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ABSTRACT

This study analyzes an assemblage of smoking pipes from the Strickler Site, a Susquehannock village in Central Pennsylvania occupied from 1645 to 1665. These pipes were excavated by Arthur Futer in the 1940’s and 1950’s from a burial ground located in the northern portion of the site known as Cemetery 2. The collection is now located at the North Museum in Lancaster, Pennsylvania. The Strickler Site was the only Susquehannock site occupied during this time period. Located along the Susquehanna River, it provided the Susquehannock people with an ideal location to trade with local European groups, particularly the English, the Dutch, and the Swedes. The occupation of the Strickler Site was therefore a time of intense interaction with neighboring European and Native American groups. Although the Susquehannock remained highly competitive within the context of the colonial fur trade during this time, they were also engaged in constant warfare with neighboring Iroquoian groups to maintain power within this competitive trade arena.

The study of material culture provides an entry point into the complex dynamics of Susquehannock culture during this time period. I discuss the diverse collection of pipes represented at the site and comment on their function, meaning, and purpose. More importantly, I analyze these pipes in order to comment on the broader context of Susquehannock exchange, negotiation, and agency during this time. I hope that this type of study will demonstrate the problematic nature of acculturative and direct-historical approaches, and instead emphasize how the material culture from Susquehannock sites can be used to demonstrate the ways in which these people negotiated a highly dynamic colonial context.
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Colonialism in the Northeast

Archaeologists interested in Native American life have often wrestled with the multifaceted and highly complex nature of the colonial era. Although studying Native American life during the colonial era can be a somewhat daunting task for archaeologists, the results of such studies are often highly lucrative and beneficial to understanding the complicated nature of colonial entanglements. Because of the inherent complexity of this time period, archaeologists and historians have relied upon several distinct theoretical approaches in order to better understand Native Americans within the context of colonialism. However, they have often struggled to agree upon a theoretical approach that takes into account the highly complex dynamics of this time period, and yet is simultaneously able to decipher patterns and trends that arise in colonial interactions and entanglements.

Archaeologists emphasized two theoretical approaches to the study of Native Americans in the early and mid twentieth century: the direct-historical approach and the acculturation approach. The direct-historical approach promoted the notion that Native Americans experienced continuity between prehistoric and colonial times. Archaeologists following this approach argued that an understanding of Native American life during the colonial era and beyond could be used to better understand prehistoric life as well. This approach emphasized ethnohistorical and ethnographic sources written during the colonial era over archaeological remains, thereby “diminishing archaeology’s relevance to contributing information that might lead to alternative understandings of Native Americans in the postcontact period” (Rubertone 2000:427). This approach is outdated, not only because it diminishes the importance of archaeological work on
prehistoric sites, but because it does not take into account the complex dynamics of change
Native Americans experienced during the colonial era.

The acculturation approach emphasized the loss of Native American traditional practices
and values. As Gil Stein (2002:905) explains, “the term *acculturation* describes a process in
which smaller, less powerful groups, so-called recipient cultures, gradually become more like the
larger, powerful, ‘donor societies’ that control them.” As evidence to promote this theory,
archaeologists often used artifacts as a measurement of Native American change. Under this
model, a high frequency of European artifacts at a site automatically indicated Native American
acculturation (Rubertone 2000:428). Both of these models imply that cultural influence only
flowed in a unidirectional manner, from Europeans to Native Americans.

Recent archaeological studies, however, recognize that the colonial era was a dynamic
time period, and that perhaps one single theoretical approach alone is not capable of taking these
complexities into account. New models reject these unidirectional approaches, particularly the
notion that Native Americans simply assimilated to European culture. Stephen Silliman
(2005:65), for example, argues in favor of an archaeological perspective that “calls for exploring
*who* maneuvers, redirects, deploys, and subverts colonialism and *how* they do so. That is,
colonialism becomes a context, albeit out of necessity, in which indigenous people find ways to
survive.” Archaeologists are also beginning to emphasize the importance of complex social
interactions and entanglements in which Native Americans actively negotiated a highly dynamic
social context. Michael Nassaney (2004:128) explains how “anthropologists now realize that
natives were active agents who made variable and complex choices in daily life. They resisted as
well as accommodated cultural changes and new conditions.” Thus the concept of Native
American negotiation and agency, often through resisting the loss of traditional practices and values, has become an increasingly popular theoretical framework.

In order to better convey this new theoretical approach, archaeologists have recently attempted to clarify the language used to study and describe Native Americans during this time period. In particular, they are beginning to use the term “colonialism” over “culture contact.” Stephen Silliman (2005:58) argues that the term “contact” implies that the interaction between Native Americans and Europeans was a short event that simply ended abruptly. The term “colonialism,” on the other hand, rejects the notion that this time period was simply a short event, but instead implies that it involved an extensive and more complex process. “Colonialism” takes into account the issues of power, domination, and consequent resistance over a broad span of time. Moreover, it indicates that a complex process took place that involved an attempt of a colonial population to dominate another group “based on perceptions and actions of inequality, racism, oppression, labor control, economic marginalization, and dispossession” (Silliman 2005:59). This new language attempts to convey the complexity of power and identity struggles embedded in colonial situations.

More importantly, new theoretical approaches are beginning to question how Native Americans participated in complex colonial contexts. The direct-historical and acculturation models both view Native American communities as passive groups, but “archaeologists have come to recognize that a focus on agency, practice, and social identity can greatly clarify our understanding of how complex societies function and evolve” (Stein 2000:905). In particular, Gil Stein (2000) points out several aspects to take into account when deciphering the ways in which Native Americans negotiated this context. First, it is of course necessary to recognize that cultural influence and interaction was not a unilinear process between Europeans and Native
Americans; rather, interactions were highly dynamic and multilinear (Stein 2000:907). In addition, interacting communities must be considered not only heterogeneous, but composed themselves of diverse groups and individuals with often conflicting goals and interests (ibid:907). As a result, issues arise when archaeologists discuss the concept of a Native American “community” without regarding the importance of individuals. As Jason Yaeger and Marcello Canuto (2000:5) explain, the “growing focus on agency and interaction actively discourages the reification of social institutions like the community by emphasizing how individual actors competently manipulate their place within multiple social contexts.” It is therefore important to recognize that, although the community is a “dynamic socially constituted institution” (Yaeger and Canuto 2000:5), individual agency also plays a large role in maintaining and promoting the existence of the community as a whole. All of these elements should be taken into account when considering how Native Americans actively participated in colonial interactions, both as individuals and members of a broader society.

I explore these issues through a study of the Susquehannock, who resided along the Susquehanna River in Pennsylvania during the colonial era, from 1575 to 1675. To date, there has been little research conducted on these people that explores the nature of European and Susquehannock relations and foregrounds the how Susquehannock communities and individuals actively negotiated a dynamic colonial context. In his discussion of Susquehannock history, for instance, William A. Hunter (1959:9) suggests that “unavoidably, therefore, the span of our Indian history is a brief one, and its most obvious theme – the decline, displacement, and acculturation of the Indian consequent upon white contact – is a dreary one.” The majority of historical and archaeological literature written about the Susquehannock has unfortunately followed a similar tone. John Witthoft (1959:32), for instance, argues that “the major events of
Susquehannock history were mere by-products of the history of the Iroquois and of the European settlements.” As a result, several studies on the Susquehannock refuse to shed light on their purposeful interaction, agency, and negotiation within such a highly complex social context. It therefore is appropriate to explore how the Susquehannock demonstrated their own interests and goals within complex social relationships.

This paper investigates the smoking pipe assemblage of the Futer Collection in order to begin to unpack these issues. The Futer Collection contains excavated materials from a cemetery of the Strickler Site that are now located at the North Museum of Lancaster, Pennsylvania. The study will also look at the broader context of the Futer Collection in order to gain a more holistic view of Susquehannock trade, exchange, and consumption during this time, particularly by looking at the distribution of different types of artifacts represented in mortuary contexts excavated by Arthur Futer. I will argue that the Susquehannock did not simply experience acculturation and a loss of their own traditional practices and values. Rather, I will use the Futer Collection and the pipe assemblage to demonstrate the complexity of exchange and negotiation between the Susquehannock and neighboring European and Native American groups. Although the pipe assemblage is only one facet of material culture, it strongly indicates how the Susquehannock experienced complex and often ambiguous social and gendered redefinitions of smoking practices, possibly as a means to mitigate conflict and tension during a time of warfare and instability.

*Research Questions: Exchange, Consumption, and Cultural Decline*

In order to address the broader issue of colonialism for the Susquehannock, this paper focuses on three issues: exchange and trade, distribution and consumption of European trade
goods and native-made objects, and notions of cultural collapse and decline. One main question addressed in this paper is: What was the nature of Susquehannock exchange with other European and Native American groups, and what does this exchange indicate about Susquehannock practice, negotiation, and agency during the Strickler Phase? The concept of exchange leads to a discussion of whether or not a culture experiences diffusion or acculturation. William L. Mangold (1987:4) explains the complexity of acculturation by suggesting that:

[…] its numerous variables include the degree of cultural difference; circumstances, intensity, frequency and availability of contact; relative status of the agents of contact; who is dominant and who is submissive; and whether the nature of flow of cultural exchange is reciprocal or nonreciprocal.

Thus an understanding of exchange and how it may lead to acculturation is multifaceted and may “develop in several different directions” (Mangold 1987:5). No scholars have suggested that the Susquehannock did not experience any type of cultural diffusion, since the presence of European material culture is prevalent in the archaeological record. In many ways, however, this approach relies on outdated acculturative models that do not take into account the negotiation and agency of the Susquehannock within this context.

In order to shed light on Susquehannock agency, this study will look at how European trade goods and native-made goods are distributed in the archaeological record, particularly as mortuary objects. I pose the questions: What can material culture indicate about how the Susquehannock consumed and incorporated these goods into their graves? How does the distribution and consumption of these mortuary objects demonstrate the complex ways the Susquehannock negotiated the colonial context? A study of the distribution of mortuary objects can illuminate not only mortuary practices, but broader social relationships and patterns within this dynamic time period as well.
Finally, this paper will address the issue of cultural collapse and decline, which occurred only about a decade after Strickler Site abandonment. An understanding of Susquehannock culture during the Strickler Phase may indicate how cultural decline occurred shortly afterwards. However, scholars are typically not explicit about what notions of “collapse” or “cultural decline” signify for the Susquehannock. Barry Kent (1984:51) explains how, according to ethnohistoric sources, there were no Susquehannock peoples living along the Susquehanna River by 1683. Population loss and migration from the lower Susquehanna Valley both seem to have played a large role in transforming Susquehannock society during the late seventeenth century (Kent 1984:53), and there seems to be little consensus on how this change in Susquehannock society took place. As Francis Jennings (1968:16) explains, “no one has yet explained satisfactorily the strange circumstances under which they were attacked and dispersed from their homeland.” Disease may provide an explanation for population loss, since biological analysis of skeletal remains indicates that the Susquehannock increasingly experienced disease and physical strain after European contact (Boza Arlotti 1997). Scholars have also suggested warfare as an explanation for population loss as well. However, it is debatable whether any specific battles caused severe population loss for the Susquehannock (Kent 1984:50).

In addition, theories surrounding Susquehannock “decline” are not only ambiguous, but view Susquehannock culture as static and isomorphic. Perhaps the most controversial theory suggests that acculturation to European culture was the main factor that caused Susquehannock decline. Scholars have suggested that, because European objects are highly prevalent at late Susquehannock sites, they must have experienced a loss of their own cultural identity, customs, and practices. As a result, the Susquehannock experienced a great deal of social instability and were unable to maintain social cohesion amidst the fur trade conflict (Custer 1985; Witthoft
1959). For instance, Mangold (1987:1) explains how “they were engaged in almost constant warfare with the Iroquois until, finally, in 1675, the Susquehannocks suffered a defeat that destroyed the viability of the culture.” Of course, the viability of Susquehannock culture could not have been destroyed; they resided at the Byrd Leibhart site until 1677 (Kent 1984:53), helped to found Conestoga Town in 1690 (ibid.:58), and established positive relations with the Schuylkill or Delaware Indians in the mid 1690’s (ibid.:57). The Susquehannock certainly experienced transformations and changes, but notions of cultural “decline” and “collapse” by 1675 are based on false notions of a static Susquehannock culture. This paper will attempt to avoid acculturation models that suggest that the Susquehannock experienced a cultural “decline” during the colonial era. Rather, I will highlight the negotiation and agency enacted by the Susquehannock during the Strickler Phase in hopes of contributing a new perspective to this discussion. I will demonstrate how past perceptions of a static Susquehannock culture have been problematic, and I hope to provide a new framework upon which future research can attempt to discern the complex changing dynamics of Susquehannock society during the colonial era.

The Strickler Site Collection

For over a century, the Strickler Site (36La3) has been of interest to historians as well as amateur and professional archaeologists. The site is located in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania (Figure 1.1). Like many archaeological sites, the Strickler Site experienced tampering and disruption prior to formal archaeological excavation. Since the site is located on a farm, seasonal plowing since the mid-eighteenth century has undoubtedly exposed many artifacts (Kent 1984:348). Looting has also been an issue at many Susquehannock sites (ibid.:349), although Futur’s excavation records do not mention any previous disturbance or looting. However,
excavators including Donald A. Cadzow (1936), Arthur Futer (1959), and Barry Kent (1984) have conducted proper excavations at the site.

