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PREFACE

Until very recently the American public believed that the Indians in New England had long since been annihilated in the Indian Wars. New Englanders figured that if they wanted to see "real" Indians they had to travel West. Occasionally, it entered their consciousness that there were a few "remnants" left here, for they would read that the last of the Wampanoags or the Narragansetts was to speak to the D.A.R. or participate in some dedication ceremony. The idea that there might be whole reservations of Indians in New England was totally foreign to them. Now the public is becoming aware that not only are there reservations in New England but also that the largest of these are in Maine, inhabited by about 1200 Indians. The number is not large in terms of the 550,000 Indians in the United States, but it is large to those who would believe that New England's Indians are extinct.

As the evidence of Indian reservations here enters the public consciousness, so also is it entering the public conscience. The Indians are a minority group with unique problems, for their relationship with the majority has always been one of conflict characterized by war, exploitation, and forced concession. What makes this relationship even more unique is that at one time Indians were not an
exploitable minority group. Unlike the Catholics, the Jews and the Puerto Ricans, who came here as minority groups, the Indians were at one time the majority. Thus their relationship with the majority has been marked by a humiliating transformation—transformation from mastery to submission, dominance to dependence, majority to minority, and treaty-making to legislation.

With each new change came a forced change in roles more and more incompatible with the Indians' nature and culture. While still the masters, they developed their techniques of warfare and took on roles as warriors. At the same time they were also the negotiators and treaty-signers, conceding bits and pieces of that precious land for the even more precious life and peace. As this relationship developed the Indian warriors began losing in the face of the white man's more highly developed techniques of war, in the face of the increasing numbers of white immigrants, and in the face of the white man's "supernatural" ability to dupe the Indian with gifts, promises, and liquor.

Thus, the acceptance of one role—that of the warrior—soon led to another, even more incompatible than the first. This was the role of dependence on the alien culture, for once reduced to submission, the Indians' lands were quickly grabbed-up, and with them the Indians' source of livelihood and subsistence. As this process continued, ultimately affecting all the tribes in North America, the enforced role of dependence, coupled with the psychological
consequences of defeat and submission, caused the morale of
the Indian to sink lower. Remembering his days of mastery,
he clung to his slipping culture and his vanquished kin,
hoping somehow that he could master again. Unlike the
immigrant minority groups, his offended pride would not let
him be a part of that other world.

Before long, however, with the growing land hunger
of the whites there was a decided attempt on the part of
legislators and social reformers to make the Indian take on
a new role—that of social and economic competition in white
society. This was accomplished by the legislators by
literally taking what little land the Indian had and by
cutting off even the promised forms of material support
that had forced the Indian to the role of dependence. This,
it was thought, would eliminate the bad effects that depen­
dence has on the spirit (loss of initiative, morale, etc.).
What the whites did not reckon with was that the Indian is
generally non-competitive by nature. (His culture had
stressed cooperation instead.) Furthermore, by the time
these demands for competition were made on the Indian, he
had built-up a wall around him and in many cases the role
of dependence had become too well engrained. To accept the
new role of competition in the white man's world meant true
inner conflict—conflict with his own nature, his culture,
his kin. Confronted with the choice between maintaining
his culture (and the role of dependence) and taking on the
new role of competition, most Indians rejected the latter.
For those who did accept the latter, the obstacles were often insurmountable and only a fortunate few managed to "swim upstream." The Indian simply was not prepared psychologically or educationally to take on this new role. For those who rejected the role, the continued role of dependence, formerly the only apparent way to maintain the culture, ironically tended rather to disintegrate it; and consequently the morale, already twice broken, took a new plunge downward.

The white man, on the other hand, was not satisfied to let things rest. Now that he had shown the Indian the real road to mastery via integration and economic competition with the white man, he felt even more justified in his economic exploitation of the Indian. There was no room in his consciousness for one who did not know how to compete. Thus, the economic conditions on the reservations worsened and by comparison the Indian began to perceive that he was poor. With this realization came the worst and final plunge in his morale, but fortunately, his spirit had not been so broken that this downward plunge was unaccompanied by a rebound.

This rebound has taken the form of new positive action on the part of the Indian. Realizing the importance of accepting the new role of competing in white society as an answer to poverty, and still realizing the importance of one's own culture as an identity, the Indian is beginning
to fight the barriers that would have him deny one or the other. Unlike the immigrant minorities who immediately took on the role of competition in the alien new world, the Indian is now, after three centuries, taking on this role and becoming more outspoken in his demands.

In Maine this third phase in role-taking has been occurring, though hesitantly, through the last hundred and forty-six years since Maine became a state in 1820. At that time the new state accepted the responsibility for support of its Indians which Massachusetts had previously undertaken, but instead of support, Maine launched itself on a program to steal, sell, or legislate away what little lands the Indians had. It was felt that the Indian could compete like any other person in the white world; therefore he didn't need his lands. When the Indian still clung to his way of life he was considered lazy and beyond help. Exploitation by white neighbors was easy. The State felt that the best it could do was to keep the Indian happy with a small dole. And as long as the Indian seemed happy, the injustice of the situation did not enter the conscience of the administrators--or of the public at large.

Once, however, the Indians in Maine began to perceive the injustice of their situation, they became more vocal. A few specific injustices were publicized which eventually brought to light the injustices of the past century and a half. The plight of the Indian has thus reached the consciousness, and stricken the consciences, of many throughout
the nation. And it is this plight, strangely enough, that has prompted the writing of this paper.

Today the Indians of Maine and their brothers in New Brunswick are striving for a new identity in a competitive world. To achieve this goal, the Indian cannot deny his culture; he must have something to build on even if it is only pride in knowing that his culture is not inferior. By itself, it is not adequate in this competitive world, but to deny it altogether, the Indian must deny himself—most often with tragic consequences.

Although this writer is concerned with the social and economic conditions of the Indians as outlined above, this paper will take a course different from those aimed at alleviating conditions. Instead of trying to understand the problems as created by the enforced submission and the subsequent choice between the roles of dependence and competition, this writer will look back to the days of mastery when the Indian as warrior and negotiator made a valiant effort to maintain his position of mastery and dominance over the land that was his life. Hopefully, this paper will help the Indian of Maine and New Brunswick today to bridge the gap between two worlds, by providing him with the assurance of knowing that he has a distinct cultural identity with a proud heritage. Hopefully, too, it will reveal to others that the Indian of Maine and New Brunswick is rightfully proud of his culture and understandably reluctant to give it up.
Since the Indians of Maine and New Brunswick have always been either the enemies, the vanquished, or the underdogs, little has been done in the way of systematic recording or study of their culture or history. What studies have been done more recently invariably concern only one or another of the modern tribes, though they were intricately related historically and culturally. For these reasons, modern Indians wish to see a "correct" history published.

Thus, because of the need to show both Indians and Whites that Indian culture was once adequate and strong in its stage of mastery, and because of the lack of information, it will be necessary to resort to the relatively new discipline in the social sciences called ethnohistory. As this new term implies, it is the study of ethnology in terms of history. In the words of Fenton, this new discipline was called forth by the following problem:

The North American Indian field has now come to a point where further developments await the appearance of the methods of the critical historian to documentary sources, combined with study of collections /archaeological and ethnological/ and field work among the living Indians. (1948:514)

Certainly, in the case of the Northeastern Indians this statement is especially applicable, for here historic records are scattered, lacking, and often inaccurate. Furthermore, some of the tribes in Maine and New Hampshire are extinct and the remaining tribes have lost much of the memory of their history or former culture. To study the Maine Indians as they were in the days of the first white
contacts could not, thus, be dependent on one type or source alone, such as either Indians or historic records, or historians or ethnologists. It is necessary to include all sources.

Every time a new discipline such as linguistics or archaeology is consulted in an ethnological study, the scope of the study becomes tremendously diffused unless some limiting theory or generalization is used to provide direction and purpose to the study. For this paper a thesis or generalization was derived from the modern, humanistic need for an ethnohistory to show that the culture of Maine Indians was once fully adequate. Hence, it was necessary to determine, from all sources, in what way this culture was manifestly most strong. Having made some sort of generalization it was necessary to analyze all sources, to record and document all evidence verifying (or not verifying) this generalization, and finally to present the information in a systematic way.

As implied by the title of this paper, the generalization or thesis most illustrative of former mastery is that all the tribes in New Hampshire, Maine, and New Brunswick identified to varying degrees as an interacting unit. By analyzing the different concepts of unity in the Northeast specifically, cultural, linguistic, and political, it is hoped to illustrate exactly what the nature of this unity was. First, however, I will present the modern evidence derived from surviving Indian groups in Maine and New
Brunswick. Then, I will present the varying ways in which Indians identified as a unit during the first century and a half of white contacts while the Indian was still master in his own land.

I am greatly indebted to the following authorities for their helpful advice in the preparing of this paper:

James Acheson, graduate student in the Department of Anthropology at the University of Rochester;

Douglas S. Byers, Director of the Robert S. Peabody Foundation at Phillips Academy, Andover, Massachusetts;

Gordon M. Day, Ethnohistorian at the National Museum of Canada in Ottawa;

Attorney Don C. Gellers, lawyer for the Passamaquoddy Indians in Eastport, Maine;

Ives Goddard, graduate student in the Department of Linguistics at Harvard;

Hendell S. Hadlock, Director of the William A. Farnsworth Library and Art Museum in Rockland, Maine;

Dr. Tom McFeat, Chairman of the Department of Anthropology at the University of Toronto;

W. A. Squires, Curator of the Natural Science Department at the New Brunswick Museum in St. John.

Acknowledgments go especially to my informants for imparting some of their knowledge of Indian lore, language and history:

Mrs. Cecelia Acquin, Maliseet of Maliseet, New Brunswick;
Mr. and Mrs. Noel Bear, Maliseet of Maliseet, New Brunswick;
Andrew Dana, Penobscot of Indian Island, Old Town, Maine;
Michael Holmes, Passamaquoddy of Pleasant Point, Maine;
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George Soctomah, Passamaquoddy of Princeton, Maine.
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INTRODUCTION

Taking a brief look at the Indians living on reservations today south of the St. Lawrence and from Maine to the Gaspé Peninsula, one would probably identify five major groups on the basis of tribal association alone. From the Gaspé Peninsula to Nova Scotia there are about twenty-two reservations or reserves occupied by about 4000 Indians who identify themselves as Micmacs and who recognize common cultural, linguistic and political ties among themselves. Likewise, in New Brunswick on the St. John River there are approximately four reserves which are inhabited by about 1000 Indians of apparently different affiliations from those of the Micmacs. These today also recognize common bonds among themselves and are designated as Maliseets. In Quebec near Pierreville is a single village of 700 Indians with a unique identity as St. Francis Abenakis. They recognize no official affiliations with any other group of Indians. Finally, in the State of Maine are two reservation groups of Indians with no official affiliations with each other outside of being subject to the same administration of Indian affairs. These are the 700 Passamaquoddies on two reservations in the southeast corner of the State (Pleasant Point near Eastport and Dana's Point near Princeton) and the 500 Penobscots on Indian Island in Old Town.
All of these groups have, in addition to their official names, at least two other names by which they distinguish themselves. One is invariably among all the word for "men," "Indian," or "people" and is variously translated by each group according to their dialects. (Micmac, "elnu\"; Maliseet, "skijin"; Passamaquoddy, "skijin"; Penobscot, "alnabak"; St. Francis, "alnabak.") The other name is usually the name of the river or general locale where the tribe is found. Other names in common use today usually refer to the specific villages such as Tobique (Negwuntacook), Pleasant Point (Si\'ayik), or Dana's Point (Medaukmeegook). (See Appendix A.) Identity, thus, for these Indians is one of a very specific nature, which is even implied in the various translations of "man."

