

VOL. XXXIII No. 3

Price 1 Dollar

# VERMONT *History*



July 1965

*The* PROCEEDINGS *of the*  
VERMONT HISTORICAL SOCIETY



## The Indian Occupation of Vermont

By GORDON M. DAY

THERE are a number of historians who have asserted that there was no Indian occupation of Vermont. A recent work, Frederic Van de Water's *The Reluctant Republic*, pictures Vermont as an empty, virginal land, belonging to no one, and forested from the River to the Lake.<sup>1</sup> About thirty years ago, an eminent archaeologist, Charles Willoughby of Harvard, wrote that at the time of discovery "there seem to have been but few Indians in Vermont."<sup>2</sup> In the last century, George Bancroft's celebrated history of the United States claimed that "Vermont and northwestern Massachusetts and much of New Hampshire were solitudes,"<sup>3</sup> and Palfrey's history of New England contained an enumeration of the Indians from which Vermont was omitted altogether.<sup>4</sup>

It may be that these writers, New Englanders all, were influenced by Francis Parkman, who had written that "Northern New Hampshire, the whole of Vermont, and western Massachusetts had no human tenants but the roving hunter or prowling warrior."<sup>5</sup> Yet Ray had stated earlier that, "We know, indeed, that Vermont was wholly without aboriginal inhabitants. . .,"<sup>6</sup> and all these writers may have been leaning on the authority of Albert Gallatin. His *Synopsis of the Indian Tribes*, which appeared in 1836, was the classic work of the time, and in it Gallatin had written, "There do not appear to have been any tribes of consequence in the northern part of New Hampshire, or in the State of Vermont."<sup>7</sup> The idea had appeared at least as early as 1806, however, when the editor of

1. Frederick F. Van de Water, *The Reluctant Republic: Vermont 1724-1791* (New York, 1941), 3-5.

2. Charles C. Willoughby, *Antiquities of the New England Indians* (Cambridge, Mass., 1935), 278.

3. George Bancroft, *History of the United States of America* (New York, 1885), II, 99.

4. John Gorham Palfrey, *History of New England During the Stuart Dynasty* (Boston, 1882), 24-25.

5. Francis Parkman, *The Jesuits in North America* (Boston, 1899), xxi.

6. Luzerne Ray, "The Aboriginal Inhabitants of Connecticut," (*The New Englander*, July, 1843). Reprinted in W. W. Beach, ed., *The Indian Miscellany* (Albany, 1877, 280-302), 285.

7. Albert Gallatin, "A Synopsis of the Indian Tribes Within the United States East of the Rocky Mountains and in the British and Russian Possessions in North America," *Transactions and Collections of the American Antiquarian Society*, II, 1-422.

Daniel Gookin's *Historical Collections* wrote, "The Indians were never numerous in Vermont."<sup>8</sup>

If these writers were correct, there would be little for us to say here, but I suspect that their statements do not sound quite right to you readers of Vermont history. For one thing, you are aware of archaeological remains testifying to early Indian occupation, and for another, you know that the historical record is quite clear about the presence of Indians at Missisquoi, on the upper Connecticut River, and at Lake Memphremagog just before the Revolution. The real problem is to reconstruct the situation in Vermont about the time of discovery, let us say in the early 1600s. Was Vermont really an empty land at this time? Was it merely a no-man's land between Algonkian tribes farther east and the Iroquois in New York, as has been so often asserted?

The conventional picture of that time shows the Indian tribes of the Northeast to have been distributed like this: in the St. Lawrence Valley were the Algonkins; in the Hudson Valley were the Mahicans; strung out across Central New York State beyond the Mahicans were the Iroquois; in the Merrimack Valley were the Penacooks; and in the Connecticut Valley were a number of tribes which the English knew as far north as Deerfield. Vermont historians commonly speak of the Missisquoi settlement at Swanton, the Coos settlement at Newbury, the Squakheag at Vernon, and of Mahican settlements in the southwestern townships. It is noteworthy that these settlements were on the edges of the State. Excepting the Mahicans, the Indians of these villages have been usually treated as distinct tribes, and suggestions relating them to neighboring groups have been advanced very tentatively. As a result, they have remained little more than names, not peoples whose culture and history we may study. The fullest statement of this conventional picture appeared in Crockett's *Green Mountain State* in 1921.<sup>9</sup> There is more data, however, which will put a little flesh on these early inhabitants of Vermont, bits and pieces of data and sometimes more, if we sift the colonial archives of Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, and New France; make judicious use of Indian tradition; and apply linguistic and ethnographic information.

