated as exotic and, more importantly, inferior and incapable of any culture of their own (Trigger 2007), very similar to the process that Edward Said (1979) outlines as taking place with the Orient. These views colored many of the interactions throughout Lenape history.

From the time of contact with Europeans, the Lenape were constantly waging wars internally and externally. Internally, they fought to maintain their culture while interacting, blending, and yet resisting European culture. The various Lenape factions fought for different reasons, against different adversaries including the Iroquois as well as the Europeans (White 1991:17). Externally they were being pushed west and the multiple bands of Lenape were scattered, each going its own direction. Competition for the same land frequently yielded antagonism between them and the European settlers (Shoemaker 141:2004). Yet, other fragments were merging again (White 1991:19).

As the Lenape continued west, they began to blend with many other Native groups as well as with Euro-Americans. “The Glaize” was one location where this blending took place, where multiple tribes took up residence with British and other traders. “The Glaize” and other settlements like it such as the village of Kekionga were
the physical manifestations resulting from the creation of a middle ground between the
groups involved. These were areas where there was a distinct “inability of both sides to
gain their ends through force” (White 1991:52). Those who acted in the middle ground
did it for their own interests, but had to convince the others that this action was fair. This
led to compromises between the two (White 1991:52). This especially took place among
the many Moravian missionary towns that spread throughout Pennsylvania, Ohio, and
Indiana (Merritt 2003:5). It blended ethnicities and was a place where
European/American and Native identities were combined in a “mutual invention” (Rafert

Mediation was also a source of power (White 1991:33). The middle ground,
where Native and non-native cultures lived peacefully and blended, was abhorrent to
American reformers and officials in the early years of the United States (Rafert 1996:58),
explaining the militaristic efforts directly after the Revolutionary War to wipe out the
Natives from these areas specifically. Harmar, St. Clair, and Wayne all focused their
efforts on destroying Kekionga, with Wayne also pursuing destruction of “the Glaize.”
The blending taking place in these locations also helped to create “an elaborate network
or economic, political, and social ties to meet the demands of a particular historical
situation” (White 1991:33).

As each side attempted to apply their own cultural expectations, the result was
often change in that culture itself (White 1991:52). Changes worked out in the middle
ground were influential, as well as bringing modifications to each society and blurring
boundaries (White 1991:93). This situation has also been likened to a crossroads, where
many paths converge upon one another (Merritt 2003:2). Europeans and Natives arrived
at these crossroads willing to cooperate but through negotiations of their differences, redefined each other (Merritt 2003:3-4).

With all the blending of cultures, the Lenape’s further attempts at cohesion of the multiple groups by uniting in Indiana along the White River are evidence of attempts to present a more united front in an effort to increase their ability to survive in the cultural environment being created around them by the further settlement of the United States. It was not until they were threatened with destruction that it became necessary to bring all the pieces together. They had to pull together to resist the cultural changes that the Europeans were pushing on them. Often, instead of uniting against the threat, the different bands had their own motivations for pursuing peace or warfare, depending on their individual situations. In some instances and for some of the smaller groups, it was better to make peace so that they would not be wiped out by warfare. However, for the larger bands, warfare was an option as they had the people to fight back effectively. Smaller bands found it necessary to incorporate more of the European lifestyle, in hopes that they would be left alone. It is quite possible that it was the smaller bands of Lenape that joined together with the Moravian missionaries initially, creating a buffer against the Europeans.

This pursuit of physical and cultural survival, and the differences in opinion on the best way to ensure survival, led to an atmosphere of dissatisfaction when the tribe lived in Indiana. Having gained some semblance of cohesion, many wanted to fight back against the Americans. However, tribal leaders saw a greater benefit in peace to their long term survival.
By the time the Lenape gathered in Indiana, they had been repeatedly exposed to middle-ground venues, i.e., those places where the middle ground interactions could be commonly seen taking place, such as “the Glaize,” Kekionga, and many mission towns. Even the towns of the Lenape Moravian converts could be considered middle-ground territory, where despite teaching the Natives European ways, the Lenape still maintained many of their old beliefs and rituals while incorporating into their lifestyle many European tools and methods. The middle ground was a familiar place, one that we can expect to be reflected in their archaeological record, especially with regard to the trade goods that the Lenape chose to adopt. It is possible that due to this increased contact with other cultures while negotiating the middle ground there was little, if anything, distinctive about Lenape culture during the years in Indiana. The next section will go into the topic of distinct features of Lenape culture in more detail.