Correspondingly, they recognize no political affiliations with each other.

However, beginning with such similarities as are apparent in the words for "man," certain relationships between these tribes may be surmised. It is, therefore, the intent of this paper to show that these relationships, particularly in the cultural, linguistic, and political aspects, were such as to contribute to a unity in feeling and actuality between the ancestors of the modern Maliseets, St. Francis Abenakis, Passamaquoddes, and Penobscots. The Micmacs, it will be shown, have always represented a group apart from the other four tribes. First, however, it is necessary to make a brief survey of the rather superficial evidence leading us to make this extensive analysis.
CHAPTER I

MODERN EVIDENCE

While the Indians of the four related tribes rarely admit of any bonds between them today, except where common language is irrefutable (Passamaquoddy and Maliseet),\textsuperscript{2} ethnologists and historians have usually noted former bonds. In that one instance of a close relationship between Maliseets and Passamaquoddies authorities have been boldest in expressing their belief in a former unity. Of all, Dr. Tom McFeat, anthropologist at the University of Toronto, probably expresses this relationship most appropriately:

> These two populations formerly if not a single social unit were at least a single people who interacted at a very high level including inter-marriage. Whatever differences there are between them as to location, customs, social organization and so on should, I think, reflect recent divergence. (Letter: Dec. 15, 1965)

Some such as Gesner (1847:108), Meckling (1917:7), and Hannay (1909:5) go so far as to say that the Indians of the St. Croix and the St. John are the same tribe (Maliseet). Others such as Nicholas Smith (1960:15) or A. F. Chamberlain (1906:123) call them two branches or divisions of the same tribe.\textsuperscript{3}

That all of the modern tribes, excluding the Micmacs, were formerly one nation is a fact that has been recognized,
but not so boldly stated, except in a few instances, such as by Charlevoix: "Formerly all the country from Port Royal to Kennebequi was peopled by those Indians whom we now know under the name of Malecites. . . ." (1872:275)

E. Tappan Adney, a more recent student of the Indians in Maine and New Brunswick, also believed that all of the original Indians from the Kennebec to the St. John were "one people, one nation." (MSS)

That the Micmacs were as unlike the other four as the other four were similar has been frequently observed by historians, ethnologists, and by Indians themselves. Enumerating stature, features, disposition, and language, the Maine historian, Williamson, describes the Micmacs as "a people quite distinct and different from the Etechemin tribes from the other four." (1832:1478)

When language is used as a basis for comparing the tribes, the authorities seem to make the same basic assertions as above. Ganong in the introduction to Chamberlain's Maleseet Vocabulary says:

Not only are the latter Passamaquoddy indistinguishable from the Maliseets physically, but their language is nearly identical, so that they can talk together with perfect ease. (M. Chamberlain: 1899:12)

In spite of the apparent differences today between Maliseet-Passamaquddy and Penobscot, Ganong continues:

These Indians also resemble the Maliseets very closely, and speak a language which the latter can understand without difficulty. They also often are, and formerly always were, included under the name Maliseet. (1899:13)
Of the difference between the Penobscot and Passamaquoddy dialects the Maine historian Sabine says: "It is hardly greater than is to be found in the English language, as spoken in the various states of the Union." Ignoring the St. Francis, he says that the other three surviving tribes can "converse together with perfect ease," and quotes Baxter who had said that all the Indians of Maine "could understand each other without an interpreter." (1852:105) Furthermore, Adney, having made his most extensive studies in the area of linguistics, undoubtedly claimed language as the basis for classifying all the tribes in Maine as one. (MBS)

William O. Raymond likewise extends a linguistic unit to the Kennebec and says that "Although there exist some local peculiarities of dialect, they readily understand each other, and are physically one people." (1896:223) Thus, in saying that all the tribes in Maine at least as far as the Kennebec had the same language we include also the St. Francis Abenaki in the linguistic unit.

While the cultural or physical differences between the Micmacs and the other four groups have afforded but little comment, the linguistic differences are outstanding and are always noted when any comparisons are made. The Micmacs are usually said to have a language so different that communication is nearly impossible. (Maurault 1666:9) (M. Chamberlain 1899:12) The Wallises, who have made an extensive study of the Micmacs and a short study of the Maliseets, say that the linguistic difference alone is
"sufficient to establish a feeling, otherwise unjustified, of separateness." They, furthermore, go on to add that what feeling of antagonism there is on the part of the Micmacs is the result of irritating "lack of clarity" in the Maliseet language, (1957:46) Indeed, the name Maliseet, itself, is a term of reproach or insult given by the Micmacs for those on the St. John, having arisen out of the antagonism due to the irritating linguistic differences. One curious fact attesting to the tremendous differences in the two languages is that some writers have even attributed the differences in the Micmac to Mohawk influences from the North. (Col. John Allan in Kidder 1867:166) (Gesner 1847:108)

The close relationship between the Maliseet and the Passamaquoddy today is still recognized by members of both groups. In fact, in 1946 a conference was held at Tobique, New Brunswick attended by representatives of all the Maliseet bands on the St. John and the following resolution was made:

... To make it clear that the Indians of the St. John River and westward to the St. Croix and northward to the St. Lawrence in present Canadian territory was inhabited in early treaty times by one nation, speaking one language and having one government with local regional governments; who were known and are still known to the French as Etchamins; latterly by the English as Malecites, by ourselves as "Wal-as-tug-wi-ak" or Wulastooks, our name for the St. John River, and as Passamaquoddies in that area. (Maliseet Tribe 1946)

That this close relationship existed between all the tribes in Maine and New Brunswick excluding Micmacs is
the Micmacs is asserted by several older Maliseets. But the antagonism so evident between the Penobscots and Passamaquoddy of today apparently prevents members of either tribe from admitting any connection with the other. The oldest and best informants from both of these groups, rather, deny such a connection, and more often than not, try to discredit the other. Running through their arguments, however, are statements that would disprove their assertions and suggest, in spite of it all, that there was some kind of a real connection. Hence, sixty-two year old Michael Holmes of Pleasant Point insists that the Passamaquoddy are the only true Abenakis and that the Penobscots, who are usually said to be Abenakis, were, in fact, not. What is more, he indignantly adds, "The Penobscots use our history." Later in relating the "true history" of the Passamaquoddy he asserts that "Our leader used to hang around Bangor when the white men first came," and implies, but does not admit, that Passamaquoddy history was intricately connected with that of the Penobscots. Seventy-five year old Margaret Socoby of Princeton likewise discredits the Penobscots by calling them Mohawks but then she says, "We used to go hunting all over Maine--Moosehead Lake, Sebago Lake."

At Old Town a similar attitude toward the Passamaquoddy is to be observed. There sixty-eight year old Andrew Dana states that the Penobscots are and always have been a separate tribe, having originated in Massachusetts, while
the Passamaquoddy-Maliseet group he claims came from the St. Lawrence. Yet he, too, implies some kind of connection with the Passamaquoddies in his remark that "Bangor [Kadosqui] was established by those people." 13

Among the St. Francis Abenakis there has been apparently no identification with the Indians of Maine, since the last of them emigrated from the southern Maine-New Hampshire region in the first part of the 1700's. 14 (Prince 1902:18) Nevertheless, the language at St. Francis today is almost identical to that spoken at Old Town with a few minor differences. This attitude of separateness was apparently not diminished by the addition of several Maliseet families more recently from Viger.

The Micmacs, as might be expected from their linguistic differences, have, through most of their history, maintained an entirely separate existence in Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and eastern New Brunswick. 15 In addition to the reproachful term "Maliseet" the Micmacs have another term of reproach for those of the St. John in the name "Muskrat People" (Ku-us-wes-ki-tck-i-nu\‐uk). On the other hand, the Maliseets, testifying to the mutual nature of this antagonism, call the Micmacs "Porcupine People" (Ma-te-wes-wes-k-tck-i-nu\‐uk). (N. Chamberlain 1879:27). Recent evidence of this mutual regard was found by the Wallises who in questioning the Micmacs about inter-tribal relations found that the Penobscots, Maliseets, and
Passamaquoddies "received short treatment by Micmac in-formants and raconteurs." (Wallis & Wallis 1955:202)

Returning to the Maliseets, Passamaquoddies, and Penobscots, there is much in the way of recent or modern custom that would illustrate a strong feeling of unity between these groups today. Of these customs, traveling is probably the most important. Apparently this custom has decreased in importance in recent years, however, for several of the older Passamaquoddies recall traveling back and forth regularly from the St. Croix to the St. John in their childhood. Today traveling is carried on almost entirely as an economic necessity, as shown by the numbers of Indians from all three tribes participating in such seasonal occupations as blueberry picking in Washington County and potato picking in Aroostook County. Another important cause for travel between the tribes is the annual custom of gatherings or ceremonials on each of the reservations, especially at holiday times, such as Labor Day or Independence Day. (While these attract many from other tribes they have been turned into economic enterprises catering mostly to the desires of the public at large.) And a final cause for travel is the yearly pilgrimage to the Shrine in Quebec of Ste. Anne de Beaupré (the patron saint of all the tribes today in Maine and New Brunswick). Whatever the cause, however, for these travels, they have served to keep alive the social intercourse between the geographically separated groups, and thus to maintain some degree of common identity.
Prime evidence that this travel has been going on since early days is found in the family names on each of the three reservations. Names such as Francis, Mitchell, Paul, Tomah, Sabatis, Sapier, and Neptune are common to all. While some of these families may explain their presence on a certain reservation by recent intermarriage, others may be traced back simultaneously to ancient ancestors on all three reservations. Still, for other families their presence in different places is explained by ancient intertribal migrations or intermarriages. Another related phenomenon to be observed is the existence of the same family totem, such as Bear, in all three groups, but designated by different Indian or Christian family names. Thus the Bear family at Tobique calls itself Bear (or "Hu-in-w'djck") and at Old Town calls itself Mitchell (or "A-wes'sus"). Regarding intermarriage as evidence of a feeling of unity between separated tribes, it is not surprising to find this phenomenon lacking between the Micmac and their closest, but politically separate, neighbors, the Maliseet. Thus have the Wallises noted:

Today one gets the impression of slight contacts between the two groups. There are few Micmac spouses among the Malisees. Extra-tribal marriages [for the Maliseet] has been mainly with the Penobscot (earlier with Huron), and social and economic interest is oriented toward tribes and white industries in New England. (Wallis & Wallis 1957:47)

Turning to folklore still current among the tribes concerned, we find much evidence of former unity in several
forms: (1) Legends explaining the origin of the tribes as made up of members of other tribes; (2) legends of one group which relate events as taking place in the territory of another; (3) legends claiming unity or brotherhood; (4) legends with similar themes occurring among the different tribes.

