

## The Petun and Paired Villages

Charles Garrad, January 2011

### ABSTRACT

Differences are observed in the distribution pattern of villages in the respective territories of the two "Petun" (*wendat*) nations, the Wolf and the Deer. The significance of these differences is discussed.

### NOTE ABOUT NAMES

The names "Petun", "Huron", "Neutral", "Iroquois" are all European nick-names for peoples who would have called themselves "*wendat*" (Wyandot)/ The nicknames are used here, with apologies to the Wyandot people, for convenience in identifying specific groupings of Wyandot Tribes.

### INTRODUCTION

It will be readily observed from the map (Figure 1, page 2a) that the village sites among the Petun Deer are arranged in obviously intentional pairs. This is contrast to those of the Petun Wolf.

Tables 1 and 2 (following) indicate that:

In the territory of the Petun Wolf Tribe there was at any one time one principal village, from 5.5 to 12 acres in size. There was also a second smaller village of 2 to 3 acres in size. The distance from the principal village to the smaller village was at least one mile, possibly up to two miles.

In the territory of the Petun Deer Tribe there was at any one time one principal village, from 1.5 to 8.4 acres in size, accompanied by a second village from 1 to 3 acres in size. The distance between the contemporary villages was from 200 feet to .8 mile, always less than one mile.

The villages of the Deer were closer both geographically and in size, and presumably function, than those of the Wolf, and that they are in pairs is more obvious..

TABLE 1 - Names of Village Sites mentioned in the text and Figure 1, abbreviated and complete, by Tribe, in alphabetical order, with GBP (Glass Bead Period, Table 9, page 8) and estimated size of site (no actual sizes are certainly known).

#### Wolf Tribe

|                   |                           |                               |                    |
|-------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|
| CR                | Connor-Rolling BcHb-3     | GBP 2b-3a                     | 3 acres (1.2 ha)   |
| DG                | Duggan BcHa-11            | GBP 2                         | (unknown, small)   |
| GF                | Graham-Ferguson BcHb-7    | GBP 2b-3a                     | 2 acres (.8 ha)    |
| HL                | Hamilton-Lougheed BbHa-10 | GBP 2b-3a                     | 12 acres (4.8 ha)  |
| HM                | Howie BbHa-3              | GBP 1                         | 12 acres (4.8 ha)  |
| KC                | Kelly-Campbell BcHb-10    | GBP 3                         | 12 acres (4.8 ha)  |
| LS                | Latimer BbHa-12           | GBP 1-2a                      | 2 acres (.8 ha)    |
| McE               | McEwen BcHb-17            | GBP 3 (upper occupation only) | 3 acres (1.2 ha)   |
| MV                | Melville BbHa-7           | GBP 2                         | 12 acres (4.8 ha)  |
| SM                | Sidey-Mackay BbHa-6       | GBP 1                         | 5.5 acres (2.2 ha) |
| <u>Deer Tribe</u> |                           |                               |                    |
| HCL               | Haney-Cook Lower BcHb-27  | GBP 2b-3a                     | 1 acre (.4 ha)     |
| HCU               | Haney-Cook Upper BcHb-27  | GBP 2b-3a                     | 1.5 acres (.6 ha)  |
| MA                | McAllister BcHb-25        | GBP 1-2a                      | 3 acres (1.2 ha)   |
| MM                | MacMurchy BcHb-26         | GBP 1-2a                      | 7 acres (2.8 ha)   |
| PF                | Plater-Fleming BdHb-2     | GBP 3                         | 3 acres (1.25 ha)  |
| PM                | Plater-Martin BdHb-1      | GBP 3                         | 8.4 acres (3.4 ha) |

TABLE 2 - Distances between sites in each proposed pair

Wolf Tribe

|           |           |          |
|-----------|-----------|----------|
| HL to CR  | 2 miles   | (3.2 km) |
| KC to McE | 1.15 mile | (1.8 km) |
| MV to DG  | 1.17 mile | (1.9 km) |
| SM to HM  | 1.17 mile | (1.9 km) |