This study investigates artifacts from the Strickler Site excavated by Arthur A. Futer starting in 1947. These artifacts are now located at the North Museum in Lancaster, Pennsylvania. As Futer (1959:136) explains, the area that he excavated at intervals for about a decade consisted of individual burials that were “confined to the northeastern area of the burial line,” although he argues that “the burial grounds extend on a terrace edge in an arc from the
southwest end of the site to the northeast, with the village located toward the center of the arc” (Figure 1.2). Kent (1984:349), who excavated other portions of the site in the 1970s, describes how there were three cemeteries at the site, each excavated by different archaeologists over the past century. The collection represented at the North Museum, excavated by Arthur Futer, is known as Cemetery 2 (ibid.:350). Although Kent attempts to describe the nature of excavations conducted prior to his own archaeological mitigation efforts at the site, it is difficult to get a sense of the relationship and scale of these cemeteries. Futer (1959) records a total of 105 burials excavated from what has been called Cemetery 2 (although some are missing from the written record), and describes ninety-five of these burials in his chapter in *Susquehannock Miscellany*.

![Figure 1.2. Map of the Strickler Site (Kent 1984:350).](image-url)
**Pipes: A Useful Line of Evidence**

The study of material culture is extremely useful in understanding the complex dynamics of the colonial era, which is full of intricacies and complexities that can be difficult to decipher. But as Yaeger and Canuto (2000:11) explain, “archaeologists can attempt to counteract this ambiguity by examining the material conditions that structured those interactions.” The Futer Collection contains a very diverse assemblage of both native and European objects. Archaeologists, particularly Barry Kent (1984), have attempted to provide basic descriptions of Susquehannock material culture and the types of native and European goods seen on a variety of Susquehannock sites. William Mangold (1987:1) extends these descriptions even further and argues that Susquehannock material culture “can provide insights into the functions of those objects, their changing forms, and the reasons for those changes.” But what seems to be missing from previous research is an in-depth study of one type of material culture. This study investigates pipes, both European and native-made, to better understand Susquehannock negotiation enacted through trade and consumption during the colonial era.

There are several reasons why an analysis of the pipe assemblage in the Futer Collection may clarify the nature of Susquehannock trade relations as well as their consumption of both trade and native-made goods. First, pipes are extremely useful for chronology and dating purposes. It is often possible to place European trade pipes within a somewhat accurate date range using Adrian Oswald’s (1961 and 1975) studies on European pipes. Certain pipes with maker’s marks can often be traced back to specific locations of manufacture. In addition, European pipe stem fragments are often useful forms of dating, based on Lewis Binford’s (1962) equation for using bore stem diameter for a large assemblage of pipes to determine its overall
date range. Therefore, pipes can serve as strong indicators of trade, suggesting with whom the Susquehannock were trading as well as when they obtained these goods.

H. Geiger Omwake’s (1959:135) discussion especially highlights the importance of European pipes for better understanding Susquehannock exchange. He makes use of a small kaolin pipe stem assemblage from the Oscar Leibhart site in order to date the site, and suggests that it was occupied from 1648 to 1674. Not only was Omwake able to use these pipes to generally date the site, but he was also able to suggest that the Susquehannock were specifically trading with the Dutch and Swedes at this location. Although the date range for the Strickler Site has been determined, this study makes use of the assemblage of white kaolin pipes from the Strickler Site in a similar fashion, especially to more precisely identify trade relations.

Native-made pipes are also a significant source of information for understanding Susquehannock trade relations. On a basic level, an understanding of the distribution of native-made pipes in relation to European pipes may indicate not only with whom the Susquehannock traded, but how they used and interpreted these goods in dynamic and transformative ways. Native-made pipes can be compared with the trade pipes in terms of both distribution and function to get a sense of how the Susquehannock used, interpreted, and perhaps redefined previous uses and interpretations of these pipes. Pipes are also useful artifacts to analyze because they often demonstrate specific trade relations once their point of origin is known. In addition, they may often indicate cultural influence between the Susquehannock and neighboring Native American and European groups. For instance, Cadzow (1936:77-81) describes the distinct types of pipes represented in his excavations of the Strickler Site in 1931, suggesting that while some pipes were locally made and demonstrate unique Susquehannock characteristics, others show
influence from different native peoples including the Iroquois, especially those from the Seneca region of New York.

On a deeper level, while pipes are useful chronological indicators and markers of trade relations, they also often strongly connote important information about ritual, social status, and gender. An understanding of the pipe assemblage may suggest how colonialism potentially influenced a transformation or redefinition of Susquehannock smoking practices. They therefore indicate how the Susquehannock actively negotiated their own cultural changes and redefinitions. Issues of gender, exclusivity, and ritual often arise in discussions of pipe usage. Michael Nassaney (2004:129) explains how “men, tobacco, and ritual were often associated in native North America prior to European contact,” therefore indicating that pipe smoking was a once highly gendered and exclusive male practice. However, “smoking became more widespread in native society by the mid seventeenth-century as men, women, and children adopted it” (Nassaney 2004:129). William Turnbaugh (1977) offers a similar argument for the Algonquians. Another model presented by Nassaney (2004:133) suggests that there was an increase in tobacco use in native society in order to better connect with the ritual realm in a time of conflict and often hostility. Pipes can therefore indicate the types of gendered, social, and cultural processes that existed during a particular time period. A strong understanding of the pipe assemblage from this portion of the Strickler Site may therefore shed light on not only the nature of Susquehannock trade relations, but how they were interacting with European groups and simultaneously altering their own customs and practices in purposeful and meaningful ways during the colonial era.
CHAPTER 2: BACKGROUND

This chapter will provide relevant background information necessary to this study. First, I will provide a culture history overview of the Susquehannock. Next, I will describe the complexity of Susquehannock trade relations, particularly the shifting alliances between natives and Europeans and the nature of ongoing conflicts between the Susquehannock and neighboring native groups. I will then discuss Susquehannock life during the Strickler Phase in detail. In particular, I will explain the nature of Susquehannock trade relations during these two decades, their social organization, and the history of these people shortly after the Strickler Site’s occupation. I will then discuss the function, purpose, and meaning of pipes in native culture. I will explore not only the complexities of pipe usage, but how there may have been a redefinition of pipe usage by the time of the Strickler Phase. Finally, I will describe the relevance of mortuary contexts in this study. This chapter will draw upon ethnohistoric sources for relevant descriptions of the Susquehannock when appropriate.

The Susquehannock: A Culture History Overview

Current literature on the Susquehannock is scarce and does little to shed light on their dynamic culture. While they are occasionally mentioned in discussions of the decline and decimation of native peoples during the colonial era, little has been written about Susquehannock social or political organization, religious practice, or constructions of gender and age. Though they often receive brief mention in the broader context of Native American and European relations during the colonial era, literature on the Susquehannock typically does not describe their practices, beliefs, and customs.
There is one theme in Susquehannock history that literature emphasizes: their role as traders. As Hunter (1959:18) explains, “the historical importance of the Susquehannocks lay in their role as traders,” specifically because they “carried on an active exchange of goods with Dutch traders on the lower Delaware and with the English in Maryland; and, acting as middlemen as well as hunters, they extended their operations into the region of the Ohio.” Clearly, the Susquehannock played a large role in the fur trade in the mid seventeenth century. However, an understanding of the Susquehannock as traders alone does not take into account other important aspects of their society, such as their social and political dynamics or their religious practice.

Another commonly discussed characteristic of Susquehannock history is their ancestral relationship to the Iroquois. In his descriptions of the ancestry of the Susquehannock, John Witthoft (1959:39) explains how “we do not know whether the Susquehannock were a late offshoot of the League or were a tribal group cut off from the Cayuga during the formation of the League […] About 1550 Susquehannock ceramics had just become distinct from those of the Cayuga.” As a result, most historians and archaeologists concur with the notion that, at some point after 1550, the Susquehannock officially branched off from the Iroquoian League and became their own culturally distinct group located in Central Pennsylvania. Barry Kent (1984:7) agrees with this idea, suggesting, “we can basically assume that the social organization, religious structures and technological capabilities of the Susquehannocks were more or less identical with those of the ethnographically and historically better-known Iroquois.” For instance, Iroquoian influence is visible in Susquehannock pipes. Often, it is possible to make parallels between these two distinct yet culturally similar groups in order to get a better sense of Susquehannock culture. There is simply more information available on Iroquoian culture and material culture. As a
result, much of the research conducted for this study makes cross-cultural comparisons between the Susquehannock and the Iroquois when appropriate. At the same time, however, it is important to recognize that the Susquehannock were a distinct cultural group with distinct traditions and customs.

**Susquehannock Trade Relations**

As the fur trade developed, three main tribes played a dominant role, pushing other native groups out of this trade network: the Hurons, the Iroquois, and the Susquehannock (Wallace 1989:13). As Paul Wallace (1989:13) explains, “when the fur trade developed, these three Iroquoian powers – Huron, Iroquois, Susquehannocks – were able to cut off the coastal tribes [...] from the rich hunting lands of the interior, and so to seize the position of middlemen in the trade.” These groups not only maintained central roles in the fur trade, but competitively pushed other native groups out of the trade arena. By 1640, most scholars agree that the Susquehannock were at the height of their power as traders, interacting with the Dutch and Swedes at the mouth of the Schuylkill River and the English along the Chesapeake Bay (ibid.:100). At this point in time, the Hurons maintained strong trade relations with the French in the North, while the Iroquois needed to re-evaluate their trading strategy in order to remain competitive in the fur trade. In 1647, the Hurons allied themselves with the Susquehannock in order to increase their power as they fought against the Iroquois, who were attempting to break into the fur trade with the French (ibid.:102). Iroquoian attacks on the Hurons broke their alliance with the Susquehannock and removed the Hurons from the trade arena in the 1650’s (ibid.:102). Thus tensions mounted between native groups during this time period as a result of colonialism, particularly through a desire to maintain a dominant role in the fur trade.
Ethnohistoric sources highlight how the English positioned themselves at the forefront of the fur trade through their relationship with the Susquehannock. A treaty was established between the Susquehannock and the English in Maryland in 1661; portions of the Maryland Records reveal that “a law of Maryland passed May 1, 1661, authorized the Governor to aid the Susquehannocks, under which they were furnished with a quantity powder and lead, also with two pieces of artillery and four men to manage them” (quoted in Murray 1931:80). Thus the English provided the Susquehannock with arms and military protection so that they could better fight against Iroquoian attacks. Maryland Records of New Amstel on May 21, 1661 also describe the rules and regulations for English interactions with the Susquehannock. In particular, the English aided the Susquehannock in constructing a fortification area, and the Governor of Maryland demanded that the Susquehannock help with the construction of this fort in exchange for protection against the Seneca (Murray 1931:79). The Strickler Site was determined to be the location of this defensive fort during the period of alliance between the Susquehannock and the English (Kent 1984:348). Other demands from the English governor of Maryland to his men interacting with the Susquehannock dictate the following:

Upon your arrival to the fort, immediately press them to appoint some one or more of their great men, to whom you shall make your applications on all occasions – that is, either in demanding assistance to help fortify, or of provision, or upon any orders received from us […] You are carefully to avoid all quarrels with the Indians; and therefore, permit not the soldiers (to) sit drinking or gaming with them, but keep them to exact military discipline and to avoid idleness often exercise them […] Lastly, you are to have a wary eye upon all Dutch that come to the fort, observing their actions and treaties with the Indians, but show not any animosity against them; if you find any close contrivances to our prejudice, give us speedy notice, and oppose, with discretion, any open actions that may tend to our loss (quoted in Murray 1931:79-80).

These excerpts highlight several aspects of the relations between the English and Susquehannock. First, their relation involved a certain degree of reciprocity, since the natives were expected to help with the construction of this fort in exchange for English protection.
Second, these descriptions indicate that the interactions between the Susquehannock and English were not particularly personalized, but merely entailed military involvement. Finally, ethnohistoric accounts indicate that the Susquehannock were interacting with the Dutch during this time period, despite English attempts to monitor Susquehannock relations with other European groups. They were therefore playing several angles within the context of the fur trade, rebelling against English desires and the supposed parameters of their alliance. Although the English tried to maintain control, Susquehannock relationships with other European groups seem to have been a form of resistance against the English.

Primary sources also indicate that Seneca attacks on the Susquehannock in 1663 were easy to overcome, demonstrating the extent of Susquehannock power at this time (Wallace 1989:103). Father Jerome Lalemant extensively describes this Seneca defeat in the Jesuit Relations, explaining how “Iroquois humbled by this affront more than can be imagined, disbanded, and come to put themselves on the defensive, they who till now had borned their victorious arms though all these countries” (quoted in Murray 1931:810). The Susquehannock therefore possessed the ability to easily defend themselves against the Iroquois. Their power is often attributed to their alliance with the English, since they were given aid through the construction of the fort and military arms and protection through this relationship (Wallace 1989:103). However, in 1674, Englishmen in Maryland reversed their policy with native groups and ended their treaty with the Susquehannock. Trade relations therefore completely shifted as a result of these negotiations. These relations highlight the competitive nature of trade during this time period, not only between native groups, but between native peoples and Europeans as well. Native groups were competing with one another in order to trade with various European groups, and each group established specific alliances in order to secure a prominent role within a
competitive trade arena. Both Native Americans and Europeans were actively engaging in negotiations to better their position in this colonial context.

*The Strickler Phase*

The Susquehannock resided along the Susquehanna River for only a century, beginning around 1575. This occupation is divided into several phases, described most clearly by Barry Kent (1984:18-24). Although several characteristics of Susquehannock society endured during all of these stages, perhaps the most significant is the fact that each site is located near the Susquehanna River. As Donald Cadzow (1936:62) explains, “Located above the swift water between what is now Safe Harbor and Turkey Hill, the Susquehanna River […] constituted not only a natural migration route but a highway for ready transportation and trade between the Indian tribes which at different times settled along its banks.” As a result, although the Susquehannock shifted site locations over time, their location along the Susquehanna River was a distinct feature of their settlement pattern that shaped their central role as traders along this advantageous transportation route.