Of the first type we find a Maliseet legend which depicts the Passamaquoddy tribe as originating from the marriage of a Maliseet man and a Penobscot woman (A. F. Chamberlain 1898:44). Among the Penobscot there is a story describing also the Passamaquoddy origins, but it explains only the Maliseet-Passamaquoddy connection, for it makes no reference to Penobscot. Briefly, it relates that Maliseets took up residence in the Passamaquoddy region after a break-up at the Maliseet village of Amcookpack.

Of the second type—legends which take place in the territory of neighboring groups—we find a Maliseet legend concerning a place near Princeton, Maine (Wallis & Wallis 1957:35) (Passamaquoddy territory) and referring to an incident that history tells us occurred at St. Francis. Other legends of this type—among the Passamaquoddy is one which tells of a Wabanaki girl in the village of Lusiqantook (St. Francis) (Prince 1901:382), and another about Katahdin (in Penobscot territory) and Red Rose (Atkinson 1950:121).
The third form expressing brotherhood is best represented by the legend first recorded by Williamson, in which the Penobscots claim that all the tribes between the Saco and St. John are brothers—with the oldest on the Saco River and the youngest at Passamaquoddy. (1832: 1:460)

In the last type—common themes—our belief that the Micmacs were slightly different breaks down somewhat. Certainly, Fisher in her analysis of the mythology of the Northeast finds greater consistency within the Penobscot-Passamaquoddy-Maliseet area, but the more remarkable folklore unit within the context of the whole Northeast is that represented by the entire area south of the St. Lawrence, including the Micmacs. In this area, as a whole, is to be found a unique consistency in themes centering around the Wabanaki culture hero Gloo'kap (Fisher 1946).

Agreeing with this theme consistency in folklore of the entire Maine Maritime area are other legends among the Micmac, Maliseet and Passamaquoddy implying a close relationship between these tribes probably in the most ancient of times. On the other hand, there are among these same groups a few legends which are probably more recent for they all seem to explain the separation or differences between the Micmacs and the tribes to the west. Foremost among these is the Micmac legend explaining the Maliseet linguistic differences as resulting
from a separation of Micmacs consequent upon a fight over two dogs (Watson 1907:161). The simple fact that such legends as this latter one exist only in reference to Micmac intertribal relations seems to point up their separateness as existing in prehistoric times, in spite of some sort of previous unity.

From the foregoing brief survey of the five modern tribes in the Maine and Maritime area we find enough modern evidence indicative of some type of former unity among four of the tribes. It is this evidence which leads us to make the analysis in succeeding chapters. Before proceeding, however, to analyze the cultural, linguistic and political aspects of the unity, it is necessary to make a historical survey of tribal names used to identify the various groups under discussion.
Micmac - "Megumage," territory of Nova Scotia and eastern New Brunswick
Maliseet - "Woolustukw," "beautiful river" (the St. John).
St. Francis Abenaki - "Alsigontegook," "river of empty habitations."
Passamaquoddy - "Pestumoquadik," "place of pollock."
Penobscot - "Bunawabsk',k," "where the river broadens out."

1 Margaret Socoby, a Passamaquoddy, claims that the Penobscots are Mohawks since their language is so different from that of the Passamaquoddiies.
2 Cecilia Acquin, a Maliseet, states that the Passamaquoddyies drag their words and that the Penobscots are as unintelligible as the Micmacs except for a few words.
3 According to Hadlock: "These two tribes have been so closely related throughout historic times that many writers have recognized them as only one tribe, the Malecite or the Etchemin. The Malecite or the Etchemin may be said to consist of two groups, the Passamaquoddy Indians who inhabited the extreme eastern coastal regions of Maine and the southern coast of New Brunswick, and the Woolastukwik Indians, now commonly called Malecite, who inhabited the St. John Valley. Thus it may be seen until the two groups are placed in proper relationship to each other one may be justified in extending the southern bounds of the Malecite to include the Passamaquoddy Indian." (1946a:373)
4 Considering that some of the St. Francis Abenakis came from the Kennebec, this quotation may be seen as inclusive of all of the four modern groups in question.
5 Andrew Dana of Old Town insists that Maliseet and Penobscot are closer dialectically than are Passamaquoddy and Penobscot.
6 Noel Bear of Tobique (Maliseet), who has spent time at Old Town, claims that though he cannot speak Penobscot he can understand it.
7 Passamaquoddiies who have visited the St. Francis Abenaki on the annual pilgrimage to the Shrine of Ste. Anne de Beaupré say they have no difficulty in understanding them.
The term "Maliseet" is derived from the Micmac word "ma-li-si'-tchik," meaning "lazy speaker" (M. Chamberlain 1899:27). A similar feeling of antagonism was found to exist between the Micmacs and Penobscots in the Micmac name for the Penobscots as "Ganibax," derived from "cannibals" (Speck 1940:17).

Although it has been shown that Iroquoian speakers did inhabit the St. Lawrence in Cartier's time (1534) careful studies of Micmac have not shown any affinities with Iroquois. In spite of the outstanding linguistic differences between Micmac and the other four tribes, several have noted similarities existing between the Maliseet and Micmac dialects (Hale 1834:3-3) (Hoffman 1955:66) (Hawkins 1845:361) (Speck 1946:355), which must be attributed to diffusion since such similarities are not so noticeable between Micmac and the other dialects, excepting, of course, in the case of elements common to all Algonquian languages.

Margaret Socoby, a Passamaquoddy, recalls traveling to the St. John many years ago where she and other Passamaquoddies were identified as "Maleseezik" by some Micmacs.

In answer to the question of whether or not these tribes were united eighty-four year old Cecilia Acquin of Tobique replied that she had heard they were, that a "rich old man /she once knew/ used to say that white man spread us apart." Likewise, William Saulis of Tobique and Peter Paul of Woodstock, both of whom were Adney's informants, claim, as does Adney, that all the tribes in Maine and New Brunswick were united under the name of "Wakuntugwik," "River Country People."

This leader was undoubtedly Bashaba of Kadesquit. See Chapter V.

"Mohawk" is the worst epithet possible, for the Mohawks were notoriously ancient enemies of all the Algonquian tribes in the East. See Chapter V.

Such aspersions as the foregoing are evidence of a natural antagonism arising out of several historical circumstances: (1) That the Penobscots probably have received into their ranks some Mohawk-like survivors from the Indian wars in southern New England; (2) that the Penobscots early befriended the English while the Passamaquoddies remained loyal to the French until 1749 at the earliest; (3) that the histories of both tribes are interconnected, yet while much attention has been given to the Penobscots in history, the Passamaquoddies have been generally neglected; (4) and today, economic considerations, in large part, determine the Penobscot disdain for their Passamaquoddy brothers.
This has resulted largely from hostile attitude of the Abenakis toward the English that was sustained through the Indian Wars, culminating in the burning of their village of St. Francis in 1759, while the Penobscots, still resident in Maine, had become friendly to the English.

Today, and in recent years, some Micmacs, attracted by the seasonal labor (potato picking and blueberry raking), have settled permanently in Maine, especially in Aroostook County.

Anthropologist Frank Speck tabulated intertribal marriages among the Penobscot in 1915 (Speck 1940:232).

The Nicola families of Old Town have been traced back to ancient Norridgewocks and Etchems (Eckstorm 1945:18); the Sockalexis and Bear families at Tobique back to the Kennebecs; the Sapiel or Sappeer family at Passamaquoddy back to the St. John; and the Francis family back to the Kennebecs (Adney MSS); and the Neptunes have been traced to both Maliseets and Passamaquoddy (Eckstorm 1945:56).

For an enumeration of family totems among all four groups see Hadlock (1946a), Speck (1917a:811-12), Eckstorm (1919:59), Speck (1940:213-214), and Mooney and Thomas (1913:3).

Hurons were located on the St. Lawrence and at St. Francis in the early days. According to Billy Saulis, many of the Maliseets at Tobique originated at St. Francis, and, since Tobique was established more recently (1801) as a Maliseet village, this is possible.

According to Adney, "This break-up occurred only in English settlement times about a lease of Savage Island to an Englishman (Scotchman) for 99 years that the Indians thought was for 9 years. When the facts were known several chiefs removed to Passamaquoddy." (MSS)

When Rogers' Rangers destroyed that village in 1759 it was believed that the priest at that place had sold out (Shea 1855:154). Curiously enough, the Passamaquoddy of today relate a similar legend about the burning of Norridgewock in 1724, though history verifies the faithfulness of the priest there (Father Rasle).

One legend explains that the Penobscots and Micmacs intermarried at Peter Dana's Point generating a tribe and a language of their own (Passamaquoddy) (Wallis & Wallis 1955:204). Another Maine legend explains the origin of the Penobscot River and it takes place around Mt. Katahdin (Wallis & Wallis 1955:404). And finally, Raymond relates a Maliseet legend which claims former unity between Maliseets and Micmacs (1896:223).
23: Wendell Hadlock refers to these as "Children's War" legends rationalizing tribal separations (1947:84).

24: Others are: (1) a Passamaquoddy legend describing a fight between a Micmac boy and a Passamaquoddy boy (Leland 1902:25); and (2) a Micmac legend showing the Maliseets as smaller in physique and numbers (Wallis & Wallis 1955:448).
CHAPTER II

TERMINOLOGY

The problem of names for Indian groups in Maine and New Brunswick has been tremendously complicated by many factors stemming from one crucial tendency of early explorers—that of using a name for a group which was rarely the name used by the group itself. Usually these names were learned from other Indian tribes or were derived from the name of a river or territory where they were located. In some cases the names would describe a peculiarity of the people. It was, hence, not odd for one tribe to have several names at one time.