People were driven to take part in a common world, in its construction and maintenance. During this process, all the cultures, societies, and people underwent changes (Wolf 1982:385). These changes affected their history, their identity, and subsequently their material record.

**How would a Lenape village be represented in the archaeological record?**

While the previous discussion may not seem necessary in a topic on archaeological assemblages, it is only through examination of the “features that give . . . [artifacts] value as vehicles of meaning through which people negotiate their relations with each other and the world at large” (Attfield 2000:75) can the broader context emerge. Archaeology can be accomplished by solely examining the artifacts, but this
means nothing in a larger cultural framework. Artifacts can only be understood in the cultural context from which they came.

*Identifying Native American and Lenape Archaeological Sites*

Several themes emerge for identifying a historic site in the Midwest as Native American. The presence of chipped stone or ground stone artifacts and trade goods may both be reliable indicators. Chipped stone implements could be found at other historic settlements but would be found in higher frequencies at Native American settlements, making them useful in distinguishing a historic Native American settlement from historic Euro-American settlements. Native-specific trade goods and the indications of how they were used are also among the more identifying traits of the historic Native Americans. As was the case at the Montgomery Site (Cotter et al. 1992), thimbles were used as earrings and to create a necklace, which is a usage particular to Native American groups.

As for the identification of specific Lenape sites, chipped stone artifacts may help but there is no indication they were widely used by the Lenape in historic times, nor that there was a Lenape-specific style of chipped stone point. With trade goods, some strictly indigenous uses emerge such as with the perforated brass thimbles, as mentioned above. Perforated brass arrowheads are also seen among many Native groups. There are no indications that these uses are unique to the Lenape, or of any other unique uses of trade goods specific to the Lenape. Trade goods will be examined more in depth in the following section.

There are, however, a few trends in the Lenape material record that could be indicative of a Lenape archaeological site. These trends include the use of vermillion,
 augmentative artifacts, and ideological artifacts. Vermillion pigment is discussed in several ethnohistoric sources and was found at a few archaeological sites. However, the use of the pigment is the cultural determinant and this is not visible in the archaeological record. Red dots were worn on the cheeks of Lenape women so that “the Creator will recognize, after death, a woman as Delaware” (Brown and Kohn 2008:322). It is possible that vermillion could indicate a Lenape settlement archaeologically, especially if the archaeological site is in the known vicinity of a historic Lenape location.

There were also some trade goods that were manufactured especially for the Natives on request, such as the silver brooches that were found at Fort St. Mary’s. They were used by many other Indian tribes, but a plain hemispherical style of brooch is fairly unique to the Lenape (Harrington 1908:413). Silver ornaments in general were popular among the Lenape, mainly circular silver brooches, but also earrings, hair bands, rings, and crosses. They could be decorated with straight or curved lines, dots, and circles in various configurations. Animal and floral patterns are occasionally seen (Harrington 1913:234). More work needs to be done to determine if the Lenape had one particular style that may be used to help prove cultural affinity of an archaeological site, and to examine if the plain hemispherical brooch is definitely unique to the Lenape. Again, the presence of such an artifact could correlate an archaeological site to a known historic Lenape location, even if it is not completely diagnostic of the Lenape.

Two more Lenape-specific artifacts are masks resembling human faces and wooden “Delaware dolls” despite their probable rarity in the archaeological record. Stone heads or masks are mentioned as a distinguishing feature of Lenape sites in New Jersey as these are completely absent from Iroquois sites there (Skinner 1909, Skinner
and Schrabisch 1913). As of 1908, wooden masks of identical make to the stone ones were still worn among the Lenape in Ontario (Harrington 1913; Skinner 1909:21). Catlinite masks in the form of human faces were recovered from the archaeological site of Conestoga Town, an early 1700s site in Pennsylvania. However, the use of rock as a medium may have fallen out of use with their frequent migrations, replaced by more lightweight and easily transportable wood (Custer 1996:316).