Deer Tribe

|            |          |           |
|------------|----------|-----------|
| MM to MA   | .8 mile  | (1.3 km)  |
| HCU to HCL | 200 feet | (0.06 km) |
| PM to PF   | .25 mile | (0.4 km)  |

FIGURE 1 (Map) - Paired Villages in the Petun Country, and two others mentioned in the text - page 2a

## NEUTRAL AND IROQUOIS COMPARISONS

A comparison with Neutral village patterns is justified because the Wolf and the Deer Tribes migrated to their historic Petun locations from their Neutral homeland. The Neutrals were a Confederacy of perhaps at one time as many as “almost forty villages” (JR 20:105), ten Tribes (Noble 1984(1):4, 23), potentially 40,000 people.

In 1972 the late Ian T. Kenyon (1972:6-7) used the terms “capital” and “satellite” to describe the relationship between some villages within the (tribal ?) cluster of Neutral sites in the Hamilton area. There was “at any given period, at least one site in the 5 to 15 acres range”. “The smaller sites are usually located .2 to .9 miles from larger ones and probably represent satellite communities”. Kenyon suggested that each cluster “may represent a single political unit in the Neutral ‘confederacy’” (a Tribe?).

That “the capital-satellite village model” existed also elsewhere among the Neutral than just the Hamilton area was later confirmed by Paul A. Lennox and William R. Fitzgerald (1990:438-440). Whether it applied to all Neutral tribal clusters is unknown. It is not evident in the prehistoric Neutral London cluster. “The difference may be the result of changing economic factors, or may simply be the result of a sampling bias amongst historic Neutral excavations which have focussed on the larger settlements” (Lennox & Fitzgerald 1990:440).

The Neutral “capital-satellite model” obviously applies moreso to the Petun Wolf than to the Petun Deer. If it is shown that there is similar variability among the Neutral tribal clusters, then it follows that the Wolf and the Deer originated in different tribal clusters within the Neutral Confederacy.

Among the Five Nations in New York, Dean Snow of Penn State University commented to this author that “As to pairs, Seneca sites exhibited it for a long time” (email October 11, 2010). The Seneca were the closest geographically, and probably genetically and culturally, to some of the Neutral tribes. The Onondaga and Mohawk may have had paired larger and smaller villages (Fitzgerald 1992:59). This could suggest that the “capital-satellite” pattern was not a recent evolutionary development but is of considerable antiquity, dating back to the development of villages and of separate tribes within the Iroquoian milieu.

## THE PETUN AND THE EARLY NEUTRAL FUR TRADE

In 1648, after decades of destructive diseases had reduced the Petun population in its adopted location from perhaps a maximum of ca., 10,000 at the time of Champlain to perhaps 3,000, the Petun were reported to comprise “two different Nations which occupy the whole of that country, - one called the Nation of the Wolves .. the other .. the Nation of the Deer” (JR 33:143).

The Wolf and Deer sequences from the time of their arrival until their Dispersal in 1650 A.D. may easily be traced through their archaeology. The Wolf arrived first (ca. 1575/80 A.D., early GBP1) and the principal Wolf village occupied four

successive locations before its destruction by the Iroquois in December 1649 followed by the Dispersal of the survivors early in 1650 A.D. The Deer arrived later (ca. 1600, late GBP1-early GBP2a). The principal Deer village occupied three locations until the 1650 Dispersal.

Archaeological research in the Petun Country revealed that were additional villages that did not stay to generate sequences. These may have been absorbed by Wolf or Deer villages, or returned to the Neutral homeland, or moved on to Huronia.

The writer proposes that all the historic villages in the Petun Country migrated there from the parent Neutral territory in south-west Ontario as part of the Neutral strategy to gain a place in the developing fur trade.