This tendency to apply different names led to the varying names applied by the different countries which sent explorers to the New World. Thus the French would have one name, the English another, and the Dutch still another. And this was further complicated by archaic and inaccurate orthography so that even in the case of the very same name a hundred different spellings could have appeared, depending on the language of the writer and on the sharpness of his ear.
The discussion of terms which follows is intended primarily to clarify the terms which will be used throughout this paper. But this analysis has also an important bearing on the thesis of this paper—that tribes in New Hampshire, Maine, and New Brunswick were unified to varying degrees. By analyzing the usage of terms as applied by both Indians and whites some will appear more inclusive and more often than others. It is such names which will tentatively outline groups unified in one respect or another. And in the following chapters it will be interesting to see how the names apply to the various aspects of unity in the Northeast.

Etchemin

The term Etchemin is a curious name for the Indians of Maine and New Brunswick, for it appears as early as 1603 and disappears before the end of the same century, so that even Indians today are not familiar with it. Champlain appears to be the first to have used it, in 1603, while exploring the St. Lawrence around Tadoussac. There he remarks:

Three nations had engaged in the war, the Etechemsins, Algonquins and Montanais. These to the number of a thousand proceeded to make war upon the Iroquois, whom they encountered at the mouth of the river of the Iroquois, and of whom they killed a hundred. (Champlain 1880:238)

Although he identifies their activities he does not identify their territory until the following year when he cruised
along the coast of Maine and visited the St. Croix, the Penobscot, and the Kennebec. On all of these rivers he identified the Indians as Etechemins and in 1605 was confirmed by Lescarbot, who said that "the nations between the river St. John and Kinibeki, a district comprising the rivers St. Croix and Norumbega (Penobscot), are called Etechemins." (Champlain 1880:4:277) Later, in 1611, Biard noted that this same stretch of territory was peopled by a nation of "Etheminqui" (Jesuits 1896-1901:2:69). Using the old name of Norumbega, Biard later identified it as the territory of the Etechemins when he mentioned the Sieur de Monts colony, "... upon the coast of Norumbega among the Eteminquois people upon a small island which he called Sainte Croix." (Jesuits 1896-1901:2:43)

Up till Biard's time and even until 1621, the French were the only explorers to employ the term Etechemin. However, in 1621, the English, after their capture of the French post Port Royal, proceeded to grant a patent to Sir William Alexander (Secretary of State of Scotland) for the lands from Cape Sable to the St. Croix. In this patent granted by King James I the territory was recognized as "the countries of the Souriquois and of the Etechemins" (Weston 183:12:12). Nevertheless, Sir Alexander made no attempt to colonize the tract and the English near the Kennebec continued to use the word "Tarratine" which they had begun to employ in 1607. Not until 1632 when the
French again held possession of Maine and New Brunswick by the Treaty of St. Germain did the word Etchemin reappear, and again it was Champlain who used it. Of the Chaudière Rivière he said, "Rivière des Etchemins by which the savages go to Quinibequi . . ." (Champlain 1880:296).

During most of the first half of the Seventeenth Century according to Ganong, "Coste des Etchemins" was frequently applied by the French to the country between Penobscot and St. John (Ganong in Denys 1908:110). But the date of 1660 seems to have been one of the last appearances of the term when "Etchimis" was placed north and east of the Penobscot on a map (Appendix C) in History of Canada by Rev. Father DuCreux (1950-51:1:268). At this time, and even before, however, Etchemin began to be replaced by several terms, of which some are still in use today.

**Tarratine**

If it can be shown that two terms were consistently used during the same period of time for people inhabiting the same territory, then it can be fairly well assumed that they were the same people.

Until the end of the first English era in Maine and New Brunswick (1632), the term "Tarratine" was consistently used by the English for Indians north and east of the Penobscot with whom Indians to the south (in Massachusetts) seemed to be at war. According to Williamson, Hawkins of Plymouth in 1615 found "the war at the height and the principal natives destroyed." (1832:1:215) and "after
the conquests and glory achieved in their battles with the Bashaba [chief] on the Penobscot7 and his allies, they [the Tarratines7 were not like their enemies wasted by disease and famine." (Williamson 1832:1:1:70). If they were then neither defeated nor destroyed by the plague of 1616, what happened to them? Certainly, had they been an intrusive group (as Eckstorm and others claim) we would have some historical evidence of their immigration or emigration. Thus, until such proof is advanced we must assume by their territorial location that they were simply a branch of the Etchemin.

In 1650, the term "Malecites" (Maliseet) was apparently first recorded on a map by Gorges (1890:2:184), though the authenticity of the map is doubted. Since the term covered the territory from the Kennebec to the St. John and since it ante-dated the "Etchimis" of the DuCreux map (1660), only one conclusion can be drawn—that these were two names for one people.

**Abnaki and Armouchiquois**

The term Abnaki9 referring to the Indians of the Kennebec also overlaps territory formerly identified as Etchemin. In fact Champlain seems to identify the two terms as designations for one people in 1629: "Ouakenakiouek (ceux de l'aurore) ou Abenaquis. C'est le nom que les Montagnais donnaient aux Etchemins et en particulier aux sauvages du Kenebec..." (Champlain 1890:2:196). If the Etchemins were supposed to have been nomadic hunters, then
in the Abenakis Indians of the Kennebec we have an additional terminology overlap in the term Armouchiquois."

Because Champlain says of the "Obenaquiouit," those "qui cultivent la terre" the Abenakis must have been Armouchiquois since the distinguishing feature of the Armouchiquois was their agriculture. This problem is slightly clarified by Biard who met some Armouchiquois in the bay of Kinbequi and was told by them to go toward Wiscasset (on the east side) instead of going up the river. At Wiscasset or Pemaquid they met Meteormite, the chief, who said they had no corn to trade but that they did have skins. (He probably was therefore an Etchemin since the Etchemins were hunters.) He also asked Biard "to excuse the misconduct of the morning", protesting that all the disorder had originated not with him but with the Armouchiquois." (Jesuits 1896-1901:2:45) This would suggest that Armouchiquois country began at Casco Bay and extended south. But how far inland it reached, or whether it included the Abnakis of the interior we cannot tell until 1660 when on the DuCreux map "Armouchiquois" seems to have been replaced in part by "Abnakis" extending from the Kennebec to Lake Champlain. Thus the Abenakis were probably Armouchiquois" and since Etchemin appears on this same map with Abenaki one could safely conclude that the Etchemins and Abenakis were as different as the Etchemins and Armouchiquois.
Furthermore, from approximately the time of the DuCreux map (1660) we seem to have evidence that all the tribes, at least from the Connecticut River to the Kennebec and possibly to the Penobscot, identified themselves as Abenaki. Since these bands formed a linguistic, cultural and political unit, as will be shown later, their identification with the more inclusive name is not surprising. In a truce of 1690 we find probably the best enumeration of the included tribes as those "from Pennecook [on the Merrimack River around Concord, New Hampshire], Winnipissockwage, Ossipee, Piggwacket [both of which were located on the Saco River and were known to the French as Chouacit and later Socoki], Amascongen [or Arcasaguntacock on the Androscoggin River], Penchepsout [Pejepscot River], Kenebeck River and other places adjacent" (Mass. Historical Society 1825:1:112-114).13

The experience of Biard above in the Bay of the Kennebec raises another question: if the people of Meteor-mite were so different from the Armouchquois to the south, then who were they? Later known as the Jawenocs, occupying the territory around the St. George River in Knox and Lincoln Counties, they were first met by Popham in 1607 near Pemaquid.15 While they called their land "Bemoquiducke" and Bashaba their chief (Rosier in Purchas 1906:18:358), no name was given for them until "Jawenoc" appeared in the 1700's. Since they occupied part of the territory (east of the Kennebec) identified earlier as Etchemin, one would assume they were a branch of that stock. However, other
factors intervened making them later enemies of the Tarratines (Etchemins) north of the Penobscot; as a result they were almost totally annihilated by the war with the Tarratines by 1615 and later by the Plague of 1616. After that they apparently identified themselves with the Abenakis of the Kennebec (Williamson 1832:457).

Pentagoet

Pentagoet is another intriguing name for the group of Indians around Castine on the eastern shore of Penobscot Bay. The name was originally recorded by the French in 1605 as "Pemptegoet" (DeMonts in Purchas 1906:243) and was believed to refer to both the Penobscot River and to the land around its mouth. The English in the meantime had gone only as far as the western shore of the Penobscot Bay and had come during the period of warfare (1607-1615) which had broken out between the Tarratines on the east bank and those unidentified (probably Wawehoc) on the west bank. Recognizing the French influence east of the Penobscot, the English did not set foot in that territory until 1625--twelve years after the English had obtained possession of the territory (with the capture of Port Royal in 1613). Nevertheless, up to this time they had persisted in using the term "Tarratine" for the Indians of Castine. Once they established a trading post there (1625) they began calling the Indians "Penobscot" or "Panawamske" from the name of the river. In 1632 when the French again reoccupied the territory, the old name of "Pemtegwi" or Pentagoet (Eckstorm
1919:50) was again employed for the territory south of Bangor and because the French continued to hold possession there, with only a few brief interruptions, until 1759 the name Pentagoet (for the river, the place, and the Indians) stuck. Since Pentagoet was clearly the location of the Tar-ratines and within the territory of the Etchemins, and later of the Maliseets (Gorges Map 1650), the conclusion must be that the Pentagoets, too, were a local branch of the Etchemins or Maliseets. 18

Souriquois and Micmac

To take up another name which appeared in the 1600's on the fringes of the Etchemin territory to the east, the Souriquois were identified first probably by Champlain in 1603 as living on Cape Breton (Purchas 1906:18:219) and were known to wander from the north of St. John to Newfoundland (Lescarbot 1907-14:1:73). Apparently, however, the Souriquois that were found on the St. John in 1607 were there only temporarily, for "a good portion of the said savages had assembled there to go with Hembreton on the warpath against the Armouchiquoi." (Champlain 1907:111). In 1611 Father Massé also found the Souriquois there. How far north on the St. John or west the Souriquois ranged is not revealed by the early explorers, 19 but we do know that they made war on the Indians on the Saco River between 1607 and 1615 so must have passed frequently along the coast during these years. That the Souriquois continued to occupy coastal portions of Etchemin territory during the remainder of the
27

century is possible, for the name "Sorriquois" occurs in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia on the DuCreux map of 1660, and in the last decade of the century we find mention of a group called Micmacs on the lower St. John in the writings of Cadillac (1854:273-306) and Dièreville (1933). These undoubtedly were the Souriquois, for the name Micmac concurrently replaced Souriquois throughout all of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.