These wooden masks, as well as images of human faces carved on the posts of the longhouses, were part of the Gamwing or Big House Ceremony. Twelve carved human faces were always present at each ceremony (Falleaf 1969a). This would make these masks ideologically different from the other groups around the Lenape and would be an individual and unique diagnostic artifact for determining cultural affinity of Lenape archaeological sites, except that wood only preserves under the right circumstances. Generally it is not something that is recovered or is still recognizable when found.

Little wooden images in human form were also kept by many Lenape historically. The Lenape told Harrington that some dolls were male and some female and they were generally kept to provide mystic protection for the health of the owner (Harrington 1913:231). These sacred figures were carved out of wood and passed on from generation to generation, from grandmothers to mothers (Caffrey 2000:55). These “Delaware dolls” were cared for, including making new clothes and moccasins (Perry and Skolnick 1999). These have never been found archaeologically however, possibly due to the material, but more likely due to the curation of the dolls by subsequent generations.
Trade Goods

European trade goods had a major impact on the Lenape. Their introduction would have promoted the development of new economic, political, and social strategies (Glenn 1992:58). Trade goods would have also caused many physical alterations of the environment, such as over-damming due to the ability to more easily control the flow of water or overhunting with the ease of use of guns (Richter 2001). The Lenape residing in Indiana would have had access to the greatest number of trade goods, including materials for farming and construction as well as many Native-specific goods such as blankets, shawls, silver brooches and gorgets, and tomahawks (Glenn 1992:67,70). Many of these goods would most likely have served augmentative purposes, such as with glass beads and copper or silver brooches, or labor-saving purposes, such as with kettles, axes, or muskets (Ferris 2009:121). They would also have represented new needs of indigenous peoples during this tumultuous period of history and cultural interaction (Kidd 1954:1). These trade goods would be the most obvious indication of a historic Native American occupation at an archaeological site, possibly Lenape if they were the only group known to have lived in that area at that time.

Trade goods can be divided into several categories according to how they were made and how they affected the Natives. Some goods were completely new and could not be replicated using Native materials; some were new in form but were gradually converted to a Native “style.” Some trade goods were broken down and converted to material for use in making Native artifacts, such as with glass chipped points or scrapers made of sheet brass (Quimby 1966). Obviously, Natives were using and modifying trade goods to suit their own purposes, and it can be expected that a Lenape site would exhibit
all of these types of trade goods. Some of the uses for these trade goods were similar to European uses, and some were not. This is important to remember when looking at archaeological assemblies, as the European function of an artifact may not be the same as the Native function. Herb Kraft (1986) discusses this briefly, pointing out that iron axes and silver spoons have been found worn as pendants around the neck in some burials (not usually what Europeans would have done with them).

Early Lenape would have been offered such trade goods as cloth of various types, muskets, kettles, axes, gun accessories, knives, and glass beads (Skinner 1909; Skinner and Schrabisch 1913). They would also have had access to or manufactured clay pipes and pottery. Many of these goods were imported solely for Native use, including shirts, socks, muskets, lead, red cloth, kettles, axes, powder, awls, adzes, knives, flints, guns, and wampum (Skinner 1909:28). These early goods, once adopted, would have seen continued use among the Lenape. Slightly later in time, 1680-1750, the list of trade goods available to the Lenape expanded to include tin pots, basins, alcohol, earrings, rings, bells, beads, mirrors, and combs (Glenn 1992:63). Red or scarlet cloth continued to be in high demand.