The commercial reason for the migration of the Neutral Wolf and Deer and others unnamed to their historic Petun location may be surmised. The parent Neutral Confederacy had an extensive prehistoric trading empire, oriented mainly toward the south, through its related tribes such as the Cherokee, Susquehannock, Seneca, Erie and others. It was at a disadvantage when desirable European goods began to appear on the lower St. Lawrence to the East/North, which they were unable to access via the river because of the Mohawk (et al). It was necessary to bypass the river and the Five Nations by developing a route to the lower St. Lawrence, or people who traded there, overland. The people who traded on the St. Lawrence for European goods included the Rock, then living in the Trent River system. The Rock had the goods but needed furs. The Neutrals had furs to exchange for European goods. The first principal Wolf village, Sidey-Mackay BbHa-6, was placed about half-way between the Neutrals and the Rock Tribe on the Trent, to interact with the Rock. Benson, the principal Rock village at that time (ca.1575-1580 A.D.), and Sidey-Mackay, both show evidence of interaction with each other (Emerson 1954:203, Ramsden 1977a:286. 1977b:25;, Trigger *et al* 1980:129, 132)..

About 1589 A.D. (JR 16:227) the Rock abandoned the Trent and removed to a location close to the Huron Bear. This began a series of changes which ultimately led to the Bear assuming the controlling role in the Huron fur trade. The Neutrals responded ca. 1600 A.D. by sending a second tribe, the Deer, to settle north of the Wolf, to develop a beneficial alliance with the *Cheveux-Relevés* Ottawa, who seasonally controlled the Beaver Valley and French River, and a close relationship with the Bear.

The Neutrals' big advantage was in having unlimited access via the Grand River to

the beavers of the Dundalk Till Plain (Luther Marsh, etc.), as shown on the Baron Lahontan's 1703 and 1704 maps (1970 1:157). Arising from the same watershed close to tributaries of the Grand were several tributaries of the Nottawasaga River flowing easterly. The Sidey-Mackay BbHa-6 village was built on one of these to process fresh beaver from the upstream trapping area. People from the Rock Tribe Benson site came to Sidey-Mackay to trade European goods for the processed pelts. The people from Sidey-Mackay then delivered these goods to Neutrals in the trapping area, who took them to the Neutral villages..

Among the Wolf, in all four instances the distances between the villages in each proposed pair is always in excess of a mile (e.g. McE-KC), and in the most positive instance of related villages (HL-CR) about two miles. The difference in size between the principal and proposed secondary Wolf villages is pronounced, and only between HL and CR does the Coefficient of Similarity calculation result in figures in the Highest Similarity range. However, the pottery at SM and HM, the clay pipes at KC and McE, the glass beads at KC and McE, do demonstrate some relationship (Tables 3,5,7), and it is accepted that the villages in each pair were contemporary and both removed to their next location at the same time. The proposed relationships of HM and DG respectively to SM and MV are not convincingly demonstrated but rely on proximity, being the same GBP, and there being no better candidate.

Among the Deer, in all three instances the distances between the villages in each proposed pair is always well under a mile, the two villages are much closer in size and similar in artifacts than with the Wolf.

Coefficients of Similarity using pot rimsherds, clay pipe bowls and glass beads, calculated for every village site in the Petun Country and period, are consistently highest between the two sites in each pair of Deer village sites, or with an immediate ancestor or successor Deer village site (Tables 4,6,8).

As to the sizes of "capital" villages, the Wolf best match Kenyon's observation of from five to fifteen acres among the Neutral (Table 1), but as to the distances between the paired villages, the Petun Deer most closely match Kenyon's distances (Table 2).

Ossuary patterns related to the villages in the two sequences are not consistent, and could suggest a rising death-rate, accelerated social turmoil, and abandonment of the Petun Country before the GBP3 villages reached full term and conducted a

Feast of the Dead, and that this process began earlier among the Deer than the Wolf. Among the Wolf, confirmation that the GBP1 SM and HM villages are indeed a pair is that they shared one ossuary placed geographically at about mid-point between them on what probably had been mutual corn-field ground. The succeeding GBP2 MV and DG villages also shared one ossuary, but this was placed entirely within the secondary village. The succeeding GBP2a-3a HL and CR villages each had an ossuary. The final GBP3 KC and McE villages were abandoned before term and only single and multiple burials but no ossuaries have been found for either.