The question of how far west into the Etchemin territory the Souriquois or Micmacs have occupied has been a question of great importance to those who would identify the Tarratines or Pentagoets as Micmacs, simply because they were at war with the Armouchiquois in the early 1600's. The first authority to do so was Ganong:

It seems clear that this name [Tarranteen] was originally used for Indians east of the Penobscot and apparently of different affiliations--hence they could hardly have been the Maliseets or Passamaquoddy, and all circumstances would point to the Micmacs. (Letter 1912)

Fannie Eckstorm, the most ardent supporter of this theory, claims that the Tarratines (Micmacs) and Etchemins made war on the Abenakis around the Penobscot in 1607 and that as the war continued the Tarratines slowly moved in to occupy the region of the Etchemin and stayed there until just before the second epidemic in 1630, when they withdrew to the east, leaving the country to be filled up again by Etchemins (Eckstorm 1945:77). As proof, she cites place names of Micmac origin. She mentions that they committed outrages too barbaric to have been committed against members.
of their own tribe and finally maintains that they were never mentioned on an authentic treaty or deed.

More recently Siibert has conceded that "The Tarratines apparently are the Micmac." (1941:279). And Hoffman agrees but claims that they did not occupy the Etchemin territory till after the war ending in 1615 and after the epidemic of 1616 (1955:71).

Many inconsistencies and errors run through these arguments, foremost of which is that two primary sources indicated the existence of an intrusive group within the Etchemin territory. The English, alone, called the Pentagoets by Tarratine, a name apparently learned from more southerly tribes, not from the Indians in question. Furthermore, the French, who had immediate contacts with the Indians of Pentagoet during part of the time involved (1607 to 1613), called them all Etchemins. The reason for the "apparently different affiliations" as mentioned by Ganong was, of course, a reference to the conflict between the two (I think) closely related groups east and west of the Penobscot. Some understanding of this conflict may be found in Hadlock's explanation of warfare in the Northeast "... as an outlet for energy and entered into as a pastime." (1947:219). Joseph Nicolai in his Life and Tradition of the Red Man may well have alluded to this same conflict in his legend of the war between the tribe on the Penobscot and a group of "disappointed ones" (1893:107). Although history relates the war as beginning over the murder of the son of an Etchemin chief (Champlain 1907:108-112) by an Armouchiquois, Wechling
in his doctoral thesis states that "It was probably not a very serious affair ... Its causes had to do with the chieftainship."\textsuperscript{27}

Ganong's derivation of "Tarratine" as "trader" probably has more relevance to the conflict than simply the chieftainship. Before the war had broken out both Etchemins and Souriquois had been seen by DeJongts in 1606 trading with the Armouchiquois at the Saco River; furthermore, it is stated that the two trading tribes came away dissatisfied with the trade and angry at the Armouchiquois (Purchas 1906:18:265). That the Etchemins, like the Souriquois, had early been involved in the trade between Europeans and more western Indians we find proof of in the many early references to French and Basque traders along the coast of New Brunswick (Champlain 1907:27).\textsuperscript{28} Thus, if being traders would identify the Tarratines as Micmacs so would it also identify them as Etchemins.

In saying that the Tarratines slowly moved in to occupy the territory of the Etchemins Fannie Eckstorm has probably come unwittingly closer to the truth than she realized. Indeed, mixed war parties of Etchemins and Souriquois were often seen along the coast from Port Royal to St. Croix. In 1606 Seicondo (or Chkoudun), chief of the St. John, while at Port Royal (probably trading) was told of the murder of his son by the Armouchiquois, and consequently Membreton, the Souriquois chief there, declared war on the
people of Bashaba at the Penobscot River (Champlain 1907: 109). Purchas likewise speaks of the "warre of the Souriquois and Etchemins" on the people south of the Kennebec (1906:18:264). Finally in 1607 Lescarbot also remarks that "Oagimont, an Etchemin, Sagamos of this river, the St. Croix... was making ready to follow Membretow and his band on the warpath..." (Lescarbot 1907-14:4:359-60). Ganong, like Eakstorm, does not admit that the Tarratines were Etchemins, but he does concede that "The Etchemins seem to have joined the Souriquois allies at that time, and hence the name 'Tarrantynes' may have covered both simply because the Micmacs were more prominent." (Letter 1917)

In conclusion, it does not seem possible to call the Tarratines Micmacs, first of all because the name was applied to mixed war parties; secondly, because the Micmacs were never really resident in Etchemin territory; and thirdly, because there is no evidence that the Micmacs lingered in the territory after the war (1615); yet "Tarratine" was still applied to Etchemin inhabitants northeast of the Penobscot.

By the last decade of the 1600's the original three-fold division of Indians in New Hampshire, Maine and New Brunswick still persisted, though each group was called by some name other than the earliest names of "Souriquois," "Etchemin," and "Abnaki." According to Governor Villebon at his fort on the St. John in 1694:

There are three Indian nations in Acadia, the Canibas, the Malicites and the Micmacs, each having a different language. . . . The Malicites begin at
the rivers of St. John and go inland as far as Rivi è re du Loup and along the shore, occupying Pesmouquadis, Majais [Machias], les Monts Deserts and Pentagoet [Penobscot] and all the rivers along the coast. . . . The Canibas are those settled on the Kinibeguy. (Raymond April 28, 1892)

Having established the continuity in the terms Etchemin and Maliseet, it is sufficient to note here that practically all ethnologists or historians such as Albert, Hannay, Eckstorm, and Murdoch agree, and agree to the territorial extent of the Maliseets.

As for the Canibas of the Kennebec, their identity as the same Abenakis of Champlain is proved by the concurrent usage of the two terms in the 1690's—Diereville (1933:217) and Villebon calling them Canibas (probably a variant of Kennebec) while Father Rasle at Norridgewock at the same time called them "Abenakis."

As the colonial powers began occupying the several rivers of Maine and New Brunswick, and as wars with the colonists on the southern frontiers of Maine and New Hampshire began to involve local bands one by one, distinctions were made between Indians of different places regardless of cultural, linguistic or political affiliations. Thus, toward the end of the 1600's the general names of Etchemin or Armouchiquois had generally disappeared and even the name Maliseet came to be used in a more restricted sense. The Indians were then more commonly known to the colonists according to rivers or specific villages.

Because of this tendency to call Indians by the name of the river on which they were found, it is possible that
the same tribal name at various times could have designated different people, especially in the case of a migratory people who because of 150 years of warfare (1613-1760) were forced to become even more migratory. When this situation is complicated by alternating periods under two different and conflicting colonial powers, the task of identifying modern tribes as the descendants of certain ancient ones is tremendously complicated.

In the name "Penobscot" we find a perfect example of the problem: in the days of Popham, Champlain and Biard it would have included those of Pemaquid, Bangor and Castine—all probably speaking a similar language; however, in the war which followed between those of the east bank and those of the west, a distinction was naturally made. Those on the east were called Etchemins, Tarratines or Pentagoets; while those on the west, whether Etchemins or Abenakis, later identified with the Abenakis. When the wars with the Mohawks began around 1660 a village was established in the vicinity of Bangor or Old Town, and because of its strategic inland spot, one could hypothesize that it became a refuge for Abenakis fleeing Mohawk incursions. Yet, this village was clearly within the old Etchemin territory, so the identity of its inhabitants would seem to have been mixed. In Villebon's letter of 1698 we have proof for this mixture of Indians on the Penobscot:
At Penta goet among the Malicites are many of the Kennebec Indians. Taxous was the principal chief of the River Kinibeguy, but having married a woman of Pentagoet he settled there with her relatives. As to Matakando [chief at Pentagoet] he is a Malacite. (Raymond April 26, 1892)

By this time, too, there would have been more reason for a mixed population on the Penobscot for the Kennebec were having their troubles with the English, while the French (in the persons of St. Castin and Father Thury) were well established at Pentagoet. Whether or not the Penobscots had a separate origin and existence on the Penobscot River, as is claimed today by the Penobscot Andrew Dana, we have little in the way of absolute proof. That there was another village above Bangor or Old Town is shown by John Gyles in 1689, who was taken to Madawamee at the forks of the Penobscot and its east branch (1869:13). Since he does not identify the people there as either Abenakis, Etchemins, or possibly as an original Penobscot, we are left to guess. 35

Apparently then, from 1660 on, at least two villages of probably mixed inhabitants existed on the Penobscot, 36 but when the French lost possession of the territory after the Treaty of Utrecht (1713) the French and their Indian allies could not afford to remain unprotected on the coast at Castine, so Cummings believes that thereafter Old Town probably became the main village (1894:188). That this was probably so was repeatedly shown by the absence of any mention of a village at Castine in the 1720's. 37 Fannie Eckstorm agrees:
That a part of these Pentagoets at least joined the Penobscots of Old Town is evidenced by the presence among the Penobscots of descendants of the Baron St. Castin, a French trader at Pentagoet, (1919:50)

Thus do the Penobscots of today claim, and probably rightly so, that they are Tarratines.

As a result of the mixture on the Penobscot, ethnologists have made many confused attempts to determine the ethnic relations of the Penobscots. Some like Ganong claim that the Penobscots were related to the Kennebecs, "... though less closely than ... to the other Maliseet sub-tribes." (E. Chamberlain 1899:13) Most linguists, on the other hand, maintain that the Penobscots have greater affinities with the Abenakis formerly to the west (Prince 1910:17). Thus, an accurate judgment as to their ethnic relations requires both a linguistic and historical study, having established the existence of a tribe called Penobscot at or near Old Town (PanoUSMadi) sometime after 1713.

The name "Maliseet," in contrast to "Penobscot," presents much less of a problem to the ethnologist. In the 1690's it was spelled variously as "Marizis," "Marisizis," and "Malecites" by such men as Cadillac and Devillieu; with approximately the same meaning as that of Villebon, i.e., it applied generally to the territory from the St. John River to the Penobscot. But as "Penobscot" came into more widespread usage for those on the Penobscot, especially after the Maliseet of Pentagoet merged with the Abenakis at Old Town (after 1713), the term "Maliseet" was understood to designate those of the old Stohemin stock on
the St. John and St. Croix alone, where the St.chemin language and people were still essentially unmixed.