The 1640’s mark the beginning of the Strickler Phase (Kent 1984:22). During this phase, the Susquehannock occupied a single site that was the largest known Susquehannock village: the Strickler Site, located in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania (ibid.:348). The suspected date range of this site has changed over time; while Cadzow (1936:96) explains that he “can safely assign the site to a period between 1629 and 1675,” Kent (1984:348) places this site at a more precise date range of 1645 through 1665. I will apply Kent’s date range of 1645-1665 in this study because Kent’s work contains a greater amount of information on datable material culture and
incorporates a strong understanding of Susquehannock historical context and ethnohistoric sources.

Barry Kent conducted extensive research to determine population estimates for the Strickler Site. This research is based upon the number of excavated postmolds thought to represent longhouses, and considers how many individuals would have lived in a single longhouse. As Kent (1984:361) explains, “an 80 by 17-foot Iroquois longhouse in the middle of the eighteenth century could have accommodated, in 20 compartments, 60 people.” However, Kent suggests that it is necessary to lower these figures because Susquehannock longhouses only measured 60 feet each, indicating that each house could hold 40 people. At the end of this analysis, he suggests that a total of 2,900 people would have lived at the site at any given time (ibid.:364). Although this method of population estimation is somewhat subjective and controversial, when this same method is applied to a large range of Susquehannock sites, it clearly demonstrates the drastic increase in population and site size over time. For instance, while the Strickler site would have been 550,000 square feet with a population estimate of 2,900 people, the earlier Washington Boro site would have only been 250,000 square feet with a population estimate of 1,700 people (ibid.:364).

Kent (1984:343) suggests that by 1660 the Strickler Site ceased to experience population growth, and by 1665 the site was no longer occupied. However, no other concrete archaeological evidence has been pursued to determine whether the end of the Strickler Phase represented a particularly threatening time period for the Susquehannock. Beth Bursick (2010:18) claims that the Susquehannock

[...]were engaged in a constant struggle for power with other Native American groups and suffering losses from the conflict, trying to navigate tricky and fragile negotiations with the colonists, and facing the threat of disease inside their own
community. These last years at the Strickler Site show a decline in the Susquehannock’s power as they struggle to overcome these issues.

Although she astutely describes the tensions and struggles that arise in the history of the Susquehannock during this time period, archaeological evidence from the Strickler Site has yet to clarify this issue.

Several scholars have presented a general model that the Strickler Phase represents a period in which the Susquehannock were heavily involved in the fur trade with Europeans, and perhaps even dominated trade for a time. In his discussion of the Strickler Site, Barry Kent (1984:367) explains, “it would appear that it was the sole village of the Susquehannocks during that period. This was clearly the period of the height of Susquehannock political and economic power.” Henry Frank Eshleman (1909:17) also seems to agree with this notion that European aid and alliance allowed the Susquehannock to flourish during this time period, even before this treaty was established with the English in Maryland. He describes how “about 1633 the Susquehannocks seemed to have an undisputed superiority over all other tribes” (Eshleman 1909:17). Primary sources also explain that the English of Maryland aided the Susquehannock in building a fort. The English most likely helped the Susquehannock construct this fort to compete with other European groups, particularly the Dutch (Murray 1931:79). The presence of this fort at the Strickler Site and alliance with the English of Maryland in 1661 are strong indicators of this superiority and power in terms of both trade relations and land control.

These questions are all considered and explored in light of the fact that colonialism must have necessarily impacted Susquehannock culture and society. This study explores the consumption of trade and native-made goods at the Strickler Site in order to delve into the specific ways the Susquehannock played a central role in their own process of transformation during the colonial era. It will make use of a material culture analysis approach in order to
understand this process of cultural exchange and consumption, particularly within the context of the fur trade during the Strickler Phase.

Pipes in Native Culture

Smoking pipes have a variety of functions, purposes, and meanings in Native American cultures across North America, and these meanings seem to be equally complex for the Susquehannock. In particular, it is significant to understand the ways smoking and tobacco are indicators of gender roles, political relationships, and communal and individualized ritual. Native men alone cultivated tobacco, and “while its frequency of occurrence is difficult to assess prior to contact, there appears to have been a link between men, ritual, and tobacco at the time of contact, with increasing use over time” (Nassaney 2004:127). Not only was smoking considered a gendered activity in prehistoric times, but it also had strong ritual and political connotations as well. Native Americans participated in smoking a “Peace Pipe” to establish negotiations and peaceful relationships with all participating individuals, while they would have used “War Pipes” to organize and prepare individuals participating in warfare (Steinmetz 1984:30). In many of these contexts, the smoking of tobacco has ritual connotations, since “tobacco smoke is considered by many Native American tribes to be the visual form of prayers and invocations” (Mangold 1987:21), and “tobacco, offered directly or as smoke, allows for communication with the spirits” (Paper 1988a:5). Thus smoking was used as a form of connecting with and invoking the spiritual realm to promote a particular outcome, such as a peaceful negotiation or success in warfare.

Although scholars agree that pipes were typically used for ritual purposes, the type of pipe used for specific ritual functions is less clear. Paul Steinmetz (1984:28) explains how “there
were many different kinds of pipes, that, although they were common to all tribes, their religious meaning and sacramental uses were very diverse.” The Sacred Pipe is a type of pipe that especially pertains to ritual use. The bowl and stem are two separate parts that are brought together exclusively during ritual; many Native American cultures used them prior to European contact (Paper 1988a:9). For many Native Americans, this type of pipe often related to mythological tales passed down through generations through story-telling (Steinmetz 1984). However, there seem to have been a wide variety of pipe shapes and sizes that would have been used for ritual purposes. Jordan Paper (1988b:651) also explains how “early European descriptions, not written by ethnologists, do not always report the full ritual, but they all specify that the sacred pipe was pointed in the direction of the spirits.” Although pipes are known for their relationship to the spiritual realm, the specific purpose, meaning, and symbolism behind these ritual acts is not fully understood. For the Susquehannock, the ritual significance associated with certain pipes is particularly difficult to ascertain, since there are so few ethnohistoric records of these people.

Many pipes contained effigy forms intended to invoke spiritual guidance. However, the significance of these effigies is not entirely understood, since “it is not known which symbols may have had stronger significance or power, or if the artifact of which they are a part was ‘powerful’ in its own right” (Mangold 1987:22). In addition, effigies have also been interpreted not only for their ritual significance, but for their social significance as well. Perhaps different effigies may have symbolized distinct totems or clans for the Susquehannock, a theory that has been applied to Iroquoian effigy pipes (Mangold 1987:22).

Tobacco was typically associated with men both ritually and politically in prehistoric times, but this exclusively male pipe usage may have transformed during the colonial era.
Michael Nassaney (2004) provides extensive commentary on how Native American pipe use experienced transformations during the colonial era, possibly as a result of European influence. On one level, Europeans began to create and import their own pipes to the Americas, and “imported pipes were also accompanied by the introduction of a new species of tobacco from the Caribbean (*Nicotiana tabacum*) that was used alongside of *Nicotiana rustica*” (Nassaney 2004:130). Europeans, particularly the English, began to trade European white ball clay pipes to Native Americans along with strains of tobacco not indigenous to North America.

However, while the introduction of these European trade pipes into native material culture is worth noting, European influence on native smoking may have had broader cultural and social implications than the trade pipes themselves. As Nassaney (2004:129) argues, “smoking became more widespread in native society by the mid-seventeenth century as men, women, and children adopted it.” He makes use of skeletal analysis conducted on men, women, and children to suggest that respiratory complications were increasingly visible and prevalent on women and children in the mid-seventeenth century, thereby implying that they incorporated the practice of smoking (ibid.:130). In addition, he addresses the possibility that the English were participating in casual tobacco smoking by the end of the seventeenth century, and that perhaps native peoples were emulating English recreational tobacco use (ibid.:130). However, as Nassaney (ibid.:131) suggests, it seems most likely that natives were not simply emulating this recreational practice and rejecting the previous significance placed on the male activity of ritual and political smoking, but rather that “tobacco had different meanings and contexts of use for native men, native women, and Europeans, and these meanings were not simply transcended by the exchange of tobacco and pipes.” Regardless, the fact that women began to smoke during the seventeenth century implies that the practice of smoking experienced a redefinition and
realignments. Although smoking may have become a recreational activity for women and children, thereby redefining gender roles and the meaning behind prehistoric pipe usage, men still continued to use certain exclusive native-made pipes for ritual purposes.

Another component that is highly significant, and will be discussed in more detail later, is the fact that not all native pipes were alike. Native Americans used different types of pipes for distinct ritual and social reasons (Nassaney 2004:132), but they continued to prefer using their own pipes for ritual purposes, and males continued to be the individuals responsible for smoking (ibid.:133). As Neal Trubowitz (2004:144) explains, “it seemed that there was little interest by Native Americans in the European white clay version of smoking pipes.” Of course, this does not imply that European pipes were insignificant and did not play a role in native society. Rather, it indicates that they continued to view their own pipes as ritually and socially significant, and that European pipes were not able to simply replace native ones. Although the European influence may have initiated the practice of native recreational smoking, native peoples still preferred to use their own pipes.

These changing social practices and dynamics are apparent in the archaeological record, and yet are difficult to fully understand. On the one hand, it has been suggested by Nassaney (2004) that women and children began to make use of smoking pipes for recreation, possibly emulating Europeans. On the other hand, it has also been suggested that perhaps women and children began to use pipes, ritually and politically charged objects, to contribute to the spiritual well-being of their communities during an increasingly complex and conflict-ridden time. As Nassaney (2004:133) suggests, “tobacco use increased to benefit society. In the process, ritual became less institutional and more personal as the efficacy of religious specialists was questioned and their roles were being challenged.” Nassaney therefore suggests that ritual
smoking became an increasingly democratized practice because religious specialists became incapable of averting the problems associated with the colonial context. As a result, a stronger understanding of this pipe assemblage may demonstrate why these objects appear to have been used on a more widespread basis after European contact, and how colonialism may have caused a social, political, and religious transformation to take place in native society through a new perception of pipe smoking.

**Mortuary Contexts**

Much of what has been left behind in the Susquehannock archaeological record comes from mortuary contexts, which certainly affects the analysis and interpretation of these materials. Archaeologists have theorized and debated how to interpret these contexts and the grave goods they contain. In particular, archaeologists often use the material culture found in a mortuary context to better understand the Susquehannock (Boza Arlotti 1997; Custer 1985; Witthoft, Kinsey and Holzinger 1959). These contexts provide a distinct window into Susquehannock society not only because they often contain a high frequency of artifacts, but because they are ritually and spiritually powerful spaces.

Not only are the pipes themselves objects that highly connote ritual activity through the practice of smoking, but the mortuary contexts in which these pipes were found are also of great significance. As Susan Gillespie (2000:75) explains, burials are contexts “in which actual physical remains are usually present together with material signifiers of the individual’s experiences and identities in life.” As a result, the materials placed in a burial context are highly significant objects that often make connections to the ritual realm. Mortuary goods not only indicate the experiences and practices of the individual with whom they are buried, but they may
also provide information on the relationship between the individual and the broader society to which he or she belonged (Gillespie 2000:76). As a result, I will consider how the individual buried with a particular pipe may have used and interpreted this object in his or her own smoking practices. Furthermore, I will relate the presence of pipes found in certain burial contexts to broader patterns of smoking practices within Susquehannock society.

An issue more difficult to grapple with, however, is how to interpret native and European goods found in the same mortuary context. The question remains: what does the distribution of these goods within a mortuary context signify, and how did the Susquehannock consume, interpret, and perceive them? Ana Maria Boza Arlotti (1997) tackles this issue, providing an extremely useful and extensive commentary on the evolution of social organization of Susquehannock society over time through an analysis of the mortuary goods found at various Susquehannock sites. In particular, her “objective therefore is to understand the social mechanisms by which Susquehannock society adapted to the new regional scenario” (Boza Arlotti 1997:2). For this objective, she explains how she will “rely on grave goods and their shifts in distribution through time” (ibid.:14). Because European contact was most likely a factor that initiated change in Susquehannock society, a shift in grave good distribution indicates a social change over time, whereas a lack of change seen in the grave good distribution is an indicator that not a great deal of social transformation took place in Susquehannock communities despite European contact (ibid.:15-16). Boza Arlotti’s work demonstrates how the distribution of material culture found in a mortuary context can provide a great deal of information on the impact of colonialism on Susquehannock society.

A similar methodology can be applied to the Futer Collection artifacts containing contextual information from Cemetery 2. This study incorporates a similar yet more basic form
of analysis and draws upon Boza Arlotti (1997) and Jay Custer’s (1985) works when appropriate. This study will not only look at the distribution of artifacts found in Cemetery 2, but will also consider this broader context when discussing specific pipes. However, it is also useful to discuss the complex meaning, purpose, and function behind artifacts found in mortuary contexts, not simply their distribution. For this reason, I will discuss particular pipes not only in terms of their function and purpose, but in light of their relation to the ritual realm through their presence in a mortuary context as well.
CHAPTER 3: DATA COLLECTION AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter is broken down into three sections, each of which explains the methods used to collect relevant data on the Futer Collection and its pipe assemblage. I first explain the nature of the Futer Collection and the excavation records provided by Arthur Futer. I will then describe the methodology used to collect data on the pipe assemblage and which characteristics I deemed necessary to measure and record. Finally, I will discuss the information recorded by Futer on Cemetery 2.