Among the Deer, the GBP1-2b paired MM and MA villages each has its own ossuary. The succeeding paired GBP2b-3a HCL and HCU villages appear to be anomalous in that they are both full-term villages but without known ossuaries. Possibly they relate to a remote shared ossuary which has no obvious village affiliation, or to ossuaries of which no record survives. The GBP3 paired PM and PF villages were abandoned before the occupation cycle was completed and do not have ossuaries.

Speculatively, the functions of secondary villages may include or reflect:

(1) A duality of certain social functions, such as, for example, reciprocal burial functions (Steckley 1990).

It could be argued that even though the Petun Wolf and Deer shared a close relationship, certainly an alliance and a confederacy, the Deer placed a greater emphasis on dual roles in social functions than did the Petun Wolf.

(2) The need to provide defined domains or jurisdictions for clan chiefs of lesser status than the principal Wolf and Deer chiefs.

(3) The need to provide accommodation for transient or wintering visitors at a distance from the principal village in the pair, perhaps so that the visitors could conduct ritual and ceremonial functions unique to them with privacy, and, after 1646, without observation by Jesuit priests resident in the larger village. The presence of presumably transient seasonal wintering Odawas and perhaps Nipissings, is particularly evident at CR among the Wolf, and PF among the Deer (Fox & Garrad 2006:126-127), and is suggested at HCU and HCL (para (5) below). The secondary villages were not exclusively occupied by the visitors, nor were the visitors confined to them.

(4) After Jesuit priests took up residence in principal villages KC and PM, their secondary villages McE and PF may have become havens for Traditional people opposed to the Jesuit presence.

(5) Perhaps the removal to a new location provided the opportunity for some accompanying social reshuffling, so that the factors dictating the separation between

a principal village and its pair at one location are not necessarily exactly repeated when the villages moved. Particularly the clay pipes suggest that the move of HCU and its pair HCL to successor PM and its pair PF involved some social re-alignments (Table 6). Perhaps the Algonkian (Odawa ?) presence detected particularly at PF (but also at PM) continued from HCL rather than HCU.

(6) The placement of the secondary village may have some relevance to the defence of the primary village in that it might be placed on the trail to the principal village.

As the parent Neutrals “did not constitute a cohesive, mutually supportive group” but were characterised by “inter-tribal disunity” (Fitzgerald 1992:93), the variability in paired village relationships shown among the Petun should presumably also exist among the Neutrals. The possibility exists that the Deer and Wolf originated from different Neutral groups which might yet be identifiable by the details of their “capital/satellite” relationships. It is noted that the Milton Cluster of Neutral village sites, although positioned at the entry point into the Neutral territory from the direction of the Petun, did not have “obvious paired contemporaries” (Fitzgerald 1992:60-61). Neutral villages of the Spencer-Bronte (Beverly) drainage Cluster, which have produced artifacts suggesting they were particularly or even exclusively “allied with the Cheveux-relevés and Petun against the Fire Nation” (Fitzgerald 1982:98-99), are accompanied by hamlets (Fitzgerald 1992:61-62) but if they related to the villages in a “capital-satellite” relationship is not known (Lennox 1984:184,186, citing Kenyon 1972:6,7; *et al*). The Neutral Fairchild-Big Creek Cluster includes both larger and smaller contemporaneous villages, but specific inter-site relationships are not reported. The Walker site is reportedly composed of two uneven sized portions, comparable with the Huron Rock Warminster site (Fitzgerald 1992:69-70).

Among the Huron, other than possibly the dual village Huron Rock Warminster site, paired or “capital-satellite” villages do not seem to have been observed. As with the Neutral London site cluster, this may be the result of a sampling bias caused by focus on the larger or more accessible village sites without consideration of the relevance of nearby contemporary sites and the excavated site’s position in a sequence.

#### THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE NAMES “WOLF” AND “DEER”

After interviewing their nineteenth-century descendants, Horatio Hale (1894:6) concluded that the Petun had born “to the other Huron tribes the same relation which the Caniengas (who are commonly known by the nickname of Mohawks) bore

to their fellow “nations” of the Iroquois confederacy. They were deemed the oldest in lineage and the highest in civil rank. Their head-chief surpassed in dignity all other chiefs. Their dialect was the source from which the dialects of all other tribes of their branch were derived”. This suggests that the two Tribes, Wolf and Deer, sent by the Neutral Confederacy to secure a place for the Confederacy in the developing fur trade, must have had some recognized status in the Wyandot hierarchy which they could use to their advantage at their new location.

## NOTES

(1) The suggestions advanced in this paper presume that all the archaeological data presently available to the writer are entirely accurate.

(2) The writer interprets the MV site as the principal village of the Petun Confederacy at the time of the visit of Champlain and his party in 1616; the CR, GF, and HL villages as part of the first Jesuit Mission of the Apostles to the Petun 1639-1641; the KC, McE, PF and PM villages as part of the first and second Jesuit Missions 1647-1650; the KC site as *Etharita*, the principal village of “the Nation of the Wolves” in 1648, the Jesuit St. Jean, destroyed by the Iroquois in December 1649, and the PM site as *Ekarenniondi*, the principal village of “the Nation of the Deer” (JR 33:143), the Jesuit St. Matthew, from which (with PF) the Petun Dispersed in 1650 to return to their former Neutral homeland.

TABLE 3 - Highest Coefficients of Similarity for four Principal Wolf Village Sites using Pottery Rimsherds (Highest Relationship 150 and above)

SM: MV (successor) 178; LS (later arrival nearby) 154; HL (successor) 154; KC (successor) 136; HM (pair ?) 134  
 MV: SM (ancestor) 176; HL(successor) 150; DG (pair ? no certain data available) 84  
 HL: LS (ancestor) 170; CR (pair) 164; HM (ancestor) 162  
 KC: CR (pair of ancestor HL) 182; HL (ancestor) 166; GF (ancestor) 158; HM (ancestor) 154; LS (ancestor) 150; McE (pair)(confused sample, multi-component site) 50

TABLE 4 - Highest Coefficients of Similarity for three Principal Deer Village Sites using Pottery Rimsherds (Highest Relationship 150 and above)

MM: MA (pair) 148  
 HCU: MA (ancestor) 156; HCL (pair) 148  
 PM: PF (pair) 162

TABLE 5 - Highest Coefficients of Similarity for four Principal Wolf Village Sites using Clay Pipe Bowls (Highest Relationship 80 and above)

SM: HL (successor) 112; MV (successor) 108; CR (pair to successor HL) 106; KC (successor) 92; HM (pair ? inadequate sample) 0  
 MV: HL (successor) 150; KC (successor) 132; CR (pair of successor HL) 124; SM

(ancestor) 108; LS (ancestor) 84; DG (pair to SM? inadequate sample) 28  
 HL: MV (ancestor) 150; KC (successor) 148; CR (pair) 142; SM (ancestor) 112;  
 Latimer BbHa-12 (ancestor) 90  
 KC: HL (ancestor) 148; CR (ancestor) 136; MV (ancestor) 132; LS (ancestor) 110;  
 McE (pair) 78

TABLE 6 - Highest Coefficients of Similarity for three Principal Deer Village Sites using  
 Clay Pipe Bowls (Highest Relationship 80 and above)

MM: MA (pair) 86; HCU (successor) 82  
 HCU: MA (ancestor) 144; HCL (pair) 124; PF (pair of successor PM) 98 ; PM  
 (successor) 86  
 PM: PF (pair) 134; HCU (ancestor) 86; HCL (pair of ancestor HCU) 80

TABLE 7 - Glass Beads types repeated on three Principal Wolf Village Sites

SM: (no glass beads at SM)  
 MV: HL (successor) 12; KC (successor) 6; DG (pair ?, no glass beads) 0  
 HL: KC (successor) 24; MV (ancestor) 12; CR (pair) 1  
 KC: HL (ancestor) 24; MV (ancestor) 6; McE (pair) 5

TABLE 8 - Glass Bead types repeated on three Principal Deer Village Sites

MM: MA (pair) 0 (small sample)  
 HCU: HCL (pair) 9; PM (successor) 3; PF (pair of successor PM) 1  
 PM: PF (pair) 8; HCU (ancestor) 3.