William Penn’s records through the late 1760s (Weslager 1972) list additional European trade goods to the Lenape as including Jews’ harps, white clay smoking pipes, fish hooks, needles, and scissors. Rings, ribbons, and other items of decoration were becoming extremely popular as were calicoes, blankets, and vermilion pigment. The black glass spirit bottles containing the alcohol being traded to the Lenape were also becoming increasingly more prevalent (Kraft 1986). The Lenape residing in Indiana in the 1790s would have had, or at least had access to, all of these goods.
The letter book of the Indian Agency at Fort Wayne lists the goods presented to the Natives as part of their annuity payment after the Treaty of Greenville (1809-1815) as cloth of varying kinds and colors, gun accessories and guns, thimbles and other sewing implements, and blankets (Thornbrough 1961). One year they specifically requested 12 drawing knives, 12 hand saws, 12 screw augers, 300 brass kettles, 6 broad axes, 6 sets of horse gears --chains and accoutrements, with the rest of the balance in blankets and blue strouding material (Hill 1957:87). Trade goods during this time in the early 1800s would have also started to include items such as pans, coffee pots, spoons, cups, plates and other dishes, lanterns, saws, and spades (Glenn 1992:68; Kraft 2001:24-25).

All of these trade goods would have been available to the Lenape in Indiana in the early 1800s. Many of these can also be found in the archaeological record. Items such as the 300 brass kettles mentioned in the Indian Agency letter book would have been specifically destined for the Lenape villages along the White River, and at least some of them should still be there even if only in bits and pieces.

Despite the introduction of European goods, Native artifacts did not disappear. Stone tools were still used despite the availability of iron and other metal implements, though they would eventually be replaced. In fact, many Lenape craft traditions were not readily or quickly replaced by the European commodities (Santone 1998:126). A reason given for the retention of the bow and arrow was to conserve powder for guns (Newcomb 1956). While archaeological evidence may be fragmentary, it may be augmented with ethnohistoric information. So while it can be suggested that many items such as the bow were retained for their benefits in limiting consumption of more valuable items, the available primary sources do not discuss exactly what implements were being used. In
order to make the most of what they had, and to not rely on the Europeans completely, they would retain the trade goods as long as possible and as long as some aspect of them was still of use.

*Function of Trade Goods*

Material culture is and was an active element in contemporary and past social interaction through the negotiation of cultural meaning, though it is not a direct mirror of it (Hodder 1985:5; Trigger 2007:453,455). It is an objectification of social being and is used to express an identity, one that is in constant flux. During this period of contact, Natives continued to define themselves against the Other through their use of material culture (Loren 2008:22; Shanks and Tilley 1992:130). Reworked items, such as brass kettles cut apart and used to form tinkler cones, indicate these creative re-adaptations used to meet needs and make the unfamiliar familiar. By transforming these objects, they were given new meanings, functions, and significance (Loren 2008:23). Though Native Americans and Europeans produced many objects in the same way for similar reasons, the objects “remained fundamentally different because they were vehicles of different identities” (Turgeon 2004:42).

It is not surprising that many of the items seen in the archaeological record being used for alternative purposes deal with adornment and the idea of Self. The body was where differences could be defined, and distinctions between Self and Other could be made (Loren 2008:79). Dress, the body, and self are all perceived together, as how one dresses is often a statement of how one perceives oneself (Loren 2008:93). Thus, thimbles, beads, Jesuit rings, buckles, and bracelets become imbued with a social
function of defining the Self in the wake of the Other and portraying information such as
gender, beliefs, values, and social identity (Loren 2008:98). Unfamiliar objects were
redefined culturally and used in ways that fit their cultural logic (Rubertone 2000:432).
This is important to this discussion because how the Lenape perceived themselves would
be reflected in their dress. Understanding some of the mentality that brought them to
Indiana, and understanding the internal and external stresses on their culture, it is possible
to begin to comprehend how the Lenape would have uniquely identified themselves
through their dress and adornment.

Beads would have served a similar purpose prior to the arrival of the Europeans,
as aboriginal groups would have been defining themselves with respect to each other, and
unique beadwork would have identified members or a group and distinguished them
(Loren 2008:103). Even after contact, beads remained a defining tool of identity,
differentiating from the new Other as well as negotiating a changing identity against
other Natives’ changing identities (Turgeon 2004). Interestingly, the majority of the
beads available after contact were monochrome and originated in Paris, and almost all
ended up as grave goods in burials, either due to their being indicators of status or
possibly as a form of resistance to keep them from Europeans (Turgeon 2004:40).