The Futer Collection: Available Resources

The Futer Collection only represents a portion of the burial grounds that existed at the site. On the one hand, it is relevant to point out the inherent bias in only assessing a portion of the overall assemblage of the site in order to draw broader conclusions about the Susquehannock. At the same time, however, it is possible to interpret the particular burial ground excavated by Futer as a sample of the entire assemblage of artifacts from the Strickler Site, especially since the time frame for the entire site suggested by Kent is so narrow. If the date range for the site were broader, the possibility of bias in only looking at one particular portion of the site would certainly be more likely. Furthermore, the Futer Collection is very similar to the material culture found in other portions of the Strickler Site (Kent, 1984; Cadzow, 1936), and can therefore be considered representative of the entire Strickler Site assemblage.

The availability of resources and provenience information for this collection is complicated and somewhat difficult to decipher, and in many instances the specific archaeological provenience for a particular artifact is not recorded. Many of the artifacts are assigned accession numbers based upon which grave they were associated with in Cemetery 2.
The labeling system for these artifacts created several complications, since artifacts were not given their own unique accession number, but rather were given a number based upon the date in which the burial was excavated. Thus all of the artifacts from a particular burial all have the same accession number, which certainly complicated the process of formulating a database to conduct analysis. Other artifacts in the collection have essentially lost their context information and were given other museum accession numbers.

It was significant to address these provenience issues before any type of analysis could begin. At times, I analyzed the entire dataset in order to avoid any form of statistical bias. Typically, however, certain artifacts needed to be excluded from statistical analyses because they lacked relevant context information. These distinctions in the analyses were made in hopes of relieving some of these issues surrounding the reoccurring lack of context and provenience information.

Pipe Analysis

In order to begin the process of data collection, a database was created for the entire assemblage of pipes, in which important characteristics were recorded for each individual pipe fragment. The characteristics recorded in this database depended largely upon whether the pipe was native or European in origin. Certain characteristics were recorded for all pipes, whether native or European in origin, including the bowl size, stem length, presence or absence of a mouthpiece, coverings or burnishing, decoration, and any other general comments that might be useful for future reference. Other characteristics, such as bore hole diameter, potential maker’s mark, or typology based on Adrian Oswald’s descriptions (1961 and 1975) were all significant characteristics to record for European pipes in order to determine their date range and their origin.
of manufacture. Other characteristics recorded for European pipes included length of the stem if applicable, burnishing, rim finish, position of mark, type of mark, mark method, decoration, and date range. Pipes of native origin, however, required the recording of several other unique characteristics distinct from European pipes. These included their native typology according to Jordan Paper’s (1988a:68-70) general typology of native pipes as well as Kent’s (1984:145-156) descriptions of specific Susquehannock pipe forms. In addition, I recorded the height of the pipe elbow for those pipes that could be categorized as an elbow pipe.

The importance of remaining respectful and careful when handling these pipes was certainly taken into consideration during this study. The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 was an attempt by the federal government to prevent unethical and unlawful treatment of Native American graves and their associated artifacts. However, at present, no tribe in Pennsylvania is officially recognized by the state or national government, making it somewhat difficult to determine to whom Susquehannock remains and artifacts should be repatriated. As a result, the Futer Collection has yet to be repatriated, though unsuccessful attempts have been made to return the collection to Iroquoian peoples due to their ancestral relation to the Susquehannock.

Database: Grappling With Cemetery 2

As previously explained, this research investigates artifacts, and pipes in particular, excavated from the Strickler Site’s Cemetery 2. Excavation records written by Arthur Futer include the day in which each burial was excavated, the number of individuals associated with each burial, the size of the burial pit (length, width, and depth), the position of the body (flexed or extended), and each artifact associated with the grave. Although the records provide
descriptions of each artifact found in a particular grave, these descriptions are often vague and inconclusive, and the position of these artifacts within the grave is not noted. Burial numbers were assigned based on the day in which Futer excavated the grave.

Futer explains in his excavation notes how most of the skeletal remains in the burials experienced a great deal of deterioration over time. As a result, he is typically unable to provide extensive information on sex or age. He is, however, able to ascertain that six of these individuals are children, while three are adults. Preservation in certain skeletal remains allowed him to make the claim that seven of these individuals are male, while six are female. This issue will be discussed in more depth in the analysis section.

In merely flipping through these excavation records, it becomes readily apparent that Futer discovered a large quantity of grave goods at this cemetery. In addition, the artifacts were quite diverse; while some are European in origin, others are native-made. For each burial, the number of associated objects as well as the type of object was recorded in a database. Attention was paid to the origin of each object, as well as a general artifact category for each object. For the sake of comparison, I chose to record the categories of each artifact based loosely on Barry Kent’s (1984:vii-viii) sections on the material culture of the Susquehannock in Susquehanna’s Indians. Categories of artifacts include native ceramics, European ceramics, guns, gun parts, and gun flints, native pipes, European pipes, metal tools, organic materials, textiles, metal adornment, lithic tools, shell and bone pendants, glass, trade kettles, and other metal objects. These categories will be explained in detail in the analysis section. In addition, I recorded the number of European and native objects associated with each grave.

Given such a large assemblage of grave goods, it became readily apparent that the analysis of these artifacts would need to be narrowed down to answer the questions raised in the
initial stages of my research. Overall, the analysis section of this paper makes use of the material culture found at the Strickler Site in order to make claims about the nature of Susquehannock agency in the context of their trade relations. The dataset on the entire Futer Collection is full of potential for findings on Susquehannock culture, even in relation to my particular research questions. I attempted to narrow down the focus of this analysis by looking at what areas of the dataset were most relevant to the pipe assemblage.
CHAPTER 4: ANALYSIS

The Futer Collection dataset is quite extensive due to the large assemblage of diverse grave goods. The analysis of this collection is comprised of several stages. I first discuss the Futer Collection in light of pertinent colonial issues, particularly the distribution of the different types of grave goods. I then consider the complexity of the pipe assemblage. I will discuss in detail the different types of pipes represented in the assemblage, the distribution of native and European pipes, and a description of the meaning and significance of certain pipes and their relation to the complexity of Susquehannock trade, exchange, and pipe usage during this time.

The Futer Collection: The Entire Assemblage

On one level, a basic discussion of the entire Futer Collection is necessary because it introduces the broader patterns of the mortuary assemblage. More importantly, however, this type of analysis allows for a comparison between the specific patterns in the pipe assemblage and the overall patterns in the broader mortuary assemblage. A specific analysis of one line of material culture can often challenge the broader patterns of the entire assemblage. I include this section to emphasize the importance of looking at the complexity inherent in the artifacts themselves rather than relying too heavily on overall patterns in the broader assemblage.

The majority of literature dealing with Susquehannock material culture divides artifacts into “native” and “European” categories. In one sense, this is highly problematic, since the origin of a particular artifact is only one facet of its unique history. It does not speak to the particular function, purpose, or meaning of the object for the Susquehannock. Furthermore, as Patricia Rubertone (2000:428) summarizes, “studies of artifacts became the means to study the acculturative process by providing a way to gauge the extent to which Native American cultures
had changed as a result of contact with Europeans.” Scholars have referenced the high frequency of European goods found at Susquehannock sites to reinforce models of acculturation and cultural decimation, without providing any reflection on the meaning behind these objects for the Susquehannock. In another sense, however, this dichotomy may help to elucidate basic trade patterns between the Susquehannock and Europeans, and may also demonstrate what types of goods the Susquehannock incorporated into their daily lives in distinctive ways.

There are a wide variety of grave goods represented in the Futer Collection (Table 4.1). These objects are somewhat difficult to categorize, since many were made out of several different materials and could have been used for a variety of functions in a native context. The categories represented in Table 4.1 demonstrate the basic breakdown of these artifact classes, though by no means are these categories comprehensive. The table excludes wampum and trade beads, since the excavation records do not provide detailed information on the exact number of beads. The average number of grave goods associated with a particular individual was 11.10. The largest artifact class represented in the Futer Collection, according to this categorization, is metal tools, with a total of 189 objects and an average of 1.85 metal tools per grave. These include objects used for utilitarian purposes such as axes, knives, or scissors. The next largest category of artifacts is organic material, with a total of 112 objects and an average of 1.10 per grave. Organic objects include grave bark, seeds and animal bone found in trade kettles or clay pots, and red ochre used for paint. The category of metal adornment is also highly represented, with 106 total objects and an average of 1.04 objects per grave. These metal adornment objects include brass and iron bracelets, brass pendants, metal buttons, metal buckles, or pierced thimbles that would have been worn on native clothing. The two least represented artifact
categories here are European ceramics, with only 7 pieces of ceramic total, and European pipes, with only 8 pipes total.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Average Number Per Grave</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native Ceramics</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Ceramics</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guns, Gun Parts, Gun Flints</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Pipes</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Pipes</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Tools</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Materials</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Adornment</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithic Tools</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell/Bone Pendants</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Kettles</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Objects, Other</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Grave Goods</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>1132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1. Distribution of Artifacts in the Futer Collection

Archaeologists have shown interest in looking at how material culture is distributed by sex and age at Susquehannock sites (Boza Arlotti 1997; Custer 1985). In this case, the lack of skeletal preservation does not yield extensive data on age or sex. It is therefore difficult to make a strong commentary on how European and native goods were distributed amongst burials for males, females, adults, or children. Futer does not indicate his methodology for determining the age or sex of these skeletal remains. If he had used the material culture to try and sex the individuals found in these burials, this methodology would certainly be problematic in the context of this research. However, for the adults, it seems likely that he used the skeletal remains rather than the material culture found in the burial to make determinations about the individual’s
sex. If Futer had made use of the material culture to determine sex, he most likely would have used this methodology to determine sex far more extensively. In addition, it seems unlikely that he would have attributed the presence of a pipe to a female, which will be discussed in further detail, since pipes were typically associated with males. Finally, in his excavation records, he typically indicates which skeletal remains he found in poor preservation. For the individuals with a determined sex, however, he does not note that their remains were in poor condition, indicating that he probably used the remains themselves rather than their associated grave goods to determine sex. Out of 105 graves, only six bodies were determined to be female, while seven were male. Six individuals were identified as children, while only three were considered adults. Two of the identified children were determined to be female, one adult determined male, and one adult determined female. However, because it is even more difficult to determine the sex of children, it is unclear how Futer was able to draw these conclusions. All of the women and children were buried in the flexed position, while five men were buried in the flexed position and two in the extended position.

Although it is difficult to draw broader conclusions on the relationship between material culture, age and sex, Jay Custer (1985) conducted an analysis on the entire assemblage of grave goods from the Futer Collection, including a description of what types of grave goods were associated with a particular sex or age. However, rather than simply divide the assemblage into categories of native versus European goods, he instead divided it into more complex categories: Utilitarian Trade Goods, Non-utilitarian Trade Goods, Firearms, Aboriginal Ceramics, Aboriginal Ornaments, and Aboriginal Stone Tools. Overall, his conclusions suggest that “utilitarian items of both native and European manufacture are more frequently found in graves of adults than in those of younger individuals” (Custer 1985:37). In addition, his data suggests
that adults, particularly males, were associated with a greater variety of grave good classes as well as a higher frequency of grave goods. Custer (1985:40) makes use of the data available through Futer’s excavations to suggest that “males carried out the major high status roles and displayed the major high status symbols in life and death,” thereby indicating that adult males had the highest positions of power and status within Susquehannock society.

The data available through the pipe assemblage seem to confirm Custer’s findings. The pipe assemblage provides evidence to support the notion that males were often associated with these high status symbols often associated with ritual. Only one woman was associated with pipes: one European pipe and one native pipe. However, of the identified males, three were associated with pipes. One man was buried with two native-made pipes, another male with one native-made pipe, and another male with one native-made pipe and three European pipes. When pipes are viewed as status markers, their distribution indicates that males had a higher frequency of status markers than females. A more detailed analysis of other types of status markers in these graves would help to confirm these findings.

Figure 4.1 compares the number of native objects to the number of European objects in each individual burial. These numbers exclude beads, since the high frequency of beads in particular graves would have most likely skewed these data. The findings represented in Figure 4.1 confirm Custer’s (1985:33) suggestion that “graves which were rich in European artifacts were also rich in artifacts of aboriginal origin.” The graves containing a high frequency of European objects also contain a high frequency of native objects. However, the graph also clearly demonstrates how European objects typically outnumbered the native objects. Overall, therefore, the data suggest that there is a segment of the Susquehannock population that had access to a high frequency of both native-made and European goods.
Figure 4.1. Distribution of Native and European Objects in Cemetery 2 Graves.

*The Futer Collection: The Pipe Assemblage*

Although an analysis of the entire Futer Collection is useful in shedding light on trade relations and consumption of native and European goods, this type of analysis on its own is limiting in that it cannot indicate the complexity of what these objects signified in a Susquehannock context. In particular, a Susquehannock would not necessarily have used a European object in the same fashion as a European. Rather, native peoples often incorporated European objects into their material culture in unique ways, demonstrating their desire to
modify, utilize, or interpret an object in a distinctive manner. For instance, the Susquehannock often cut brass kettles to form objects that served other purposes, such as bracelets or conical jinglers (Kent 1984:204-205). A discussion of the meaning, symbolism, and use of the different types of pipes, both native and European, demonstrates the complexity of Susquehannock material culture and the relevance of Susquehannock agency.