As the French and Indian wars began to involve the Maliseets more directly in the 1700's, once again the phenomenon occurred of employing the names of rivers or villages to identify certain Indians, instead of using the generic name Maliseet. Hence we read in English reports mention of Machias, Pesmouquady or St. John Indians as participating in wars, conferences and treaties. This was only natural, for it was only the French who had used the term Maliseet, since only the French actually occupied the territory (except for a few brief intervals) until 1713. (Even after that time, they held enough influence over the Indians from the Penobscot to the St. John as to prevent the English from actually taking possession until 1759). Being unfamiliar with the territory or its Indians, the English had no recourse but to use geographical names in identifying them. For this reason, Maliseet does not appear in any English documents, and even John Gyles who lived among them on the St. John uses only the term St. John's Indians (1869:5). By the time the English actually did take possession, the Indians had apparently occupied and identified with the term (Maliseet) in spite of its connotation of reproach; so that it came into common use especially during the American Revolution (Col. J. Allan in Kidder 1867). Nevertheless, due to a peculiar political accident arising out of the Revolution
the term Maliseet became restricted to those Indians of
the old stock on the St. John.

In the foregoing explanation of the term Maliseet
lies the reason for the historical obscurity of the term
"Passamaquoddy" as applied to a tribe. From the days of
DeMonts on St. Croix Island in 1604, Indians were repeatedly found in that region and at first identified as
Etchemins by the French. In 1650 the term Maliseet on the
Gorges Map, of course, had embraced the territory of
Passamaquoddy, but the people at Passamaquoddy were not
specifically identified as Maliseets until Villebon did so in the 1690's (Journals M3). Henceforth they were occasionally identified correctly as Maliseets at Passamaquoddy
(J. Allan in Kidder 1567:284).42

More often, however, they were not identified except as those Indians at Passamaquoddy. They were not
recognized as having an independent government, nor did they sign any official documents as Passamaquoddistes until 1749 (Treaty of 1725 in Akins 1869). Thus, most writers have overlooked them or claimed them to be a new tribe.44

Even a member of the tribe in 1882 declared:

The Passamaquoddy tribe of Indians is not an old tribe, but was formed about the date of the capture of Quebec by the British of Indians of the Penobscot, another tribe of Maine, Amilocets of New Brunswick, and the Abenike of Quebec.
(Eckstorm M3)

This statement, in spite of its source, is wrong. First
of all, it has been shown above that Etchemins or Maliseets inhabited the St. Croix region from earliest historical times. Furthermore, according to Kidder:

... If any reliance can be placed on their own traditions they had resided for generations previous to the Revolution around the Schoodic Lakes, where the recent discovery of stone hatchets and other implements of an ancient make would seem to verify their assertions. (Kidder 1859:5)

The reason for their obscurity, then, stems primarily from their identity as Etchemins or Maliseets. The Passamaquoddy region, because of its excellent fishing, would have been, like other coastal areas of Maine and New Brunswick, a favorite summer resort for the Indians. Since the Etchemins were hunters practically by definition they never would have established a permanent home on the coast in ancient times (Eckstorm 1945:78). Since the St. Croix is not an extensive inland river at all, but rather is connected by waterways to the east and west with the Penobscot and St. John Rivers, it could only have attracted Etchemins from the St. John or from the Penobscot.45 Moreover, Webster asserts that (Dièreville 1933:217) the Micmacs occupied the mouth of the St. John at least up to 1700. If so, their presence there probably would have been sufficient to deter the Maliseets from seeking summer coastal resorts at the mouth of the St. John. Actually, the St. Croix region was no more distant from the main village of the Maliseet (Neductic) than was the St. John harbor.
If there had been a permanent village in the St. Croix region it would have been inland on the Schoodic Lakes as tradition relates. And there, far from navigable waters, it would have existed unnoticed and undisturbed for over a century and a half (1604-1777), until the Revolutionary War when Colonel Allan recruited Indians from the entire region in person (Kidder 1867:5).

As for their alleged non-participation in the wars—this is probably false; for, beginning with Egeremet of Machias, there is recorded evidence that Indians of the Passamaquoddy-Machias locale took part in all but possibly the first of the six major Indian Wars. In the face of such participation, then, some may ask why they seem not to have signed any treaties as a tribe. One reason, of course, is that they were only a sub-group of Maliseets probably consisting of a very fluid population. For an Indian of Passamaquoddy to have signed a treaty would have been tantamount to the signing of a treaty today by the State of Alaska with Russia. A second reason is that being the small branch of the Maliseets that they were, they presented no threat to the English either at Port Royal or at Pemaquid. Consequently, since the English apparently signed treaties only with those groups from whom they feared hostilities or whose friendship they could safely win, they never sought the signature of a Passamaquoddy. A third reason was that they occupied territory under constant dispute between English and
French; as a result, neither power dared to really settle or encroach on the region. Therefore, there was no need to persuade them to sign away any lands via a treaty. A final reason was that they actually did sign (ratify) the Treaty of 1725 in 1749, but although signed with the English, they were not the predecessors of the English under whose control the Passamaquoddies finally fell; and thus, for all practical purposes, this ratified treaty was "lost." In simpler terms, what the Passamaquoddies had done in 1749 was to go not to Boston, but to Halifax, to ratify the Treaty of 1725, since it had become strategic and crucial to the English there to secure the friendship of the Maliseets. Hence, it was only natural that members of the sub-group at Passamaquoddy would have gone with members of the main group to ratify in the same location, with the same authorities.

Finally, in reality, the Passamaquoddies were not the obscure group that many would have them seem. Their existence in the St. Croix area has even better documented continuity from 1604 to the present than that of the Penobscots whose existence on the Penobscot from earliest times is highly unlikely at least for a certain portion of them.

To summarize, the foregoing terms Armouchiquois, Etchemin and Souriquois all seem to have comprised large
groups of Indians each with their own distinguishing characteristics. Later, the terms Abenaki, Maliseet and Micmac were employed, roughly corresponding to the earlier divisions with the same distinguishing characteristics. For the purposes of this paper the distinguishing characteristics will be shown in succeeding chapters to have been minimal between the Abenakis (of New Hampshire and Maine) and the Maliseets (of Maine and New Brunswick). Likewise, the differences between the Maliseets and Micmacs will be seen as much greater than those distinguishing the Maliseets and Abenakis.

Having defined the terms, it is now possible to analyze the distinctions and similarities between the Indian groups in question to determine to what extent a unity actually existed between Maliseets (the Maliseets and Passamaquoddies of today) and Abenakis (the Penobscots and St. Francis Abenakis of today).
CHAPTER II

1. "From the Magpie Islands we proceeded to a river on the main land called the river of the Etechemins [the St. Croix], a tribe of savages so-called in their country." (Champlain 1907:39)

2. "So far as we could judge, the savages on this river [Penobscot] are few in number and are called Etechemins." (Champlain 1907:43)

3. "This nation of savages of Quinebequy are called Etechemins, as well as those of Norumbegue." (Champlain 1907:50)

4. Possible derivations of "Etchemin":
   - "skijin," Etchemin for "man" (Ganong Letter 1912)
   - "atchitemo," Algonkian (Ojibwa, Nipissing) for "red squirrel" (Adney MSS)
   - "tchinem," Micmac for "man" (Vetromile 1866:5)
   - "Chemin," French for "end of the road" (Perley Letter January 13, 1966)
   - "chiman," Algonkin for "canoe" (Lahontan 1905:2:737)
   - "Etchemin," Etchemin for "men of the snowshoe skin company" (Maurault 1866:5)
   - "Etchemin," Etchemin for "good canoe-men" (Maurault 1866:5)

5. The English at St. George's Fort in 1607 and at the Plymouth Colony in 1614 called the Indians northeast of the Penobscot "Tarrantines."

6. Possible derivations of "Tarrantine":
   - "Atirona," the name of a brave Indian friendly to missionaries (Vetromile 1859:203)
   - "Adironak," Iroquois name for the Penobscots (Vetromile 1866:51)
   - "nedarenandwe," Penobscot for "I speak Indian" (Vetromile 1866:27)
   - "Tahant," Passamaquoddy for "hard fights" (Michael Holmes)
   - "Tlunkwa," Etchemin for "traders" (Ganong in Eckstorm 1945:75)
   - "Hal-un-tuk'wepik," Maliseet for "River Country People" (Adney MSS)
In 1614 John Smith said of the Penobscot River: "On the East of it are the Tarratines, their mortall enemies, = where inhabit the French. . . ." (1665:42)

"The Tarranteenes /The Indians inhabiting eastward saving that they eate not man's flesh are little lesse salvage, and cruell than these cannibals: our Indians doe feare them as deadly enemies." (Wood 1865:67)

Possible derivations of "Abnaki":
"Wab-ôn-ak-î," an Indian of the East (Adney MSS)
"Wanôhbanaki," "Easterner" (A. F. Chamberlain 1905:123)
"Wôbanaki," Indian from the East (Laurent 1884:205)
"Ouabenakiouek," "ceux de L'aurore" (Champlain 1870:2:196)
"Wanb-" = white, "-naghi" = ancestors, thus "our ancestors to the East" (Vetromile 1866:27)
"Wabanâkik," "light strange people" (Michael Holmes)

Possible derivations of Armouchiquois:
"ul-mos-is," "little dog" (Passamaquoddy) from which Almouchiquois and Massachusetts are derived (Michael Holmes)
"ul-mou-chich," Micmac diminutive of "dog" (Peter Paul)

Hoffman seems to think that the Abenaki of the interior and the Almouchiquois of the coast south of Casco Bay were two different people (1955:68). His evidence is probably derived from "Popham's Voyage" in 1607 (Burrage 1906:411) which notes that the Indians of Pejepscot (south of the Kennebec) were at odds with those under Sassanoa of the Kennebec.

"We have no good English equivalent for the term Almouchiquois, though Abenaki seems to cover a part of the ground and Natick another part. They are best defined as corn-raising agricultural Indians of southwestern Maine and the Merrimack Valley." (Eckstorm MSS)

Williamson (1632:1:457) and later writers generally classify under the term "Abenagues" the Anasuguntacooks /Androscoggin/, the Canibas /Kennebec/, and the Sakokis /Pigwacketts and Ossipees on the Saco/. They add also the Wawenocks.