Guided by their own cultural logic, Native Americans were selective consumers
of European trade goods, and their preferences, instead of causing assimilation, helped
produce a continuity of cultural identity (Rubertone 2000:431). The construction of this
identity was not a reaction or response to colonialism but a much more varied and
complex process (Rubertone 2000:438). Colonial processes reshaped not only physical
landscapes, but social ones as well (Loren 2008:77).
Unique uses of trade goods or finding only specific trade goods at an archaeological site may then be an indicator for cultural affinity. If the Lenape were only using certain goods, or had a unique way of using some of them such as unique assemblages of adornment, this could provide a means of identifying a Lenape site in Indiana.

**Identifying a Lenape Site in Indiana**

One of the central issues in the identification of specific sites is the short occupation of many of the settlements as well as the displacement of the Lenape from these sites before the locations were recorded (Trigger 1969:303). This makes it difficult to really analyze the archaeology of the Lenape, as having enough sites to make confident interpretations is problematic. In this instance, it is more beneficial to reverse our thinking and approach the problem from a different angle. Instead of asking what events occurred at an excavated site such as a village, it may be more beneficial to ask what a site that is undoubtedly a village will leave in the archaeological record (Ranger 2007:123). This is the question posed for the Lenape villages in Indiana. They existed, and are a major part of Indiana history; however they have not been found archaeologically. If one were to be found, its cultural affinity may be hard to determine. The task at hand is now to describe what a Lenape village located in Indiana from 1790 to 1820 would look like in the archaeological record.

Settlement patterns as previously discussed indicate the Lenape had specific patterns for where they located their settlements. Usually directly along a water source, they preferred sandy soils and moderate knolls. The villages themselves would have had
a central longhouse with houses scattered around it. Richard Adams (1997:18), a Lenape elder, describes the villages as housing clusters of richer Lenape towards the center with the poorer Lenape spread out towards the outside. Fenced-in cornfields would have surrounded the houses. Sweat baths were popular, and at least one would be built on a nearby stream. Structure design quickly took on aspects of European ones, becoming one-family peaked-roof dwellings (Goddard 1978:229). They would have retained some Lenape architectural features, for example, a central hearth, while using some European ones as well.

Artifacts at such a site would be highly influenced by the state of politics at the time. The historical context during this time has the Lenape in a tumultuous position. Having lived on the middle ground for many years, they were starting to feel its effects against their culture. They were frustrated with the new American government that was opposed to the middle-ground mentality of many of the Natives.

Wampum, it has been argued, could have been used as a reaffirmation of tribal authority in times such as this (Rubertone 1989). In using it for ritual consumption such as interring it in burials, as opposed to as a tribute to the government, they challenged the government’s authority over them (Rubertone 1989:43). From the artifact listings available, wampum and seed beads were plentiful in graves from the 1700s and were most likely still plentiful in the 1800s. Of course, the amount of wampum may not be due to social status as many have speculated (Cannon 1989; Mainfort 1985) but to the time period during which the individual was interred. Wampum placed in individual graves could be a statement against the foreign government at times when the Lenape were feeling especially pressured. This is undoubtedly true for their time in Indiana, as
they had just lost more tribal land and been forced to move. They still had to deal with American squatters and a government that wanted them gone. Used in this context, wampum would most likely be found at a Lenape site in Indiana.

After contact, many Lenape objects continued to be made, such as woven items and those constructed out of wood or from gourds (Goddard 1978:227). Most of these items would not be located in the archaeological record, but it does indicate that European plates and dinnerware would most likely not be found. Stone- and bone-working probably died out quickly, being replaced with longer lasting metal tools (Goddard 1978:227). These could be located at an archaeological site. Activities, such as storytelling, flute music, and dice games were popular during this period (Goddard 1978:231), and remnants of these activities, however unlikely, may be visible in the archaeological record as well. Ceremonial items, such as those used for feasts and dances like the Gamwing, including drums, tortoise shell rattles, and vermillion may also remain (Speck 1937:11). The Lenape pattern of using carved images of human faces as masks, effigies, or sculpting in this ritual may also be visible, though highly unlikely (Speck 1937:11).