When measurements were taken of the pipe assemblage, it became clear that the issue of pipe fragments versus complete pipes would need to be considered. The pipes categorized as “Complete” indicate that they are unbroken pipes, while those considered “Partial” indicate that the stem or mouthpiece is broken. Those pipes listed as having “None” signifies that they have neither a stem nor a mouthpiece, and are simply pipe bowl fragments or unidentifiable fragments. For the entire pipe assemblage, the vast majority of the pipes (79.1%) are partial pipe stem fragments, while 5.3% do not have a stem or a mouthpiece, and 15.6% are complete pipes. For the pipes associated with a specific grave, however, the majority (51.8%) are complete. Only 3.6% of the pipes have neither a stem nor a mouthpiece, and 44.6% are partial pipe stem fragments. In many of these instances, the partial pipes associated with a grave had a complete bowl, but the brittle stems had broken. The majority of the pipes associated with a grave are complete. Although the vast majority of the entire pipe assemblage is comprised of partial pipe stem fragments, it is, at times, important to use this entire dataset in order to avoid any sort of bias. At other times, it is relevant to consider the mostly complete pipes associated with a grave only.

In both the broader pipe assemblage and those found in a mortuary context, the majority can be considered native in origin (Tables 4.2 and 4.3). For the entire assemblage, 86.2%, or 243 pipes, are native in origin, while 13.8%, or 39 pipes, are European in origin. For the pipes
associated with a grave, 83.9%, or 47 pipes, are native in origin, while 16.1%, or 9 pipes, are European in origin. These two assemblages therefore demonstrate similar patterns, where the pipes or pipe fragments of native origin far outnumber those of European origin.

Table 4.2. Origin of Pipes, for the Entire Pipe Assemblage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3. Origin of Pipes, for Pipes Associated With a Grave.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>83.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of the entire Futer Collection assemblage is interesting when compared to that of native and European pipes. The pipe assemblage does not follow the same pattern as the entire Futer Collection assemblage in terms of its distribution of native versus European made goods. While most graves contain a higher proportion of European objects in general, the vast majority of the pipe assemblage is comprised of native-made pipes. Kent (1984:22) explains that, “with the exception of smoking pipes, most other native crafts also begin to deteriorate during this period – primarily as a result of the ready availability of European-made tools, utensils and decorative items.” Pipes are therefore a particularly interesting line of material culture to study, since they demonstrate an aspect of native craftsmanship that prevailed over European manufacture, contrary to the patterns visible in the entire Futer Collection assemblage. Native and European ceramics demonstrate a similar pattern. While the average grave has .54 native ceramic pots or sherds and there are 55 native ceramic sherds total, the average grave only
has .07 European ceramic vessels or sherds and there are only 7 total European ceramic sherds in the entire assemblage.

The materials used to create the pipes include terracotta clay, white ball clay (kaolin), metal, and stone (Tables 4.4 and 4.5). Terracotta clay is the term associated with native pipes made from local clays. For European-made pipes, “white ball clay” is the technical term for what many archaeologists call “kaolin.” However, Trubowitz (2004:146) suggests that the term “kaolin” is a misidentification, and that “white clay” or “white ball clay” should be used instead. I use the categories “metal” and “stone” broadly, since a chemical analysis is typically necessary to accurately identify the particular type of metal or stone. In general, natives used local material to create stone pipes, while metal pipes could be considered European in origin due to the fact that Europeans would have introduced many metals into the Susquehannock community.

For each pipe assemblage, terracotta pipes comprise the vast majority; for the entire pipe assemblage they comprise of 81.9%, and for the pipes associated with a grave they comprise of 76.8%. Pipes of other material types occur far less frequently.
Of the 282 total pipe fragments in the assemblage, 33 were European in origin and made of white ball clay. All of these pipe fragments were broken in one form or another, and only ten of the 33 pipe fragments had an entire pipe bowl that could be characterized using Oswald’s (1975:37-41) Simplified General Typology. Archaeologists often use this typology to date European clay pipes. It takes note of very particular stylistic changes in pipes over time and places these stylistic categories into distinct yet sometimes overlapping date ranges. When this general typology is used in conjunction with more specific information known about a pipe, such as a particular maker’s mark, it is often possible to date the pipe within a decade or two of its manufacture. Three of these ten pipe bowls contained a maker’s mark stamped on the base of the pipe. The rest of these white ball clay fragments were pipe stem fragments that were simply measured for their length and bore hole size. This section will investigate those few pipes that can be understood on a deeper level. The ten pipes containing identifiable bowls in particular, although similar in form and design, each contain unique characteristics that allowed them to be dated and some even traced back to their possible origin of manufacture.

All of these pipes must have been manufactured using a mold, since Europeans molded all exported kaolin pipes (Grillo 2003:1). All of the European clay pipes from this assemblage most likely originated in England. The pipes are all white in color, and the English used white clay for pipe manufacture (Oswald 1975:11). Oswald (1975:18) also explains how “rouletting or milling of the rim of the bowl was the common practice in Britain and Holland in the seventeenth century.” Nearly all of the pipe bowls in this assemblage have a rouletted design around the rim of the bowl. The combination of the white clay and the rouletted design of these pipes point to English manufacture and trade with the Susquehannock. In addition, although
other European countries manufactured pipes, the English dominated the pipe industry in North America during this time.

While these characteristics point to England as their country of origin, their age may be more difficult to decipher. Ivor Noël Hume (1980:304) explains how, in certain respects, “there is, unfortunately, a great deal that we do not yet know about the so-called evolution of bowls and stems, and there is reason to suspect that present stylistic and dating criteria have been oversimplified.” Therefore, many of the studies written on the evolution of clay pipes, particularly Adrian Oswald’s (1961 and 1975) work, may provide useful information that may help to determine a time frame for these pipes, but these dates are not wholly certain. The stylistic characteristics for the English typologies are far more specific (Oswald 1961), but their date ranges are somewhat vague. As a result, most of these pipes were assigned the date range according to the Simplified General Typology (Oswald 1975:37-41).

Figure 4.2. Mus2947. White Ball Clay Pipe with “Rose Incised” Mark.
All but one of these pipes fit into the established date range of the site: 1645-1665. One pipe (Figures 4.2 and 4.3) could be characterized as a number “4” according to the Simplified General Typology. It has a small bowl, a pedestal foot, and a bowl with a rouletted rim, indicating that it dates from 1600-1640 (Oswald 1975:37). This pipe also contains a maker’s mark on the base of the heel stamped in relief. The mark is difficult to identify, but it appears to be some type of flower. Oswald (1975:34) notes a “Rose Incised” pipe from England that dates from 1600-1630, and provides a sketch of the mark that appears nearly identical to the mark on the Strickler Site pipe. As a result, it seems as though this pipe pre-dates the Strickler Site.

The date of this particular pipe raises interesting questions about pipe exchange between the Susquehannock and the English. One possibility is that the English traded the pipe to the Susquehannock during the Strickler Phase several years after its manufacture. However, as Edward Lenik (1971:100) explains, “in general, the clay tobacco pipe was manufactured, imported, smoked, and thrown away, all within a year or two.” Pipes were objects that Europeans, as well as colonists in the New World, could easily and cheaply obtain. To a European, they did not particularly demonstrate wealth or status, nor would they have been
coveted for more than a few years. It thus seems highly unlikely, according to European practice, that a pipe would have been held in English possession for nearly ten years before reaching native hands. An Englishman probably would have broken or discarded the pipe before it could have reached the Susquehannock during the occupation of the Strickler Site.

It seems far more likely that this pipe would have been traded to the Susquehannock during or shortly after its manufacture, from 1600-1630. As a result, it seems most likely that the English traded this pipe to the Susquehannock before the Strickler Site was occupied, and that the Susquehannock transported it to the site when they moved there around 1645. This mode of exchange is an indication that European pipes were seen to have some sort of value to the Susquehannock before and during the Strickler Phase and were not easily discarded as they often were for Europeans. Thus, the fact that there is a pipe that seems to pre-date the site seems to indicate that natives valued these items in a different ways than Europeans.

Figure 4.4. Mus2947. White Ball Clay Pipe with "PE" Maker's Mark.
Two European clay pipes can be dated very neatly within the Strickler Site date range. One pipe (GF2-4855-5) is a very simple pipe that was characterized as a number “5” according to the Simplified General Typology, and a “5a” according to the English Typology. The pipe has a long and large bowl with a rouletted rim, and dates from 1640-1660 (Oswald 1975:37). Another pipe (Figures 4.4 and 4.5) could also be characterized as a “5” according to Oswald’s Simplified General Typology for the same reasons and therefore also dates from 1640-1660. However, the pipe could be characterized as a “5c” according to the English Typology because the bowl is smaller and it has a flat base. In addition, English pipes of this typology are typically associated with a maker’s mark on the base stamped incuse (Oswald 1961:58). This pipe has a stamped incuse maker’s mark with the initials “PE” on the base of the heel. Typically, initials found on a pipe stem stand for the individual who manufactured the pipe. Oswald provides a multitude of pipe makers in England with the initials “PE,” but the mark does not provide any clues as to its precise location of manufacture. The only recorded pipe maker in England with these initials manufacturing pipes during the Strickler Phase is Phillip Edwards of Bristol, who apparently manufactured pipes from 1649-1680 (Oswald 1975:152).

Many of these pipes, however, date to the end of the site’s occupation, providing slight evidence to suggest that perhaps this cemetery was constructed at a later date in comparison to
the other two cemeteries on site. Of course, a stronger comparison with the date ranges of pipes found in the other cemeteries could potentially shed light on this issue. One pipe (Figures 4.6 and 4.7) fits under the general typology number “6” for its large bulbous bowl and large base, thereby placing it within the 1660-1680 date range as well. However, it fits into the English typology number “5b” because “the front edge curves inward from the lip and the line of the latter is at an acute angle to the stem” (Oswald 1961:57). In addition, this pipe has a maker’s mark on the base of the heel stamped in relief with the maker’s initials. However, it is difficult to determine whether these initials are “LW” or “IW.” It seems most likely that they represent the initials “IW.” Oswald provides several figures and photographs of maker’s marks stamped in relief, and those initials containing the letter “I” indicate that this letter in particular was somewhat carelessly rendered. In addition, what appears to be the letter “I” most likely represented the letter “J” in seventeenth century writing. Thus, the maker’s mark on this pipe is difficult to decipher in itself, leaving the identification of the maker somewhat ambiguous.
This pipe could be attributed to a variety of makers. Based on the suspected date range, the maker’s mark, and the date range of the Strickler Site, it is possible to narrow the pipe’s maker down to six possibilities. In London, this pipe could have been attributed to John Worcus who manufactured pipes around 1663 (Oswald 1975:148). A less likely candidate is John Wharton, who manufactured pipes in 1665, at the very end of the Strickler Site’s occupation (ibid.:148). Although he manufactured pipes from 1655-1658 and therefore before the suspected date range for this pipe, another possible manufacture could have been John Wallington of Hampshire (ibid.:173). Jeffrey Willison of Lancashire manufactured pipes around 1667 (ibid.:177), John Wilby I of Northamptonshire manufactured them from 1663-1706 (ibid.:186), and John Wright of Yorkshire made them around 1663 (ibid.:204). Thus it is difficult to say for certain who may have manufactured this pipe, despite the maker’s mark.

Another pipe (Figure 4.8) fits into the general typology category number “6” for its large bulbous bowl and its large base (Oswald 1975:37), and the English typology “5a,” thereby putting it within the 1660-1680 date range. It has no maker’s mark, but it does have the typical...
English rouletted design around the bowl’s rim. More importantly, this pipe speaks to larger issues of tobacco use, shifting gender roles, and the possibility of European influence. The pipe was associated with a female, and was also found with a native clay pipe in the typical Susquehannock tulip bowl style. The presence of a European pipe in a female burial perhaps reaffirms the hypotheses presented by Nassaney and Mann (2004) earlier in this paper. On one level, its presence is unique in the broader context of Native American mortuary practice during this time, since adult males were still typically the only individuals buried with pipes (Nassaney 2004:135). As Nassaney (2004:135) explains, “the placement of pipes almost exclusively with a limited number of men to accompany them into the afterlife […] are explicit attempts to codify idealized roles and deny, mask, or ameliorate struggles along gender and intercultural lines among the living.” Thus males were typically buried with pipes to assert this exclusive gendered practice.

Of course, it is possible that someone simply buried these pipes with this woman, perhaps as a gift of some sort, and that she did not actually smoke them herself. The presence of these pipes associated with a female at burial is highly atypical and has not yet been recorded for the Susquehannock to my knowledge. Another interpretation is that his woman actively engaged in the practice of smoking during her lifetime, and that she was buried with these pipes to commemorate this practice. However, even if these pipes were gifts placed in her burial, they still represent a contrasting pattern with previous time periods.

The presence of this pipe found in association with a female raises interesting questions about smoking practices in Susquehannock society during this time. Especially in light of the high frequency of pipes found in the Strickler Site burials, the following questions arise: Why did the Susquehannock increase their tobacco usage? Did different individuals smoke for
different reasons? Were they smoking for recreational or ritual purposes? Did the European practice of recreational smoking play a role in this apparent increase in native smoking? Assuming that she possibly smoked these pipes herself, this Susquehannock female challenges previous notions of gender roles related to communal smoking and ritual, as well as typical mortuary practices in Northeastern Native American societies in the late seventeenth century. Women were not typically associated with smoking, but this woman demonstrates some sort of realignment of this once highly gendered practice.

Nassaney (2004) offers two possible interpretations not only for women’s smoking during this time, but for the apparent increase in tobacco use by native peoples in general. One interpretation is that native communities, including women, began to use tobacco in imitation of European recreational smoking. However, this interpretation is somewhat acculturative, since it suggests that native peoples merely adopted European practices. There is little evidence to support this theory. Another more plausible interpretation is that the broader community, including women and children, participated in individualized smoking practices “to enhance and appropriate lines of communication with the supernatural to ensure spiritual and physical well-being” (Nassaney 2004:134). In this sense, although certain individuals were exclusively responsible for the spiritual well being of the community, ritual smoking became a “democratized” practice that all individuals in the community could participate in.