TABLE 9 - Glass Bead Periods (GBP) in the Petun Country

Pre GBP 1 = from arrival (1575 A.D. ?) to 1580 A.D.  
 GBP 1 - 1580 A.D. to 1600 A.D.  
 GBP 2a - 1600 A.D. to 1616 A.D.  
 GBP 2b - 1616 A.D. to 1630 A.D.  
 GBP 3a - 1630 A.D. to 1642 A.D.  
 GBP 3b - 1642 A.D. to Dispersal 1650 A.D.

#### REFERENCES CITED

Emerson, J. Norman

1954 "The Archaeology of the Ontario Iroquois"  
 unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation in Anthropology  
 Chicago: University of Chicago

Fitzgerald, William R.

1982 "Lest the Beaver Run Loose: The Early 17<sup>th</sup> Century Christianson Site and Trends in  
 Historic Neutral Archaeology"

- Archaeological Survey of Canada Paper No. 111  
Ottawa: National Museums of Canada
- 1992 "Chronology to Culture Process: Lower Great Lakes Archaeology, 1500-1650 AD"  
Unpublished Ph..D. dissertation 1990, revised 1992  
Montreal: McGill University
- Fox, William A. & Charles Garrad  
2006 "Hurons in an Algonquian Land"  
(In) Ontario Archaeology 77/78, 2004:121-134  
Edited by Mima Kapches and Patricia Read  
Toronto: The Ontario Archaeological Society
- JR = Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents  
1896-1901 73 volumes  
Cleveland: The Burrows Brothers Company
- Kenyon, Ian  
1972 "The Neutral Sequence in the Hamilton Area"  
Paper presented at the Fifth Annual Meeting of the Canadian Archaeological  
Association, St. John's. Newfoundland, February 1972.
- Lahontan, Louis-Armand de Lon d'Arce de  
1970 "New Voyages to North America"  
reprinted from the English edition of 1703 by Reuben Gold Thwaites, 2 Volumes  
New York: Burt Franklin
- Lennox, Paul A.  
1984 "The Hood Site: A Historic Neutral Town of 1640 A.D."  
(pp. iii-x, 1-183 in) Archaeological Survey of Canada Paper 121  
National Museum of Man Mercury Series, Diamond Jenness Memorial Volume  
Ottawa: National Museums of Canada.
- Lennox , Paul A. & William R. Fitzgerald  
1990 "The Culture History and Archaeology of the Neutral Iroquois"  
(pp.405-456 in) The Archaeology of Southern Ontario to A.D. 1650  
Occasional Publication 5  
London: London Chapter of The Ontario Archaeological Society
- Noble, William C.  
1984 "Historic Neutral Iroquois Settlement Patterns"  
(In) Canadian Journal of Archaeology 8(1):3-28
- Ramsden, Peter G.

1977a "A Refinement of Some Aspects of Huron Ceramic Analysis"  
Mercury Series, Archaeological Survey of Canada Paper no.63  
Ottawa: National Museum of Man

1977b "Trent Valley Iroquoian Research 1976-1977"  
(In) Arch Notes, 77-7:19-31  
Toronto: The Ontario Archaeological Society

Snow, Dean R.  
Email to Garrad, October 11, 2010

Steckley, John  
1990 "Reciprocal Burial: The Aiheonde Relationship"  
(In) Arch Notes, September/October , 90-5:9-14  
Toronto: The Ontario Archaeological Society

Trigger, Bruce G., L. Yaffe, M. Dicksie, J.-L. Galinier, H. Marshall & J.F. Pendergast  
1980 "Trace Element Analysis of Iroquoian Pottery"  
(In) Canadian Journal of Archaeology No. 4:119-145  
Canadian Archaeological Association

<><><><> End <><><><>

FIGURE 1 - Paired Villages in the Petun Country and two others mentioned in the text