There is, nevertheless, a genuine deficit in the kind and quantity of data we should like, and the reason for this is probably that whatever Indian inhabitants there were in Vermont about 1600 did not remain in place long enough to be visited and reported upon. About forty years before Champlain saw Vermont, shifts in the Indian population in the

8. Daniel Gookin, "Historical Collections of the Indians in New England," *Massachusetts Historical Collections*, I, 211.

9. Walter Hill Crockett, *Vermont: the Green Mountain State* (4 vols., New York, 1921).

northern and western parts of the State probably took place as a result of the Algonkin-Iroquois wars on the St. Lawrence River. Iroquois pressure on the Mahicans upset the *status quo* in southwestern Vermont about 1630 and before the Dutch had penetrated that far. The Iroquois likewise brought about the withdrawal of the Indians in Vermont's lower Connecticut Valley before 1670 and before the English at Springfield had learned much about them. Then, for the next hundred years, King Philip's War and the colonial wars between the French and the English kept the northern New England Indians in a chronic ebb and flow. For these reasons one can not be confident about referring any data obtained after 1676 back to the pre-contact period.

It appears to the writer that, before attempting a fresh attack on the problem, we might profitably consider the nature of Indian occupation. It is natural for us to think of land occupation in our own terms—cities, towns, cleared farmsteads—, but it will be instructive to consider the actual nature of Indian occupation in this region. We must be specific geographically, because the nature of occupation varied from region to region. If we assume that any Indians who may have inhabited early Vermont were like those known elsewhere in Northern New England, we should expect a type of occupation conditioned by both agriculture and hunting. We should expect weak chiefs, a patriarchal society, and the institution of the family hunting territory.<sup>10</sup> This institution is basic to any discussion of Indian occupation in Northern New England. It meant that twice a year the entire village, excepting the very old and the ill, broke up and each large family group travelled to its own hunting territory several days journey from the village, there to spend several months. The family territories varied in size according to their resources and in shape according to their topography, but they seem to have been about twenty miles square. The boundaries were definite, being marked on the ground where necessary; hunting trespass was forbidden; each family knew its game resources intimately and worked the territory in a rotation to conserve it.<sup>11</sup> We should probably look for a village on a major body of water which was occupied each spring long enough to get in the crop and in late summer long enough to harvest it, a summer fishing ground where lake or ocean breezes would keep down the flies, and a mosaic of family hunting territories upstream from the village. A

10. Roland B. Dixon, "The Early Migrations of the Indians of New England and the Maritime Provinces," *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society*, n.s., XXIV, (1914), 65-75; Frank G. Speck, "Native Tribes and Dialects of Connecticut," *Bureau of American Ethnology, Annual Report*, XLIII, (1928), 221-222.

11. Frank G. Speck, "The Family Hunting Band as the Basis of Algonkian Social Organization," *American Anthropologist*, XVII, 1915, 289-305; Speck, "Aboriginal Conservators" *Bird Lore*, XL, 258-261.

band of 400 or 500 persons might require twenty or twenty-five such territories.

From these considerations, it becomes apparent that it will not be profitable to study Vermont Indians in isolation. The political factors which later determined the boundaries of the State were not the factors which determined the location of Indian populations. These latter factors, as just suggested, were river and lake systems with arable intervals, fresh or salt water fishing, and upland hunting grounds, all in one contiguous package. The valleys of the St. Lawrence, Lake Champlain, the Hudson, and the Connecticut were decisive factors in Indian settlement, and, of these, two are peripheral to the State and two are outside it.

There was certainly a village at Missisquoi in the Eighteenth Century, and the history of Swanton contains the first settlers' recollections of the last Indian residents. The Indians abandoned this village reluctantly about the time of the Revolution and have always claimed the land. Two documents in particular help bring this now almost legendary village to life: the records of the chaplain at Ft. St. Frédéric and the Robertson lease, executed in 1766, which contain a number of Missisquoi family names, most of which can be found today among the Abenakis of St. Francis, and the location of several of their individual land holdings.<sup>12</sup> Father Thomas Charland, the distinguished Dominican historian who has addressed this Society on two occasions, has shown that forty Abenaki families from St. Francis moved to Missisquoi soon after the French fortified Ft. St. Frédéric in 1731.<sup>13</sup> His reconstruction, following French documents, commenced the story of Missisquoi with this event, but it was occupied before this date. According to Ira Allen, a smallpox epidemic had caused the village to be abandoned about 1730.<sup>14</sup> This date suggests that the epidemic may have opened the way for the Abenaki colonization of 1732, but we should keep in mind that the new group may have been made up in large part of returning former residents. We know, indeed, that Grey Lock's band was located at Missisquoi in 1723 and 1725.<sup>15</sup> This makes it possible that Missisquoi was the northern location to which he attracted a number of Schaghticokes in 1704.<sup>16</sup>