Evidence suggests that it is far more likely that the prevalence of pipes at the Strickler Site is indicative of enduring native ritual smoking practices rather than an adoption of the European practice of recreational smoking. While the increased practice of smoking was most likely driven by religious and spiritual motives, an analysis of skeletal remains indicates that Native Americans generally did experience an addiction to tobacco as a result of increased
smoking in 17th century North America (von Gernet 2000:74). Whether this is the case for the Susquehannock is debatable and would most likely require more intensive analysis of skeletal remains. However, as Alexander von Gernet (2000:74) explains, ethnographic sources demonstrate how “various peoples belonging to both the Iroquoian and Algonkian language families were seen with pipes in their mouths at all hours of the day and night, and tobacco figured prominently in the dreams they recalled […] Pipes were included as essential grave goods.” Although von Gernet argues that natives began to increase their tobacco usage and consequently became addicted, he also argues against notions that smoking became an entirely secularized activity. As he explains, “it must be recalled, however, that much of everyday life in native North America was imbued with a sense of sacredness” (von Gernet 2000:78). As a result, although tobacco use may have become more widespread, this does not indicate that native peoples were merely smoking for recreational and secularized purposes as Europeans were. Furthermore, ethnohistoric sources describe how this time period was full of conflict and warfare for the Susquehannock, suggesting that perhaps the entire community made use of smoking practices in an attempt to spiritually alleviate these tensions on an individualized level.

It is difficult to conclude based on this assemblage what European pipes would have signified in a native context. Although they are certainly strong indicators of trade, particularly since it is possible to date them and find their point of origin, the artifacts alone do not provide direct information on how they would have been used or interpreted by a Susquehannock. Yet von Gernet (2000:74) explains how “it was not the pipe but the substance(s) it contained that empowered individuals with a sense of the supernatural.” Thus, it seems as though European pipes may have been attributed with ritual significance, since the tobacco was considered more significant than the pipe itself. Of course, there is little evidence to suggest that these European
clay pipes would have had the same empowering ritualistic qualities as the other pipes in the assemblage such as effigy pipes or stone pipes. However, because evidence suggests that Native Americans were smoking for ritual rather than recreational purposes during this time, it appears as though even these European pipes would have inherited some sort of ritual and spiritual significance in a Susquehannock context.

Breakdown of the Pipes of Native Origin

The native pipe assemblage found at the Strickler Site contains a great deal of variety, and it is only through addressing these distinctions that the underlying cultural meaning behind these pipes can be understood, particularly within a colonial context. In discussing the significance of these different types of pipes, it becomes readily apparent that it is not only important to view these objects in the context of their production, but in their meaning for their users as well. As Anna Agbe-Davies (2004:274-275) explains, “whether one begins with the premise that the pipes were objects of trade, or the idea that a pipe was produced and consumed in a single social context,” it is significant to explore “how pipes moved from contexts of production to contexts of use.” While an understanding of the breakdown between native and European pipes is certainly useful to this study, what is perhaps even more useful is an understanding of their symbolism, meaning, and purpose for these people. However, this can only be accomplished by discussing the different types of pipes found in this assemblage, since these pipes demonstrate distinctions in how they were produced, what they indicate about exchange and cultural influence, which individuals used them within the Susquehannock community, and what type of function and meaning they embodied for their users, particularly in ritual and social contexts.
Table 4.6. Material Type, for Native Pipes Associated With a Grave.

The vast majority of the pipes, particularly those associated with a grave, were made of terracotta clay (Table 4.6). There seems to be little consensus on the proper terminology for this material, so for the sake of simplicity the term “terracotta clay” will be used here. The categorizations for the native pipes were based mainly on Jordan Paper’s typology (1988a:65-70). Most of the pipes represented in both datasets are some type of elbow pipe (Tables 4.7 and 4.8). For the most part, the unidentifiable pipes in Table 4.7 are pipe stem fragments that were not associated with any provenience information, and could not be associated with any particular native pipe typology.

Table 4.7. Distribution of Native Pipes for the Entire Pipe Assemblage.
Table 4.8. Distribution of Native Pipes for the Pipes Associated With a Grave

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elbow, other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elbow, effigy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elbow, ring-bowl</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elbow, trumpet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elbow, tulip</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Elbow Pipes*

The most common type of pipe found in this assemblage is an elbow pipe. Furthermore, there are a variety of elbow pipes, and while some can be broken down into specific typologies, others are more difficult to categorize. The most prevalent type of elbow pipe in this assemblage is the tulip-bowl pipe, comprising 17.7% of the entire pipe assemblage and 72.3% of the pipes associated with a grave (Figure 4.9). Futer (1959:137) explains that in his Strickler Site assemblage, “most common is the buff-colored, trumpet-shaped pipe with a tulip-like bowl. This distinctive pipe form is derived from the earlier Susquehannock and Iroquois ring-bowl types.” The data certainly supports this claim, since there are 34 tulip-bowl pipes that comprise 72.3% of the pipes associated with a grave. These pipes stand out as particular to Susquehannock culture, despite the fact that they evolved in form and design from Iroquoian ring-bowl pipes. As Cadzow (1936:77) explains, “contrary to most pipes of this sort, found on Iroquoian sites, these had plain cylindrical bowls, the average angle of which was about 90°.” Most of these tulip bowl pipes do not have any type of decoration, although some contain incised decoration on the bowl, often in the form of horizontal bands just beneath the bowl. These decorations are most likely influential remnants of the tulip-bowl’s predecessor, the ring-bowl pipe (Kent 1985:147). Although pipes found on earlier Susquehannock sites are typically identical to those found on contemporaneous
Iroquoian sites, these tulip bowl pipes demonstrate a stylistic departure from Iroquoian material culture.

Figure 4.9. Sample of Tulip Bowl Pipes.

Few archaeologists have attempted to decipher the function and meaning behind these pipes. On one level, they certainly demonstrate the prevalence of native workmanship, despite the high degree of exchange with Europeans during this time period. They represent a unique and prevailing aspect of native culture, especially in light of the high frequency of European goods represented at this site. More difficult to decipher, however, is how these pipes would have been used within Susquehannock society. Barry Kent (1984:155) explains how, “by the time of the Strickler site (1645) the habit was widespread among the Susquehannocks; and if we can judge by grave associations, women and children, as well as men, were addicted to tobacco.” However, this argument seems far too simplistic; it is important to recognize that changes in smoking habits were not mere indications of tobacco addiction, but that they must have signified transformations taking place in terms of gender roles and individualized ritual practice. No pipes
were associated with children, so no commentary can be made on whether children would have used these pipes for smoking.

As previously described, one tulip bowl pipe was found in association with a female (Figure 4.10) along with a European pipe (Figure 4.8). These two pipes perhaps reaffirm Nassaney’s (2004:133) theory that women and children, as opposed to simply adult men, began to smoke pipes for ritualistic purposes in order to perform individualized ritual intended to cope, on a personal level, with the stress and hostility of colonial conflict. Although only one example of female pipe association exists for this assemblage, it strongly points to the fact that men were not the only members of Susquehannock society associated with pipe usage, perhaps even for ritual purposes intended to ameliorate social conflict and strife. At the same time, however, the fact that this type of pipe was found in association with a female may indicate that this type of pipe was not seen as a highly empowered pipe used for communal ritual, since males still exclusively used those pipes.
One unique elbow pipe (Figure 4.11) demonstrates similar design and form to Iroquoian ring bowl pipes and has been labeled in the museum as a “Seneca Type” pipe. This pipe matches the characteristics of a ring bowl pipe since it is an “obtuse-angle pipe the characteristic feature of which is horizontally incised and/or punctate lines encircling the bowl and separated from each other far enough apart so that the rounded coil-like ‘ring’ of clay has been formed between them” (Rutsch 1973:141). As previously explained, ring bowl pipes were typical on earlier Susquehannock sites, but very few exist from the Strickler Site. Instead, the tulip bowl pipe seems to have evolved from the ring bowl pipe. However, the few examples of ring bowl pipes from the Strickler Phase are typically much lighter and thinner, especially around the bowl, similar to the thin bowls of the tulip bowl pipes. This example, however, seems to show particular Iroquoian influence because the bowl is very bulbous in shape and the rim of the bowl is much thicker than typical Susquehannock pipes from this time period. It looks practically identical to a pipe found on an Iroquoian site in Niagara County, New York (Rutsch 1973:150).
Stone Pipes

Five stone pipes associated with a grave were found at the Strickler Site, while thirteen pipe fragments made of stone were found in the entire pipe assemblage. Compared with other Susquehannock sites, this stone pipe assemblage is diverse (Kent 1984:151). Interestingly, Cadzow (1936:81) did not encounter any stone pipes during his excavations at the Strickler Site, leading him to conclude that “the art of fashioning stone pipes had been lost or was not being practiced at the time of occupation.” Thus this cemetery in particular seems to stand out from other areas of the Strickler Site for the presence of stone pipes. Not only are these pipes unique in broader context of Susquehannock material culture, but they are also rare in Pennsylvania. One pipe categorized as a steatite disc calumet, or simply a disc pipe (Figure 4.12), has been described by Kent (1984:152-153) as “a vasiform pipe surmounted by a disc and is quite similar to the western Great Lakes area disc calumet, and as such is a rather early example of this pipe form.” As a result, this pipe indicates that the Susquehannock were either emulating pipe forms from the Great Lakes region, or that their trade relations extended into this region and they incorporated the foreign-made pipe into their society. A more precise analysis of the stone may clarify whether they were creating local versions of foreign forms or trading for foreign-made pipes. In either case, the Susquehannock came to value and appreciate these stone pipes, particularly during the occupation of the Strickler Site.

A variety of different grave goods accompanied this pipe. It was found with eight other native-made objects, including a clay pipe and organic materials including fish bones, grave bark, and purple war paint. It was found with fourteen European objects, including a trade axe, dagger, knife, chisel, a bullet mold, a trigger guard and brass gun stock, a jewel box with mirror, three gun locks, a metal pot lifter, a metal sword, and a Jesuit ring. As a result, this object was
associated with a variety of objects indicating high social status, many of which were European in origin. The high frequency of European objects found in this grave perhaps indicates that this particular individual had close contact with Europeans.

Another stone pipe, commonly called a Keel pipe (Paper 1988:69), speaks to communal ritual as well (Figure 4.13). This pipe is vasiform in shape, meaning that the bowl is tall and conical. It has an extension on the bottom with a single hole running through the bowl, and there is also a smaller hole on the very bottom of the pipe that was most likely used for attachments of adornment, such as feathers, beaded strands, or hairs (Paper 1988:73). The pipe has a smooth and shaped exterior, which is typical for these types of pipes (Rutsch 1973:85). Rutsch (1973:86) explains how many pipes of a very similar form and design have been found on Late Woodland Iroquoian sites, and that “the vasiform pipes were found all around the Great Lakes and eastward into Pennsylvania and New York. They are found in late prehistoric to early historic sites.” As a result, these pipes seem to have been typical to the area, but their variety and quantity have dwindled over time on native sites in this region. Thus this example seems to be a rare remnant
of an earlier pipe form that was passed down for several generations as an heirloom. It is therefore highly significant that an individual was eventually buried with this pipe, since it probably remained in use for several generations prior to its inhumation at the Strickler Site.

![Figure 4.13. GF2-4855-2. Keel Pipe.]

This pipe was found with different types of grave goods than the disc pipe. The grave contained three native-made pipes including this stone pipe, a clay pipe with a human effigy face (described in detail below), and a clay pipe in the tulip bowl style. It also contained a European clay pipe previously described, dating to 1660-1680 (GF2-4855-5). Other objects found in this grave included a clay pot, a whet stone, a game ball stone, and a trade knife. As a result, this grave did not contain a large number of objects in comparison to other graves. But the pipes found in this grave seem to be particularly ritually charged, indicating that this individual may have been responsible for conducting ritual at the Strickler Site.

In terms of their social and ritual function and meaning, stone pipes seem to be some of the most significant types of pipes found at this site. In particular, they may shed light on how pipes were used in ritual and social gatherings during the colonial era, especially in light of the
specific events taking place during the Strickler Phase. As Kent (1984:156) explains, “the calumets had been an important part of a pan-Indian ceremonialism, which was frequently displayed at various meetings between whites and Indians. The calumet was smoked to encourage honor and truth among the speakers, and wampum belts were given in confirmation of these truths.” Thus these stone pipes were not significant for rituals within the Susquehannock community, but rather were used in dealing with relationships with outsiders. Since it is known that these peoples were in close contact with various European groups, it seems logical to assume that these pipes would have been used in native interactions with the colonists. Neal Trubowitz (2004:149) suggests that:

 […] the separate-stem stone Iroquoian pipes were reserved for intertribal ritual and the welcoming of alien visitors, compared to the one-piece ceramic forms that were personal pipes […] the difference in orientation in the facing-out stone effigies compared to the facing-in ceramic effigies reflected their different functions.

As a result, native peoples used stone pipes to establish positive relations with visitors, especially European colonists, during the colonial era. The high frequency of stone pipes found at the Strickler Site compared to other Susquehannock sites is most likely an indication that the Susquehannock experienced an increase in European interaction during this window of time, and consequently required the use of these pipes to maintain positive relations. The use of these stone pipes in the presence of Europeans also signifies that the Europeans would have witnessed native ritual practices and ceremonies, indicating that they may have been interested in engaging in these ceremonies in order to participate in the fur trade as well. As Rob Mann (2004:172) explains, “since the tobacco and the stone pipes it was smoked in were ritually powerful paraphernalia, they were not merely symbolic of the resulting social relationships and cultural identities but were also constitutive of those relationships and identities.” These stone pipes
therefore represent an aspect of native agency and their attempt to use ritual as a means to establish and maintain positive relations with outsiders, particularly Europeans, in the context of the colonial fur trade. They serve as strong representations of how both native and European groups participated in acts of negotiation and agency in order to maintain positive relations, and consequently, to reap the benefits of trade that they each found appealing.