Possible derivations of "Wawenoc":
"Wa-wun," "egg" for "egg gathering people" (Michael Holmes)
"Walinakiak," "people of the Bays" (Andrew Dana)
"Nopesawenoak," "warriors" (Eckstorn 1945:75)
According to Mooney and Thomas: "The earliest English accounts indicate that about 1605-20 the southwestern part of the coast of Maine was occupied by other Indians whose chief seat was near Pemaquid and who were at war with the Abnaki or Tarrateen, as the English termed them, who were more to the north; but these other tribes were finally conquered by the Abnaki and probably absorbed by them. Who these Indians were is unknown." (1913:2)

Possible derivations of "Pentagoet":
"Pen-tag-wet," "falls of the river" (Eckstorm 1941:192)
"Petak'wet," "he who lands" (Siebert 1943:505)
"Pempetegoet" is amazingly like "Bemoquiducke" of the St. George's River region, and considering the differences in orthography between the French and English, these could very well have been the same Indian word, and might provide a clue to Wawenock identity as Etchemin.

Possible derivations of "Panawakskek":
"Bunawabske," "rocky place" (Margaret Socoby)
"Bunawabskek," "rocky place" (Andrew Dana)
"Bunaps," "rock"; "Bunapskik," "rocky place" (Peter Paul)
"Pen-apsk-ek," "at the descending rock" (Eckstorm 1941:1-2)

... considering their numbers and isolation for a long time it is safe to recognize them as Pentagoets. They occupied the region from Castine to Naskeag Point and perhaps beyond and deserve a sub-tribal status by virtue of their location." (Eckstorm 1919:48)

Raymond and Webster think that they reached at least as far as Frederickton. (Wallis & Wallis 1955:17)

A note by Webster says that after Diereville's time the Micmacs withdrew to Nova Scotia. (Diereville 1933:216)

Dr. Ballard cites Father Desmiller's manuscripts and an ancient map as proof that the Micmacs were the Souriquois (Letter in Eckstorm MSS). As will be shown later, linguistic evidence also proves that these two names denoted the same people.

"The Indians in the neighborhood of Port Royal are called Micmacs; they are also found along the St. John River. . . . " (Diereville 1933:184)

Ganon also surmises that Tarantyn is derived from the Abnaki word "tlunkwa," "tluntwa," or "trentwa" meaning trader because the Micmacs were middle-men in trade between the Europens and Indians farther west. (Letter 1912)
This obviously contradicts all early authorities who located only Etchemins on the Penobscot.

There is no evidence for occupation by Micmacs at this late date except that the English persisted in calling the Indians northeast of the Penobscot "Tarratines."

Wars . . . may have been directed against an allied tribe as well as against a traditional enemy . . . raids were in most instances without the sanction of the entire tribe and were engaged in by the younger, irresponsible men or youths who wished personal glory." (Hadlock 1947:214)

Champlain recorded that Membertou, returned from war on the Saco River, had killed only twenty Indians and wounded ten or twelve more (1907:113).

In 1604 Champlain, also, noticed an already existing feud between the Etchemins of the Penobscot and the Etchemins of the Kennebec, which had probably resulted from the trade. "... our savages on the Penobscot left us as they did not wish to go to Quinibequy, for the savages of that place are great enemies to them." (1907:51)

Oagimont of Machias and St. Croix seems to have been a mediator between those south of the Penobscot and those on the St. John. In 1606 he delivered the body of Chkoudun's son from Bessabes to Chkoudun at Port Royal (Champlain: 1907:106). He was later appointed to negotiate peace with the Almouchiquois chief (DeMonts in Purchas 1906:18:287)

Eckstorm's place names of Micmac origin, as will be shown later, are probably errors. The cruelty with which she credits the Tarratines is part of warfare whether or not the two parties are related. And finally, the absence of "Tarratine" as a name on deeds or treaties only stands to reason, for the name "Tarratine" was not used by the Pentagoets for themselves.

The Indians of New Brunswick (as it is now called) were named the Etamquinquis or Etchemins; and their number, reckoning as far as Pentagoet [Penobscot] is set down at 2,500 /about 1610/ including probably the same people that we call the Malacites or Melecites." (Murdoch 1866:1:43)

Possible derivations of Kennebec:
"Kabasa," Abnaki for "sturgeon" (Laurent 1884:39)
"Kinebec," Cree for "long pointed creature" (A. P. Chamberlain 1901:680)
"Kine-bague," Abnaki for "long, quiet water" (Eckstorm 1941:142)
"gin paga," Passamaquoddy for "big lake" (Margaret Socoby)
"gun-e-bek," Penobscot for "long water" (Andrew Dana)

33 "Penobscot" is a shortened form of "Bunawapskek."

34 A note by Thwaites says that this village was occupied by the Penobscot branch of the Etchemin group (Jesuits 1896-1900:2:292-3).

35 Eckstorm assumes that there were only two groups:
"Since the Etchemins and the Abnakis were always friendly peoples, it is likely that the falls at Old Town, which was the great fishing place for salmon, shad and alewives, was shared by both tribes." (1945:77)

36 Judge Godfrey tells us that Col. Church was informed of a village fifty or sixty miles above the coast in 1696, which would have been near or at Old Town (1872:1:86).


38 Adney derived the same theory from the Penobscot Mrs. Nicolaar Shay, though Eckstorm claims that "the Tarratines never were the Penobscots. . . ." (1945:74) simply that "the name Tarratines clung to the region and has been transferred to the more recent Penobscots. . . ." (1945:77) Williamson agrees that the Tarratines were the ancestors of the Penobscots (1832:1:472) though other historians used the term for all of the Eastern Indians from the Saco River to the St. John. Assuming Tarratine, thus, to be equivalent to Penobscot, Williamson then classifies the Tarratines as one of the three Etchemin tribes, together with the Passamaquoddy and Maliseet tribes (1832:1:457).

39 Speck backs away from any hypothesis, though he does group the Penobscots as Etchemin or Tarratine, and the tribes westward as Abenaki (1940:13).

40 Louis Mitchell, Passamaquoddy representative to the Legislature in 1887, said: "Now I can show you by letters from Col. John Allan which he addressed to us, the Passamaquoddy, sometimes as the Marishite tribe. Now the word Marishite, that is the Micmac name for Passamaquoddy."
(Speech 1887)

Possible derivations of Passamaquoddy:
"pes-kut-um," "pollock"; a-quah-dik," "place of occurrence" (Ganong 1896:260)
"pestumokadyik," "spearmen of pollock fish"
Prince 1902b)
"pesto-m-o-kat-ik," "pollock place" (Margaret Socoby)
"pestumo," "fish"; "-acadic," "place of" (Peter Paul)
"p-sawm-a-cadic," "place of shad" (Peter Paul)
"pesca'dana," "pollock" (Andrew Dana)

1633 "Machias tribe" (Bradford 1856:3:292)
1635 Charles de la Tour built a trading post at Machias.
1677 Pessemunquote (Jesuits 1896-1901:60:262-3)
1687-8 Indians at Pechmoncady, Lincourt, St. Stephen,
Mogeis, Machias', and Doquet (Morse 1935:1:141)
1694 Villebon (Journals MS)
1701 Missionary moved from Medoctac to "Pemokady"
(Raymond May 19, 1892).
1704 Maj. Church learned that Indians in the region
had been told to withdraw (Raymond May 19, 1892).

Lahontan identifies the Passamaquoddies as "Openangos,"
which is obviously a corruption of "Nabanaki" (1905:1:327-8)

However, they did have a chief--Oagimont--in 1607.
(Lescarbot 1907-14:4:359-20)

"Whether the original people of St. Croix were a
part of the Pemaquid and Penobscott tribes is uncertain.
" Sullivan (1795:95) then enumerates the tribes known to the
English and excludes the Passamaquoddies.

Sylvester suggests this as a reason for their
obscurity: "Because of their close relationship with
tribes on either side of them whose history became their
history." (1910:2:36) Thus, in historic times and within
the memory of modern Indians we hear of Passamaquoddies
doing their winter hunting on the St. John or Penobscot
River.

Indeed, the derivation of Schoodic as "burnt lands"
or "open fields" might testify to the former existence of
cultivated fields in this area.

Egermei participated in the attack on Wells in 1692
(Williamson 1832:1:631), and signed the Treaty of Pemaquid

Out of pure ignorance or lack of concern, officials
of the State of Maine have declared that the Passamaquoddy
Tribe had no separate identity until 1760 when they signed
the final Treaty of Submission to the English.
CHAPTER III
CULTURAL UNITY

In order to understand the nature of the unity of the Indians in New Hampshire, Maine and New Brunswick, it is necessary to view them within the framework of, first, an Eastern Woodland Culture Area; secondly, a Northeastern Indian Hunter Culture; and, thirdly, within the Wabanaki sub-area. It is necessary to see how the environment determines these cultural frameworks and how each of these cultural frameworks determines the nature of the social organizations within. It is only thus, in terms of such cultural frameworks, that we can define the type of unity existing in the Wabanaki area.

The largest, most inclusive, cultural framework is that of the Eastern Woodland Culture Area (Wissler 1950: 236), one of the ten North American Culture Areas covering the territory from the Arctic (excluding the Eskimo) to Lakes Superior and Huron to east of the St. Lawrence. It comprises three major groups of tribes, the Iroquoian and Central and Eastern Algonkian. As the name implies, the cultural uniformity of this area is determined by the northern woodland environment. Culture traits, thus, center around woodland arts, such as hunting, fishing, and
woodcraft (bark and wooden utensils, skin or bark covered shelter, the birch canoe and the toboggan). Agriculture, where possible, is an important form of subsistence.

The more specific cultural group to which the tribes in question belong is the Northeastern Indian hunter culture (Flannery 1946:263), a more northern subdivision of the Eastern Woodland Area. Since this group is characterized most aptly by the Naskapi and Montagnais north of the St. Lawrence where the climate tends to be harsh, agriculture plays no part in this culture complex except perhaps on the fringes. Instead the whole culture is fixated on hunting. The most profitable type of game formerly was the large migratory animal such as the moose, deer, bear, and caribou, with some importance also attached to the smaller, more sedentary fur-bearers. The hunter, therefore, had to be mobile. His few possessions were highly adapted to travel and to the harsh climate, i.e., the lightweight snowshoe, canoe and toboggan. His implements and utensils were limited to the requirements for procuring and treating the game, i.e., the bow and arrow, lance or spear, crooked knife, scrapers, and awls. In his attempt to control the unpredictable environment, the hunter resorted to divination, some bear ceremonialism and theism in which shamanism and the trickster cycle played important roles. Due to the size and migratory habits of the game sought after, group or band hunting predominated
over individual hunting. Yet, because of the inconsistencies of climate and the abundance of game, the size of this hunting group was flexible and constantly shifting. Thus, the social economic and political structure was totally dependent on the fluctuations of environmental factors. The social structure was of necessity highly atomistic—the patriarchal, extended family being the most constant political unit. As will be shown later, the development of the family hunting ground system as a consequence of the white traders' demands for the fur of the non-migratory fur-bearers was a natural extension of the family hunting group.