12. Pierre-Georges Roy, *Hommes et Choses du Fort Saint-Frédéric* (Montréal, 1946), 268-312; "A Lease of Land by the Missisquoi Indians," 1765, in Hemenway, *Vermont Historical Gazetteer*, IV, 962-963.

13. Thomas-M. Charland, "Un Village d'Abénakis sur las Rivière Missisquoi," *Revue d'Histoire de l'Amérique Française*, XV, 319-332.

14. Ira Allen, *Natural and Political History of Vermont* (London, 1798), 15.

15. A number of the pertinent references from the Massachusetts records were brought together in J. H. Temple and George Sheldon, *History of the Town of Northfield, Massachusetts* (Albany, 1875), 194-234.

16. *Ibid.*, 203.

Crockett's reasoning that Missisquoi was occupied from about 1685 by Penacooks is plausible, but a careful synthesis of scattered source material will be necessary before we can understand the confusing movements of peoples in this period.<sup>17</sup> It is even possible that this was the location of the Indian mission which sprang up on Lake Champlain in 1682,<sup>18</sup> but it could just as easily have been at Chambly.<sup>19</sup> Prehistoric occupation of Missisquoi may go back 2000 years,<sup>20</sup> and it may well have been occupied in 1609 when Champlain discovered the Lake. His Indian allies told him that, before the Iroquois wars had broken out, that is about 1570, the Richelieu Valley and the islands of Lake Champlain had been occupied. He was also told that the valleys east of the Lake were occupied and cultivated<sup>21</sup>—by Iroquois, he understood the Indians to say, but this seems unlikely, since the war party was apparently headed for the Mohawk River and did not meet the Iroquois until they were well down the Lake on the western side. Missisquoi may have been one of the inhabited valleys referred to by Champlain's Indians, because it was perhaps the most advantageous spot in Vermont for an Indian village. There was fall hunting ground upriver in the hills. In the swamps around Lake Carmi were winter yards for moose and deer. At the falls was spring fishing, in the Lake was an inexhaustible supply of fish to fall back on, and, as a bonus for fat living, there was a multitude of water fowl in the marshes. The archaeological data suggests that the advantages of the site had been known for a long time. The naturalists among you may point out that the same advantages were to be found on the lower Lamoille and Winooski Rivers and Otter Creek, but we should recall that in 1609 the more southerly rivers were more exposed to Iroquois attack.

The exact extent of Mahican occupation in Vermont is still an open question, some of the ingredients of which are these: The records of the Dutch West India Company disappeared before John Brodhead went to Holland in search of them in 1841, and surviving Dutch records tell us of no Mahican villages north of Cohoes. This village, which was abandoned about 1660, may have been their most northern village but Crockett seems to imply settlements in Bennington and Pownal.<sup>22</sup> When

17. Crockett, *op. cit.*, I, 75-76.

18. E. B. O'Callaghan and B. Fernow, eds., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York* (Albany, 1853-1887). IX, 194.

19. Armand L. de D. Lahontan, *New Voyages to North America*, (2 vols., Chicago, 1905), I, 90.

20. William A. Ritchie and Don W. Dragoo, "The Eastern Dispersal of Adena," *New York State Museum and Science Service Bulletin* 379, (Albany, 1960).

21. H. P. Biggar, ed., *The Works of Samuel de Champlain* (6 vols., Toronto, 1922-36), II, 93.

22. Crockett, *op. cit.*, I, 40-41.

the English took over from the Dutch at Albany, the Mahican had already withdrawn to the east, perhaps to Stockbridge, Massachusetts.

We can deduce from Hendrick Aupaumut's traditional history, however, that Mahican moose hunting territory extended to the tops of the southern Green Mountains,<sup>23</sup> and it is probably significant that none of the deeds executed by the Stockbridges extended east of the Berkshire height of land in Massachusetts.<sup>24</sup> There is a record of a claim by one "Mahikan Abraham" to land as far north as the mouth of Wood Creek, that is, to Whitehall at the head of Lake Champlain,<sup>25</sup> but it is not apparent whether this was the limit of Mahican territory or not.