**Effigy Pipes: Mammals, Reptiles, and Humans**

One-piece elbow pipes greatly influenced the form and design of effigy pipes. As Paper (1988a:66) describes, “bending the pipe also brought the bowl into the view of the smoker, encouraging developments in décor.” Although this pipe assemblage contains a variety of effigy pipes with distinct decorations and designs, it is possible to group these pipes into certain stylistic categories. Overall, there seem to be two distinct types of effigy pipes in this assemblage: effigies containing images of animals, and effigies with human faces.

Before discussing these effigy pipes in detail, it is first important to outline the evolution of both Susquehannock and Iroquoian pipes. Prior to the Strickler Phase, Iroquoian and Susquehannock pipes were virtually identical. Kent (1984:147) explains how “although the ring bowls, and particularly the specific forms of effigy pipes as found on both Seneca and Susquehannock sites, are virtually indistinguishable, the tulip bowl pipes do not occur on Seneca sites except as very rare transported pieces from the Susquehannocks.” Although the tulip bowl pipes were distinct to Susquehannock culture, many of the effigy pipes demonstrate similar attributes to those found on Iroquoian sites. As a result, it is appropriate to use literature on Iroquoian effigy pipes to better understand the nature of Susquehannock pipes, since the characteristics are highly comparable. However, ethnohistoric evidence suggests that the
Susquehannock were at great odds with the Iroquois during this time. Thus it seems highly unlikely that the Susquehannock would have been directly trading for Iroquoian-made pipes, although more detailed analysis of the clay would be able to prove whether the Susquehannock or the Iroquois made these pipes. Here, it is assumed that the Susquehannock merely shared a cultural similarity with the Iroquois in their effigy pipe style, design, and iconography and created their pipes locally.

The stylistic similarities may also be an indication that the Susquehannock used these pipes for similar ritual purposes as the Iroquois. For the Iroquois, it has been argued that one-piece ceramic pipes containing an effigy facing the smoker would have symbolized “the smoker’s guardian spirit. These pipes were not passed around the circle but were smoked individually” (Paper 1988:76). More generally, smoking was intended to invoke the effigy located at the pipe bowl. Veit and Bello (2004:198) explain how “ethnohistoric sources note that exhaled smoke could be blown back along the top of the stem toward the effigy, thus invoking the spirits represented there.” As a result, the smoke itself would have been used to invoke the spirit represented in the effigy.

The type of ritual involved in these effigy pipes would have been distinct from the ritual involved in a separate-stemmed pipe, such as the stone pipes. All but one of the effigy pipes represented in this assemblage contain an image that faces the smoker. The fact that the effigy nearly always faces the smoker on a one-piece pipe is an indication that these pipes were used to serve the individual smoker, whereas the effigies on separate-stemmed pipes faces away from the smoker, indicating that the ritual would have been focused outward towards a larger group of participants. This reaffirms Trubowitz’s (2004) notion that pipes with effigies facing outward have distinct functions from pipes with inward-facing effigies.
The inward facing effigies therefore indicate exclusive use of these pipes by particular individuals. They therefore invoke the sense that some sort of religious practitioner would have smoked them. Perhaps the ritual use of these pipes relates to an Iroquoian practice in which religious practitioners communicated with animal spirits to ensure the spiritual health of the community. For the Iroquois, the individual responsible for ritual practices, particularly related to smoking, is often referred to as a “shaman.” One of the main characteristics of shamanism that seems particularly relevant to Iroquoian religion is that shamans “intervene with the spirit realm on behalf of the community through an embodied, usually publicly enacted experience” (Kendall 2002:360). Shamans had the power to prevent Iroquoian society from any form of harm, especially by preventing evil spirits from infiltrating their community. In addition, these shamanic figures were often associated with “Medicine Societies.” Gerald Fenstermaker (1937:8) describes how “the Society of Mystic Animals consisted of members of the Medicine Society whose duty it was to preserve and perform the rites thought necessary to keep the continued good will of the medicine animals,” thereby suggesting that these religious societies were comprised of multiple religious practitioners whose practices maintained a spiritually healthy society. Perhaps the animal effigies represented in these Susquehannock pipes directly relate to a similar type of Medicine Society as the Iroquoian Society of Mystic Animals, in which shamans communicated with animalistic spiritual beings via smoking.

Shamans were therefore responsible for communicating with the spiritual realm on behalf of the broader community, often by smoking. For these shaman figures, smoking was often a means to achieve an altered state of consciousness to better communicate with the spiritual realm. As von Gernet (2000:74) explains, “tobacco produced or enhanced visions and, according to some native smokers, enabled one to see clearly, thereby providing enlightenment and
intelligence during thoughtful deliberations.” On one level, this type of ritual authenticates an individual shaman’s powers, since only a shaman can smoke these pipes to achieve this form of enlightenment and communicate with the spiritual realm. At the same time, shamans used the practice of smoking to promote a healthy and peaceful sense of communal spirituality vital in the maintenance of society as a whole. However, as I have argued, it seems as though the Susquehannock as well as other native groups began to question the authority and capacity of these shamanic practices, thereby allowing a process of “democratized shamanism” to take hold (von Gernet 2000:78).

The term “shaman” has received a great deal of criticism, mainly due to complacent and careless usage. The mainstream use of this term indicates that anthropologists often do not take into account the inherent complexities of a shamanic figure. Furthermore, Alice Kehoe (2000) argues that the term “shaman” should only be applied to those cultures that reside in Siberia. As Laurel Kendall (2002:359) summarizes, anthropologists often “use the term loosely for a wide range of local ritual specialists, sometimes obscuring local distinctions between different kinds of practitioners on the ground.” Furthermore, issues inherent in the term “shaman” often arise in archaeology because “a near automatic equation of shamans with primordial religious experience has also fostered some dubious interpretations of archaeological remains” (Kendall 2002:359). As a result, archaeologists often interpret ritual practices based on archaeological remains to be related to some version of shamanism. In this paper, I am aware that the term “shaman” may not necessary apply to those religious practitioners associated with these effigy pipes. However, I choose to use the term in this paper simply because references to Iroquoian religious practice, which is probably very similar to Susquehannock religious practice, make use of this term. In general, the term “shaman” here refers to a figure that is responsible for communicating with the
spiritual realm on behalf of the broader society, often through smoking, in order to maintain social cohesion and stability.

The animal effigy pipes have many similar stylistic qualities to Iroquoian effigy pipes. As Zena Mathews (1981:32) explains:

Often, the animals are placed so that their heads sit on or above the rim of the bowl on the side facing the smoker. The torso of the being is assumed to be represented by the bowl of the pipe and is not defined further. If bodies are represented, they tend to be vague and usually consist of only stylized fur or feathers. Legs, if indicated, are almost always in relief, accommodated to the shape of the pipe, and stylized.

Nearly all of the Susquehannock pipes containing some type of mammal effigy make use of a similar form and style to that of the Iroquois. One example from the Strickler Site (Figures 4.14 and 4.15) is a stone pipe containing a mammal effigy facing the smoker. The particular mammal is difficult to identify, although it seems to have pointed ears, some type of snout, and short legs on the sides of the bowl. The animal has brass-inlaid eyes. The mammal effigy itself shares many similarities to Iroquoian designs, and the stem is extremely similar as well. On the stem, there are
three rows of punctuates that are separated by two incised lines that run down the stem. These features are identical to an Iroquoian specimen identified by Rutsch (1973:199). An animal effigy found on the bowl of another pipe (Figure 4.16) portrays characteristics similar to Iroquoian effigy pipes. The stem is broken, but the bottom portion of the effigy is curved, indicating that this was some type of elbow pipe. The nostrils and mouth of the mammal are visible, and it contains the same type of design on the stem as the previous example.

Figure 4.16. DS-1947-2. Mammal Effigy Pipe Bowl.

Figure 4.17. GF1-112351-1. Bird Effigy Pipe.
Another type of animal effigy present in the Strickler Site assemblage is a bird effigy. Two particular examples stand out in this assemblage. Although they share certain similarities with Iroquoian bird effigies, they maintain unique characteristics as well. For Iroquoian bird effigy pipes, Rutsch (1973:200) describes the design and style as follows:

[…] the bowl of the pipe forms the body of the bird, the head projects from the near side and may or may not be characteristic of a particular species, and the tail projects from the remote side […] the body is often decorated with incising and punctuates and the head usually extends above the bowl’s rim.

One example from the Strickler Site (Figures 4.17 and 4.18) is similar in that the bowl of the pipe forms the bird’s body. The pipe is made out of dark clay, and the large bird effigy faces the smoker. The pipe stem remains undecorated, but the bird’s body is decorated with circular designs inlaid with white clay. Another example of a bird effigy (Figure 4.19) is unique in that it is made out of stone and the bird effigy faces away from the smoker. This is the only example in the assemblage of an effigy that faces away from the smoker. The bird is similar to the loon effigy in design, but the bird is much smaller. The feet of the bird seem to dangle down the side of the bowl, as if the bird is perched on top of the bowl. For the Iroquois, these bird effigy pipes may have a particular ritualistic significance, since “the loon, the most prominent of the animal forms or images in tobacco pipes, is also found in Iroquoian cosmology. The bird occurs as a
magical intermediary between man and the spirit world. Its use in conjunction with tobacco pipes places dual importance on symbolism” (Mangold 1987:21). It is possible that the same significance was given to these pipes in a Susquehannock context.

Two pipes found in this assemblage are perhaps representatives of a reptile effigy.

One pipe (Figure 4.20) seems to represent what Rutsch (1973:212) has called a “twining snake effigy” since it appears to represent a snake’s coiled body through its wavy stem and bulged bowl. The side of the pipe bowl facing the smoker seems to portray the face of a reptile, through the triangular shape protruding from the side of the bowl with two small incised dots on either side of the top of the triangle representing eyes. Another pipe (Figure 4.21) had been labeled in the museum as “Southern Indian Designed,” but in reality it appears as though this pipe also shows similarities to Iroquoian reptile or amphibian effigy pipes. This example does not have a reptile head or tail present, which is most likely why it was misidentified, but Rutsch (1973:212) explains how several pipes he studied “were like the twining snake pipe with the exception that no reptile head or tail was present.”
There are four pipes in the entire pipe assemblage that have some type of human figure effigy. These pipes also demonstrate a high level of cultural similarity with Iroquoian pipes. Three examples will be considered here, all made of clay. For each of these examples, a human face is represented on the pipe bowl facing the smoker. The basic facial characteristics are essentially the same, although rendered distinctly. There is an attempt to depict the human face naturalistically, but the facial characteristics are very geometric in form. One example (Figures 4.22 and 4.23) has deep-set eyes, a slightly protruding nose, and a small horizontal incision to portray the mouth. It demonstrates a similarity to Iroquoian design with eleven horizontal incised bands across the back of the bowl. As a result, the style of this pipe shows influence from the ring-bowl pipe due to the horizontal bands around the bowl. Another example (Figure 4.24) has deep-set, closed eyes depicted with two incised horizontal lines. The face has a protruding triangular-shaped nose and a closed mouth depicted with one incised horizontal line. Finally, another example (Figure 4.25) has deep-set eyes with two incised horizontal slits representing...
eyes. It has a protruding triangular nose, and a circular shaped, protruding mouth. It also seems to share the ring-bowl style due to the three large incised horizontal bands on the back of the bowl. The pipe is also unique for its three brown painted bands around the stem.

The meaning behind this type of effigy is difficult to decipher, although Mathews (1979:46) suggests that, for the Iroquois, “many of the attributes found on human pipes have shamanistic connotations. The most obvious of these are horns, skeletonization, seeming trance states (eyes closed with head thrown back) and human-animal/bird combinations.” Thus perhaps these effigy pipes were intended to personify the individual responsible for smoking the pipe and conducting the ritual, as he would have appeared during the smoking ritual itself. The first example (Figures 4.22 and 4.23) was found in the grave containing a Disc pipe (Figure 4.12), a clay pipe in the tulip bowl style, and a European clay pipe dating to 1660-1680 (GF2-4855-5), along with other objects previously described. The high frequency of pipes in this grave, particularly the stone pipe, indicates that this individual was most likely associated with conducting ritual. As a result, perhaps Mathews is correct that human effigy pipes represent
individuals related to ritual practices. The human effigy pipe found in this grave could have been created to personify the individual with whom it was buried.

Metal Pipes

There are five pipes made out of metal in this collection. These pipes have received scholarly attention not only in terms of their function and meaning, but regarding who actually produced them. On a basic level, these pipes were desirable because they were less fragile than clay pipes, particularly European pipes made of white ball clay (Veit and Bello 2004:186). Each of these pipes was constructed out of pewter or lead and can be characterized as a base-metal pipe, since no distinction can be made between pewter and lead without further spectroscopic analysis. These pipes are particularly rare in the broader context of Contact Period sites in the northeast, since only 150 examples have been found thus far (Veit and Bello 2004:187).