Cross-cultural Comparisons

Looking at trade goods and cross-cultural information about them from different tribes in the region, it may be possible to observe cultural differences in their acquisition and consumption. Excavations on other Native American villages in Indiana have shown that while contact period Native Americans used very similar objects, the artifact frequencies for different categories of artifacts may be very different (Jones 1985:110).
Dividing artifacts into categories such as subsistence/arms, food preparation and consumption, adornment, structural and architectural, recreational, clothing, personal, and skills and craft activities, one can get an idea of what artifacts had a higher priority at a specific site. As has been found previously (Jones 1985), diverse Native American groups could have had different priorities. Jones also found that Native American sites were usually the only ones where silver trade items such as brooches or earrings could be found (1985:112). This study compared a Wea village located near the Wabash River and a Kickapoo-Mascouten village with materials recovered from Fort Ouiatenon (Jones 1985). Numerous historic aboriginal artifacts were recovered from the Wea village, including a small silver cross, a perforated silver triangle, kettle fragments, a silver earring pendant, a kaolin pipe fragment, olive-green wine bottle sherds, glass trade beads, and fire-cracked rock. Using functional analysis for the different artifact categories showed that while each of the tribes may have acquired similar artifacts, frequencies of these artifacts can differ significantly from tribe to tribe. The Wea Village had higher frequencies of subsistence/arms, faunal remains, and uncommon, expensive items than did the nearby Fort Ouiatanon or the Kickapoo Village (Jones 1985:109-110). The Wea Village also yielded all of the silver artifacts found during the investigation (Jones 1985:112).

Focusing more directly on the Lenape, listings of goods purchased and annuities received in the day books of the factory located in Fort Wayne, Indiana, from 1804-1806 were compared to examine the differential buying patterns for the Miami, Potawatomi and the Lenape (Baerreis 1961:60-61). Several categories were used including
personal/recreation items, food items, clothing, adornment, skills, cooking, hunting, and horse items.

Personal/recreational items include items such as pocket knives, pipes, tobacco, snuff boxes, trunks, and padlocks. Food items include salt, potatoes, corn, sugar, tea, coffee, pepper, and allspice. The clothing category includes items such as blankets, moccasins, belts, cloth, thread, needles, stockings, leggings, hats, shirts, handkerchiefs, and shawls. Adornment items include things like brooches, ribbon, head bands, feathers, wampum, mirrors, and paint. The skill category refers to those items necessary to work a particular trade or do a particular job, such as augers, hoes, axes, and saws. Cooking items include pots, pans, basins, spoons, kettles, knives, and other items related to the preparation and consumption of food. Hunting items are mostly composed of gun parts and powder, and horse items include saddles, bridles, saddle bags, and replacement parts.

While each group had access to the same goods, the percentages of what they received differed considerably. As can be seen in Chart 1, the Miami and Potawatomi were receiving similar goods from Fort Wayne, while the Lenape were receiving a much higher percentage of clothing and much lower percentages of hunting equipment. This data could complement the archaeology. Buckles, hinges, nails, brooches, clasps and other metal artifacts may remain, and from this chart it may be expected that Lenape sites would have a higher frequency of clothing-related items (buttons, clasps) than Miami or Potawatomi sites. Miami sites would have a higher frequency of horse-related equipment, and the Potawatomi sites more personal and recreational items.
Types of Goods Purchased in Fort Wayne from 1804-1806

Chart 1: Annuity Goods (Data from Baerreis 1961)
Interestingly, the Lenape only exhibited significant percentages of items in the clothing category. While this is also for only a period of two years, it may suggest that they were receiving goods from other sources as well, most likely the trader John Connor who was known to reside in the villages along the White River. One other explanation for this pattern could be that they were making and decorating their own clothing and just needed basic supplies such as fabric, thread, and needles. Low percentages for the recreation, skill, food, and adornment categories could suggest that they were able to make or procure these items themselves and were still maintaining some cultural practices.