There is one distraction which must be avoided in any study of Mahican occupation, namely, the Schaghticoles. These were refugees from southern New England who, defeated in King Philip's War in 1676, settled at Schaghticoke above Albany.<sup>26</sup> They soon began to share in the names "River Indians" and "Loups" (that is, Wolves) with the Mahicans and have often been mistaken for them in the literature. There are numerous references to the hunting activities of these Schaghticoles on the upper Hudson, in southern New Hampshire, and in the Champlain Valley, but these references must be disregarded in searching out early Mahican ownership. It is true that they may have moved into a void left by the Mahicans, but it is clear that they, being displaced tribes, were often simply taking advantage of whatever hunting opportunities became available. One reference to them is of particular interest to Vermonters. Swanton's *Indian Tribes* states that Winooskeek on Lake Champlain was a Mahican village, but this is erroneous.<sup>27</sup> What the documents really say is this: In 1698-1699 the Schaghticoles, having had poor hunting and being pressed for their debts by the Albany traders, resolved to move to Winooskeek "where they had formerly lived" to get away from their debts. They were met, however, and threatened by some "Boston Indians," who were perhaps fugitive Penacooks then living at Sandbar or Missisquoi, so the Schaghticoles had to return and make their peace with Governor Nanfan of New

23. Alanson Skinner, "Notes on Mahikan Ethnology," *Bulletin of the Public Museum of the City of Milwaukee*, II, 102.

24. Harry Andrew Wright, *Indian Deeds of Hampden County* (Springfield, Mass., 1905), 116-119, 136-189.

25. James Sullivan et al., eds., *The Papers of Sir William Johnson* (13 vols., Albany, 1921-1962), VIII, 256.

26. William Hubbard, *History of the Indian Wars in New England from the First Settlement to the Termination of the War with King Philip in 1677* (2 vols., Roxbury, Mass., 1865), I, 248, II, 94, 98, 188; O'Callaghan and Fernow, *op. cit.*, IV, 715.

27. John R. Swanton, "The Indian Tribes of North America" *Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin* 145, (Washington, 1953), 18.

York.<sup>28</sup> It seems likely, however, that the Mahicans at least hunted in southwestern Vermont, and judging solely by the drainage systems, we may speculate that the Poultney and Hubbardton Rivers, Lakes St. Catherine and Bomoseen lay in Mahican territory. The valley of Otter Creek and the territory northward is less likely.

Most Vermonters have heard of Indian Joe and his wife, Molly, and of the Coos settlement which existed at Newbury at the beginning of the Revolution. This band seems to have been only one of several closely related bands, numbering perhaps 700 persons, who were spread from Umbagog to Memphremagog at this time.<sup>29</sup> By 1798 they were at St. Francis and from there were deeding their lands in northern New Hampshire.<sup>30</sup> Many of the names found in these deeds can also be found in the town histories of the region and in subsequent records of the St. Francis band. The early history of the Coos country is rather dim. Schoolcraft's statement that the Penacooks occupied the Connecticut River from Coos to the source is based on the dubious authority of Judge Chandler Potter and seems to rest finally only on the fact that the Penacooks felt free to retreat to the headwaters of the Connecticut during King Philip's War.<sup>31</sup> There is no evidence that it was Penacook country even then. Crockett's suggestion that the northern Mahicans spent a season or two there following their defeat by the Iroquois in 1628 is possible but by no means certain.<sup>32</sup> Wassanaer's contemporary statement was merely that "(they) have settled towards the north by the Fresh River, so called; where they begin again to cultivate the soil."<sup>33</sup> We shall return to this band after considering the fourth and last band commonly mentioned in Vermont history, the Squakheags. They were centered in the Connecticut Valley at Northfield, Massachusetts, but extended northward at least into Vermont. In the past they have been a disappointing group in which to have a special interest, because they left Squakheag before the first recorded English visit in 1670, and to judge by most accounts they simply

28. O'Callaghan and Fernow, *op. cit.*, IV., 575-577.

29. Henry Tufts, *A Narrative of the Life, Adventures, Travels, and Sufferings of Henry Tufts, Now Residing at Lemington, in the District of Maine* (Dover, N. H., 1807), chap. 7.

30. See deed from the St. Francis chiefs in *Phillip's Grant Papers*, 6, New Hampshire Historical Society.

31. Henry R. Schoolcraft, *Historical and Statistical Information, Respecting the History, Condition and Prospects of the Indian Tribes of the United States* (6 vols., Philadelphia, 1851-57), V, 227; Nathaniel Bouton, *The History of Concord, from its First Grant in 1725. . .* (Concord, N. H., 1856), 27-30.