John Smith visited the Susquehannock in 1608, providing one of the only first hand accounts of the Susquehannock written by a European. Although he expresses his interest in their
physiologically large size and their weapons, he also alludes to the type of pipes they carried. Smith describes one individual in detail and the pipe he carried: “One had the head of a Wolfe hanging in a chaine for a Jewell, his tobacco pipe three-quarters of a yard long, prettily carved with a Bird, a Deere, or something such devise at the great end, sufficient to beat out ones braines; with Bowes, Arrows and Clubs, suitable to their greatnesse” (quoted in Cadzow 1936:18). Particularly interesting in the context of this analysis is his description of the long pipes. The metal pipes represented in the Futer Collection are extremely long compared to the other pipes in this assemblage; the largest example is 74.0cm long. Although Smith does not indicate the pipe’s material, his reference to these pipes is perhaps an indication that the Susquehannock were creating long pipes prior to full engagement in the fur trade with Europeans. Although the comparison is apparent between the artifacts and the ethnohistoric record, he does not reveal any concrete information about the manufacture and meaning behind these pipes.

Richard Veit and Charles Bello (2004) conducted a study on thirty-three base-metal pipes, including the five pipes represented here. They explain how these pipes are most common in upstate New York and Susquehannock sites, but a particularly high proportion was found at the Strickler Site. Most of these pipes were found in burial contexts, particularly associated with males (ibid.:188). They argue that “base metal (pewter/lead) tobacco pipes provided an alternative to the more common clay and stone pipes of the time and were used primarily by Iroquoian peoples” (ibid.:189). The reason why these pipes were deemed significant as an alternative to more common pipes is debatable. Veit and Bello discuss these pipes in terms of their manufacture and iconography in order to answer these questions, drawing indefinite conclusions.
The method of manufacture for these pipes remains ambiguous. Veit and Bello (2004:194) explain how none of the base-metal pipes they observed show evidence of mold seams, and therefore were most likely not cast in a mold. In addition, if molds were being used to create metal pipes, it seems logical to assume that they would have been produced more frequently and in a few standard forms rather than a wide variety of designs. No two metal pipes discovered thus far are identical, which seems to contradict the idea that they were created in a mold. Ethnohistoric evidence, however, supports the notion that Native Americans were casting pipes using molds. In the mid seventeenth century, Roger Williams of Rhode Island “clearly states that Native Americans were casting pipes” (Veit and Bello 2004:194). Veit and Bello (ibid.:195) also suggest that perhaps Native Americans were manufacturing these pipes by hammering or carving metal, since “native craftsmen carved the pipes from bars of lead traded to them for the manufacture of musket balls.” Lead and pewter are malleable materials that could be carved just as easily as stone, and there is little question that Native Americans had the technology to carve their own stone pipes and work with other metals such as copper (ibid.:196). However, the process of exchange with Europeans for lead would have been necessary in order for Native Americans to have the materials to construct these pipes.

Whatever the case, Trubowitz (2004:146) poignantly expresses how “metal pipes joined stone pipes as important means of establishing communication and relations between Native Americans and Europeans.” If natives were creating these pipes, they would have needed to trade with Europeans for lead or pewter in order to carve, mold, or hammer the metal into a pipe. If Europeans created the pipes, they were considering native iconographies and incorporating them into the pipe design, therefore taking native desires into account during their manufacture. If Europeans were manufacturing these pipes, it would certainly indicate a very specific and unique
type of trade relation taking place between the Susquehannock and European groups. Mangold (1987:44) acknowledges that these pipes are only found at the Strickler Site for the Susquehannock, indicating that there may have been one particular source or trader who traded these pipes exclusively to the Susquehannock at this village. Both theories demonstrate the ways in which both the Susquehannock and Europeans acted in purposeful and meaningful ways within the context of the fur trade, although the Susquehannock seem to have benefitted the most from having pipes constructed in their preferred style.

![Figure 4.26.](image)

Figure 4.26.
GF1-61450-20.
Metal Bird Effigy Pipe.

Style, design and iconography may point to the origin of manufacture for these pipes, but once again problems arise. As Veit and Bello (2004:196) explain, “the almost exclusive use of native motifs, often drawn directly from earlier stone examples, also hints that Native Americans made the pipes.” Four of the five examples represented in the Futer Collection demonstrate typical native motifs. One pipe (Figure 4.26) has a small, straight-sided bowl that curves away from the pipe stem at an angle just above ninety degrees. The pipe is generally very angular in comparison to typical native clay elbow pipes. There is an effigy at the bowl, which represents two birds that seem to be perched on the edge of the bowl facing the smoker. The effigy broke off from the rest of the pipe. Another example (Figures 4.27 and 4.28) contains some type of
mammal effigy at the end of the bowl. The unidentified animal effigy is perched on the back of the bowl, and the animal’s head peers over the edge of the bowl facing the smoker. The bowl is somewhat conical in shape, and there are two horizontal bands in relief that run around the center of the bowl.

![Mammal Effigy](image)

**Figure 4.27.** GF-21252-1. Base Metal, Mammal Effigy Pipe.

Perhaps the most interesting and unique example (Figures 4.29 and 4.30) is a pipe made out of both wood and metal. The mouthpiece portion of the stem is made of metal, but the rest of the stem seems to be made of wood. There is evidence of red paint on the wooden portion of the stem. No longer attached to the pipe was an effigy of an owl facing the smoker. The bowl of the pipe as well as the owl effigy were made out of wood and have brass inlaid designs. The inside of the bowl is lined with a thin tube of metal, most likely copper due to its golden color.
However, one pipe (Figure 4.31) appears in form to be very similar to a typical European clay pipe, but with much larger proportions. It has a very long stem that measures 54.5cm. This pipe is unique in that it does not incorporate any elements of native design or form, but rather seems to be a direct imitation of European pipes. The typical European pipe form seems to challenge Veit and Bello’s (2004:199) argument that the pipes’ “motifs and general absence from European sites seem to argue for native manufacture and an association with shamanism.” It seems unlikely, though it may be possible, that a Susquehannock would manufacture a pipe
modeled after European design rather than execute their own iconography. Perhaps these distinct pipe forms represent different origins of manufacture; while Europeans may have created base-metal pipes modeled after their own clay pipes, Native Americans may have created metal pipes using their own iconographies, styles, and designs.

Thus, these pipes remain somewhat of a mystery. Further analysis on the metal could perhaps provide stronger indicators of their origins of manufacture. It might also indicate whether the same community or individuals in fact manufactured them, or whether different pipes were created in distinct locations. All but one example demonstrate how these pipes catered to native desires through iconographic effigies. No matter their process and origin of manufacture, they demonstrate a unique yet somewhat ambiguous set of interactions between the Europeans and Susquehannock within a colonial context.
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS

An in-depth analysis of the Futer Collection pipe assemblage relates back to my initial research questions regarding Susquehannock exchange and trade, distribution and consumption of European trade goods and native-made objects, and notions of cultural “decline.” The majority of the pipes found in the Futer Collection can be considered native in origin (Tables 4.2 and 4.3). Of the few European pipes represented in the collection, ten contained a pipe bowl that was able to be dated within a time frame of several decades, and some even originated back to their possible location of manufacture from evidence in maker’s marks. Of the entire pipe assemblage, most are native-made from the terracotta clay material. For pipes associated with a grave, the stone pipes are the next frequent pipes, followed by white ball clay pipes and metal pipes (Figure 4.4). Of the native pipes, the vast majority (91.5% for those associated with a grave) are made of terracotta clay. A small percentage of the pipes were made of stone (8.5% of the pipes associated with a grave). Tables 4.7 and 4.8 indicate the native pipe forms represented in the Futer Collection. Clearly, the most prevalent pipe form is some type of elbow pipe. Stone pipes are the least frequent pipe form represented in the collection.

The Futer Collection demonstrates that the Susquehannock were clearly avid participants in the fur trade and came to value European objects, often in unique and transformative ways. The overall trends in the Futer Collection, as seen in Figure 4.1, indicate that the Susquehannock placed a high frequency of European objects in their mortuary contexts, therefore demonstrating their importance in Susquehannock society. The entire Futer Collection provides evidence to support the notion that the Susquehannock were avid traders with Europeans and incorporated many of these trade items into their graves. Most graves contained a higher frequency of European goods compared to native-made goods, indicating that trade items were deemed
significant in Susquehannock society. A comparative study with an earlier Susquehannock site would shed light on the intensity of trade and whether they experienced increased trade during the Strickler Stage. However, these data alone indicate the significance of trade items at the Strickler Site and the intensity of interactions and relations these people must have maintained with Europeans.

Of course, the high frequency of trade goods does not mean that the Susquehannock experienced acculturation to European culture, nor that they interpreted and used trade items as Europeans would have. The meaning and significance of these objects seem to have been redefined in a Susquehannock context. Moreover, they can be interpreted to represent how the Susquehannock were active, strong and often aggressive participants in the colonial fur trade. The choice to participate competitively in the fur trade signifies the desire to endure and thrive as a people. Furthermore, ethnohistoric sources written by Englishmen indicate that the Susquehannock were not particularly faithful in their alliance, but rather played several different angles within the context of the colonial fur trade, participating in trade relations with various European groups.

The distribution of the Futer Collection therefore sheds light on several aspects of Susquehannock trade relations. Unfortunately, however, archaeologists have often used this type of data to support acculturation models. Although the Susquehannock appear to have traded for and consumed a high frequency of European goods overall, certain lines of material culture indicate that the Susquehannock still utilized and valued their own locally made objects as well. The pipe assemblage provides an example of an artifact class that does not follow the same trend as the entire assemblage, challenging notions that the Susquehannock merely assimilated to European culture. The Susquehannock appear to have greatly valued their own locally made
pipes over trade pipes, particularly for ritual purposes, and did not appear to have traded for a high frequency of European pipes.

The variability in the pipe assemblage, particularly through the distinct type of pipe forms, usages, and meanings, demonstrates that the concept of Susquehannock cultural “decline” cannot be applied. Clearly, the Susquehannock were engaging in meaningful ritual intended to maintain social cohesion and stability amidst a conflict-ridden time period. Future studies on the nature of Susquehannock culture during this time period should reject terminologies that label Susquehannock culture as “decimated” or “collapsing” during this time period, and instead consider their changing and transforming social dynamics.

Furthermore, it is also significant to recognize that each of these pipes would have been used in significant ways for different individuals. For instance, for the female buried with the European and tulip bowl elbow pipes, these pipes would have been highly significant in her ability to perform individualized ritual and allow her to maintain a personal connection with the spiritual world. They would have provided her with the opportunity to deal, on her own personal level, with the stress and conflict imbedded in the colonial fur trade.

It is possible to draw several more specific conclusions from the pipes analysis related to these research questions. The complex nature of the analysis section of this study certainly indicates how an interpretation of artifacts can be very useful for understanding the multifaceted nature of cultural encounters, particularly for Native Americans in the colonial era. Specifically, they reveal the high level of complexity in the relations and interactions that took place between the Susquehannock and Europeans during the occupation of the Strickler Site. In addition, they provide strong evidence to support theories surrounding Native American agency.
While the entire Futer Collection demonstrates the desire to remain strong competitors in the fur trade, pipes form a line of material culture that more specifically supports Susquehannock negotiation and agency. The high proportion of native-made pipes, especially compared to the overall high frequency of European goods in the entire Futer Collection, indicates that pipes remained a significant aspect of Susquehannock society despite European contact. In particular, the tulip bowl elbow pipes demonstrate one form of Susquehannock material culture that sets these people apart from other Native American groups, particularly the Iroquois. They indicate that the Susquehannock valued their ability to create pipes locally and did not value European trade pipes over their own. In the broader context of Susquehannock trade relations, pipes provide a strong line of evidence to support the notion that Native Americans did not merely trade for European goods to participate in an acculturative process. Rather, they were active and engaged members of the fur trade with their own desires in mind, many of which included maintaining traditional practices.

The variety of native-made pipes indicates that different pipes embodied different meanings and purposes. However, it appears as though all of these pipes would have been used with a certain degree of sacredness in various ritual practices. Stone pipes were ritually charged objects used by exclusive individuals for communal rituals practiced to maintain positive relations with outsiders. Effigy pipes, however, were most likely used by shaman figures to communicate with animal spirits. Elbow pipes, particularly tulip bowl pipes, also most likely served some type of ritual function and they probably did not smoke them recreationally. The function and meaning behind European ball clay pipes to a Susquehannock individual remains unclear. There exists the possibility that natives smoked European pipes recreationally rather than for ritual purposes in imitation of Europeans, who only smoked recreationally. However, it
seems more likely to suggest that the Susquehannock would have interpreted these new European pipes based on their previous perception of smoking: for ritual rather than recreational purposes.

All of these examples demonstrate that the Susquehannock may have been using pipes and smoking rituals as a means to cope with the stress and conflict of the colonial fur trade. These distinct pipe forms and pipe usages also point to different social categories that most likely formed in order to communicate with the spiritual world as a means to alleviate the stress of the colonial era. It seems as though there were a few individuals, particularly males, associated with communal ritual that accessed the spiritual realm in order to deal with foreign individuals. However, there may have also been an introduction of individualized, or “democratized,” ritual practice as well. The female buried with a European trade pipe and a tulip bowl elbow pipe indicates that women, and perhaps children as well, were participating in individualized smoking. Smoking was therefore no longer a practice limited to particular individuals in Susquehannock society, but rather became a more widespread practice.

Pipes only form one type of material culture represented at the site. There are a multitude of other artifact classes that certainly deserve equal attention. In addition, a comparative study of the material culture found at different Susquehannock sites may speak to the changes these people experienced over time, particularly within the constantly changing atmosphere of the colonial fur trade. The study of artifacts can clearly lead to a stronger sense of social identity, negotiation, agency, and experience; one can only imagine what an analysis of other types of artifacts could contribute to the understanding of Susquehannock culture during this dynamic colonial situation.
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