This is not a positively tested method, however it may potentially provide valuable information on determining the cultural affinity of future sites throughout Central and Northeast Indiana, as that is where the three tribes resided at the beginning of the 1800s. Analysis from multiple sites would be needed to acquire statistically significant data. However, this initial foray into the material goods of some of the various Indiana tribes suggests that there may be some significant differences in artifact usage between the groups.

An important issue in locating Lenape historic and archaeological sites is the inability to determine the cultural affinity of the site, and it may be possible to further label these sites if such a method can be found to reliably differentiate between the tribes. This may seem tedious or unnecessary, however having this knowledge adds to the cultural heritage of the Lenape, as well as adding to or even altering our knowledge about the history of the Indiana territory in the early 1800s.
Chapter 7: Historic Lenape

I have undertaken to show how Lenape cultural history and archaeology may be better understood when taken in a larger spectrum, as a larger system with a more holistic view of the evidence, and how this can be applied and projected forward. When looking at how “this totality developed over time. . . we unraveled the chains of causes and effects at work in the lives of particular populations, we saw them extend beyond any one population to embrace the trajectories of others—all others” (Wolf 1982:385). It is not enough to question the early histories, but to investigate them in order to debunk, confirm, or expand on them.

Who were the Lenape historically?

The Lenape, during the time that they resided in Indiana, could be “accurately described as peoples with remarkably complex histories of survival and enduring attachments to community and place” (Rubertone 2000:435). Having survived centuries of contact with Europeans and Americans, they re-negotiated their sense of identity and place to adapt to changing circumstances, the result of European colonialism. Those living in Indiana were stretched and strained by this constant process of change, and this eventually led to the period of revitalization that took place in 1801. They were also adept at using the “middle ground” to accomplish what they needed to do, and much of
this would be reflected in their material record in confluences between the Native world and the European one in the use of trade goods. While initially the middle ground may have been resultant of their efforts to coexist with their European neighbors, it eventually became a way of maneuvering these relationships in manners that were beneficial to both.

**Who were the Lenape archaeologically?**

The multiple migrations experienced by the Lenape caused many changes in their culture but they also emphasized continuity. Food, decoration, and ritual practices remained similar despite pressure to change. Traditional housing styles were retained as long as it was feasible, but were adapted to European styles in an effort to coexist. The same is true of clothing; while the material became Europeanized, the decoration remained Lenape. They refashioned European goods into a Lenape image, and with that the Lenape retained many unique characteristics. While incorporating some European items into their lifestyle, they also used them to maintain their own identity. Beadwork, brooches, and adornment simultaneously reflected their unique identity along with the desire to coexist with the Europeans.

A Lenape site in Indiana from the late 1790s to the early 1820s would be located along the river on sandy soils and on higher ground of some sort, such as a low rise. Unfortunately, houses would most likely resemble settler houses in the archaeological record, and the possible absence of storage pits due to the inclusion of domestic livestock would not define them otherwise. While the houses may have been too ephemeral to be located archaeologically, the longhouse would have been the center of village life, and the amount of activity that took place there should be visible. Trade goods should be
plentiful, specifically metal tools, kettles, and jewelry. If they could survive, one would expect to find the wooden masks the Lenape used during the Gamwing and other rituals, though their survival is highly unlikely. Those that have survived the rigors of time have done so in private collections or as heirlooms.

While many of the traits of a Lenape site would be invisible in the archaeological record, such as clothing displaying their unique ribbon work, many traits should be retained, such as unique patterns inscribed on silver brooches or unique patterns in beadwork. It is apparently only a matter of looking in the right place.

In the end, it is always beneficial to gain greater insight into the past, whether it is by confirming it or otherwise. In the case of the Lenape, this project has sought to expand upon a time and place in Lenape history, that of the village of Wapicomekoke, which has received little attention. Perhaps this is the reason it has been so elusive archaeologically, or perhaps it has long since been destroyed through development. In either case, it is not forgotten and perhaps one day it will further prove or disprove the notions of historic Lenape culture put forth here.
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