32. Crockett, *op. cit.*, I, 47.

33. Nicholas J. van Wassenaer, *Historical Account of all the Most Remarkable Events Which Have Happened in Europe. . .* in *Original Narratives of Early American History* (New York, 1909), VIII, 89.

went to Canada and were lost in that great melting pot at St. Francis. Practically everything we have known about them was collected in Temple and Sheldon's *History of Northfield, Massachusetts*.

But the Squakheags did not disappear from history nor did they sink without a trace in the St. Francis melting pot. There is a quantity of additional information about them, which has not been recognized because of a confusion in names. The fact seems to be that the Squakheags were actually the Sokokis of the old French writers, a tribe which since Williamson,<sup>34</sup> is generally assigned to the Saco River in Maine.<sup>35</sup> His notion was copied by various historians, notably by the editors of the *Jesuit Relations* and the New York colonial documents.<sup>36</sup> Finally it was taken up by the *Handbook of American Indians* and is now commonly accepted by historians and ethnographers.<sup>37</sup> There is no documentary evidence for it. Williamson and his followers were surely impressed by the nice alliteration in the names of Maine Indian tribes and their locales—the Passamaquoddies on Passamaquoddy Bay, the Penobscots on the Penobscot River, the Canibas on the Kennebec, and the Arosagunticooks on the Androscoggin, suggesting naturally that the Sokokis belonged on the Saco. This apparent similarity of names would not have existed if the original forms had been known and used, because the river was called Sowacotuck and the tribe Sokwaki. These are totally different words. Sowacotuck is properly *msoákwhitékw* River of Standing Dead Trees, and Sokwaki is properly *sohkwahki*, plural *sohkwáhkiák*, the People Who Separated.<sup>38</sup>

The early documents furnish us with one authority for the early location of the Sokokis. This is Father Gabriel Druilletes, who visited New England in 1650 and 1651 on missions for the government of New France. In his report he wrote, "The Connecticut is the river of the Sokokis."<sup>39</sup> Druilletes was a contemporary; he had access to his Algonkin co-envoy, to his Abenaki friends, to New England officialdom, and, most significantly, to a Sokoki guide.<sup>40</sup> His would seem to be a

34. William D. Williamson, *History of the State of Maine; from its First Discovery, A. D. 1602, to the Separation, A. D. 1820* (2 vols., Hallowell, Me., 1832), I, 28, 459, 465.

35. The evidence for this is contained in my paper "The Identity of the Sokokis," *Ethnohistory*, in press.

36. Reuben Gold Thwaites, ed., *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents* (73 vols., Cleveland, 1896), XXIV, 311, note 15; O'Callaghan and Fernow, *op. cit.*, IX, 5.

37. Fredrick Webb Hodge, ed., *Handbook of American Indian North of Mexico* (Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 30, Washington, 1907-1910), II, 613; Swanton, *op. cit.*, 14; Frank G. Speck, "Wawenock Myth Texts from Maine," *Bureau of American Ethnology Annual Report XLIII*, (1928), 173.

38. Ray, *op. cit.*, contains the argument for this.

39. John Gilmary Shea, "Journal of an Embassy from Canada to the United Colonies of New England, in 1650," *New York Historical Society Collections*, 2nd series, III, 322.

40. Thwaites, *op. cit.*, XXXVI, 129.

plain, authoritative statement. If we allow Druilletes to direct our attention to the Connecticut River and if we look there for Sokwakis instead of Sokokis, our eye is at once caught by the name of our elusive Squakheags. This name probably came from the locative form *sohkwah-kik* but it also resembles the plural of the tribal name, *sohkwáhkiák*. Daniel Gookin, who was a contemporary on the spot, called them Squakeys,<sup>41</sup> giving the tribal name an English plural which fits very closely the name we set out to find—Sokwakis.

If, then, our fourth Vermont tribe was the same as the Sokokis, the history of the Sokokis becomes of interest to Vermonters. They first appeared in the French records in 1643 as occasional prisoners of the Algonkins, who brought them to Three Rivers.<sup>42</sup> Many references to them follow. For example, they were mentioned in connection with the theft of some furs and a murder on Ile Dupas.<sup>43</sup> I don't know that the Sokokis were more turbulent than other Indians under the influence of firewater, but incidents like this gained them official mention. They also appeared in the baptismal records at Montreal, Sorel, and St. Francis.<sup>44</sup> The Jesuits mentioned them and the desirability of starting a mission among them.<sup>45</sup> They were apparently the first refugees to settle on the St. Francis River, and as time went on, they became one of the two dominant elements of that mixed band. They participated in the attacks on Salmon Falls and Schenectady, accompanied Frontenac against Onondaga, and went with LaSalle to the Mississippi.

Once the little-known refugees from Squakheag are identified with the Sokokis, a number of stray items fall into place. The "Zooquageers" and "Zooquagese" in the histories of Ferrisburg, Grand Isle, and Franklin are clearly Sokwakis.<sup>46</sup> We can also turn to reconsider the Coos country with fresh vision. Considering the usual territorial needs of the northern Indians, we may suspect that the Sokokis owned the Connecticut to its source. Druilletes' statement suggests this, and John Pynchon's statement asserts it, although we can not be sure that he really knew.<sup>47</sup> This hypothesis, which would make the early inhabitants of Coos to be

41. Cookin, *loc. cit.*, 160.

42. Thwaites, *op. cit.*, XXIV, 183.

43. *Jugements et Délibérations du Conseil Souverain de la Nouvelle France* (6 vols., Québec, 1885-1891), I, 570-572.

44. *Registre de Notre-Dame de Montréal*, 147; Thomas-M. Charland, *Les Abenakis d'Odanak* (Montréal, 1964), 17.

45. Thwaites, *op. cit.*, LX-LXIII, *Relation de la Mission Abnauquise de Saint-François de Sales, l'Année 1702* (New York, 1865), 17.

46. Rowland E. Robinson, "A Sketch of the Early History of Ferrisburgh," in Hemenway, I, 31-34; D. Webster Dixon, in Hemenway, II, 473; John B. Perry, in Hemenway, IV, 944.

47. O'Callaghan and Fernow, *op. cit.*, XIII, 308.

Sokokis, has some advantages. It would make it easier to explain how the Sokokis could be in conflict with the Algonkins on the St. Lawrence River. The Lower Coos at Newbury would have provided a logical place for the Squakheag withdrawal of 1669. Some such withdrawal rather than a complete abandonment of the region is indicated, since their head men were back in Northfield in 1686 and 1687 negotiating for the sale of their lands, and a few individuals remained in the proximity of the English settlements into the Nineteenth Century.<sup>48</sup> It is not clear, however, whether it was Squakheags or fugitive Penacooks who were living there in 1704 when they were attacked by Caleb Lyman's men, then invited by Governor Vaudreuil to settle in Canada.<sup>49</sup> They preferred to stay at Coos at this time in order better to carry the war to the English, and, according to Father Aubéry's map, a mission village existed there at some time prior to 1715.<sup>50</sup> We know nothing more about this mission, but more information may come to light someday in the Jesuit Archives. The main body of Squakheags may not have withdrawn to Canada via Coos, since it is nearly certain that some of them were at Schaghticoke in 1735. The Indian deeds to the Fort Dummer area were obtained from Indians then residing at Schaghticoke.<sup>51</sup> Among the sixteen names appearing on these deeds are two which are still known as family names among the St. Francis Abenakis.

Thus far we have considered only the probability of occupation about 1600 of those village sites which are known to have existed between 1660 and 1780. Geography, undated artifacts, and Champlain's account all suggest other villages in the Champlain Valley, but we need not postulate any more elsewhere. If the Indians of Vermont in 1600 were partly agricultural, as we have assumed, it seems likely that they were centered in the Champlain and Connecticut Valleys where conditions suitable for Indian agriculture were found. A moderate population on both edges of the State could utilize handily the interior under the family hunting ground system. The artifacts which, as Crockett pointed out,<sup>52</sup> have turned up in almost every township, may testify to an older and more general occupation, but this question must await systematic archaeological research.

48. Temple and Sheldon, *op. cit.*, 56; Wright, *op. cit.*, 105-107, 114-115.

49. *Conseil entre les Sauvages Abénakis de Possesek [sic] et le Marquis de Vaudreuil* (Le Bulletin des Recherches Historiques, 1931), XXXVII, 598-600; Stephen Williams, *A Biographical Sketch of Rev. John Williams*. . . (Springfield, Mass., 1837), 105-106.

50. Joseph Aubéry, *Carte pour les Hauteurs de Terra*. . . Public Archives of Canada, Map Division, H3/900-1715.

51. Wright, *op. cit.*, 125-128.

52. Crockett, *op. cit.*, 63.