According to Flannery (1946:270), the area south of the St. Lawrence formed a sub-area of the northeastern hunter culture and comprised the Micmac, Maliseet, Passamaquoddy, Penobscot, and Abenaki. (As a whole, this group will be referred to as the Wabanaki (Speck 1926:283).) And this culture area is characterized by the same elements that appear to the north, though with somewhat less emphasis on the hunting since climatically the environment permits some subsidiary agriculture. Here, too, the more stable cultural characteristics of the agricultural tribes to the south and east have blended with the northern elements of a hunting economy. The economically necessary summer-winter cycle still operates, perhaps with greater seasonal differentiation of pursuits, for agriculture necessitates a sedentary existence, at least for the
duration of the growing season (which was just about 100 days). Furthermore, the proximity of the coast must have acted as a strong lure in annual seasons of hunting scarcity. Consequently, the family band organization dominated during the hunting months (fall and winter), but during the spring and summer the Wabanaki would gather in small villages, especially along the rivers and coasts, to fish and plant a few rows of corn.

At the advent of the white man the Wabanaki material culture was clearly a blend of the North and of the South. While all that characterized the North was still retained, pottery, splint basketry, the mortar and pestle, etc., were obviously southern agricultural influences. In the social and political sphere perhaps the greatest effects were to be perceived, for annual gathering in villages necessitated more cohesive political organization. Hence, the chief became a stronger figure, and the social structure was noticeably more complex to the southwest where the longer growing season permitted longer residence in villages. Women throughout the region had thus attained higher status in accordance with their greater economic importance in the agricultural sphere (Chamberlain 1904: 129).

Unfortunately, by the time the white man really started observing the mode of life of the Wabanaki, the effects of contact had long been underway (Speck 1946: 356-8) and the pre-contact importance of agriculture in
the culture of the Northeast was underestimated or simply not perceived. According to Thwaites:

They were a powerful but mild people dwelling in villages when first encountered by the French but later lost their village habit to some extent, under the influence of the French who induced them to revert to the hunting stage in the interest of the all-absorbing fur-trade, (Lahontan 1905: 1:327-8)

Thus by 1600 when the explorers began taking note of native customs, the village was becoming less important as a way of life, family and even individual autonomy was developing as a natural requisite of the fur trade. In spite of these developments, political authority was still vested in a chief (sagum), and for this reason the early explorers found supposedly strong leaders, whose authority, however was really only nominal, over an extensive and highly amorphous group of people.

Often attempts have been made to describe the culture of the Penobscots, Passamaquoddy or Maliseets as uniquely Penobscot, Passamaquoddy or Maliseet. However, what cultural distinctions there were may be attributed merely to recent diffusion from either the North or the South on the fringes of the Wabanaki group. In fact, speaking of Maliseet and Penobscot cultures Speck calls them merely "separate aspects of one phase of culture." Usually even the Micmacs are included under the Wabanaki culture area, and indeed, if environment is such an important determinant of culture, then they ought to be included. However, there seems to be much conflict of
of opinion, or vagueness at least, on the cultural position of the Micmacs. In fact, Mechling groups the Maliseets as closer to the Micmacs than to the Penobscots "in everything except language." (Mechling 1956:7:115) In his Ph.D. thesis, "The Social and Religious Life of the Malecites and Micmacs," (1917) testifies to the validity of this grouping. When discussing culture A. F. Chamberlain likewise groups them as "the Micmac and related tribes." (1904:128:30) Others are aware of the similarities, but pay more attention to the distinctions between the Micmac and the other Abenaki tribes as a group. For example, Hadlock says:

... The ethnological collections, particularly those at St. John, N.B., show close relationship of the Penobscot and Malecite design of materials and colors used. This is not so with the Micmac, although there are similarities in some instances between Micmac, Malecite and Penobscots. (Letter January 27, 1966)

Specw, too, notes differences, particularly in social organization (family hunting systems) (1905:302), which is much looser and less complex among the Micmac. The greater affinities in the social organization of the Micmac with tribes north of the St. Lawrence forces one to conclude that the cultural differences between the Micmac and the other Wabanaki tribes are not basic, but represent merely the effects of less direct contact with, and diffusion from, southern and Iroquoian tribes than the Penobscot and Abenaki evidently experienced.
Along the shores of New Brunswick and Maine the coastline takes a gradual trend toward the southwest, making ecological gradations barely perceptible over a long stretch of coastline. But south of the Kennebec and Saco Rivers the coast begins to trend more directly southward, so that in a short distance along the coast more dramatic ecological differences can be perceived. It is in this area that dramatic cultural changes in accord with the climatic changes were early observed by explorers. This was where Champlain (1907:60) and other explorers distinguished between the agricultural, sedentary Armouchiquois to the south and the more seasonally oriented Etchemins and Souriquois in the north. This distinction becomes especially important in terms of territorial conflict and general antagonism between two ways of life. It is here, thus, around the Saco River, that we find an important ecological and cultural break in the uniformity characterizing the Northeast.

Finally, it is possible that culture, determined in large part by the environment, contributed to an enormous extent to the feeling of unity in the Wabanaki area. This feeling of unity within the Wabanaki group was non-existent among the Micmacs. But since their culture probably approximated more closely that of the other Wabanakis in some prehistoric time, it is felt that other factors are to be considered for their general lack of contact with their neighbors the Maliseets and Passamaquoddies. (And
it is to this lack of contact that the few cultural differences noted in historic times between the Micmacs and other Mi'kmaq are to be attributed.

Having defined the culture area to which the tribes of Maine and New Brunswick belong, it is now necessary to analyze the internal structure and dynamics of the culture in order to determine the nature of the unity.

In his many studies of the social organization in the Northeast Frank Speck has shown how very dependent social structure is on environment. He says that tribes, forced by environment to depend on hunting and fishing, must move with the seasons and must therefore divide "into small, biological groups of individuals related by blood or marriage under the direction of some able-bodied elderly leader, a family head, These groups or 'camps' change their location according to the condition of the game supply." (1917c:100) This quotation, of course, underlies Speck's insistence on the family hunting system both as prehistoric and as the basis of land ownership; and it has sparked the academic debate over whether or not the system, as found by early whites, was pre-Columbian. Without launching into the debate here, it seems logical enough to state that the harsh environment could hardly have permitted of either large stable several-family units year-round, or bands much smaller than the consanguineous family- as a matter of self-preservation. Thus whether or
not the family band organization was pre-Columbian or as pervasive as Speck claims is unimportant here. What is important is to see the fluctuating nature of the social organization in Algonquian society, to see the consanguineous family as the basic unit, and to see the family band system as fitting into the necessities of the fur trade.

In order to understand how fluctuating the band organization could be, it is clarifying to look at the band as it existed north of the St. Lawrence. There, while members of the band identified themselves with it and usually married within it, minor or major dialect or cultural differences could exist among the members. Band ties were so loose that sovereignty existed entirely in the families or kin groups. There were often no chiefs outside of family heads, and no legal procedures "for adjudicating contentions between the constituent individuals or families of the band." (Cooper 1939:71) Thus, in a society where friendly face-to-face relationships were valued above all else and where harsh words were viewed as intolerable as murder (Hallowell 1946:206-7), voluntary splits were common. To the Algonquian, life was too harsh to have to suffer social maladjustments in addition to environmental difficulties. Under such environmental conditions then, the band was peculiarly well adapted both to the environment and to the psychology in the Northeast. Not only did it easily permit of fluctuations in size in accordance with the food supply but also in accordance with the psychological
make-up of the Algonquian himself. Understanding the nature of the band as thus, one can readily see the constant splitting and reuniting of bands, noted especially by the Jesuits, as not an extraordinary phenomenon within a single group of people.

Although village life had affected the social organization of the Wabanaki to a considerable degree, semi-migratory band life predominated in the early 1600's. Champlain noted only a few Indians on the four major rivers (St. John, St. Croix, Penobscot, and Kennebec where they later became permanently established), and then only at certain times during the year. Although Champlain, recognizing common bonds, termed the Indians on these four rivers as Etechemins, most later explorers saw these different bands as separate tribes. Gesner from his knowledge of New Brunswick Indians naively points to the social organization as the cause for this tendency of the explorers:

From the peculiar habits and patriarchal form of government of the North American Indians, new tribes were frequently formed, and the lesser tribes or families, although bound to some greater community, received distinct names from the early voyageurs. (1847:108)

As a result of village life several months out of the year, the family band organization of the Wabanaki seemed to be much further developed than that of more migratory tribes north of the St. Lawrence. Analyzing the Penobscot family band system, Speck finds much in common
with the more northern tribes (patrilineal, non-exogamous, lineal system of relationship). His main difference lies in the family totem—a special family relationship to a certain animal with an explanatory myth (1915a:300). This difference leads Speck to define the Penobscot social system as "a nascent clan organization" (1915a:302), similar to that of the Iroquois and southern New England tribes, although without the usual exogamy or diet and conduct restrictions. Although some have called the Wabanaki family unit a clan or gens, Speck refutes such terms by quoting Hallowell who calls them "patronymic families" (Speck 1935:528) and Siebert who calls them sibs "("named, formal, totemic exogamous, unilateral group") (Speck 1940:204). Whatever the term they may be given, the twenty-two families as found by Speck among the Penobscots (1914:213-215) each with their own family totem and their paternally inherited land tended to be a divisive element—a carry-over from the hunting band days, with a marked development in the direction of greater family consciousness and identity. The fact that each family called its territory "my river" would lead one to believe that one or two such family bands might have established themselves on a river, and thus became known as a "tribe." The fact that tribal totems were derived in the same way as family band totems—from the animal most pursued in the territory (Speck 1917a:13)—would also lead one to the same conclusion. The primordial existence of
the family band as opposed to the tribe is further sug-
gested by Mechlìng who, noting the Bear family among the
Micmacs and the Penobscots, concludes that the Maliseet
Bears may be "remnants of the old band of that name"
(1958:7:110). Fannie Eckstorm likewise mentions a similar
occurrence in the legend which "... tells how a sturgeon
family became the progenitor of a tribe called the
Cabassaguntiaks, a small clan which used to live on the
Kennebec River. ..." (1957:47)

As an outgrowth of the family band system, the
moiety grouping (the twofold tribal division into land and
water families) may have had some bearing on the splitting
and localization among the Wabanaki tribes. To quote Speck,
the first to perceive this division:

"The human families ... seem to have chosen
their habitat near the places inhabited by their
animal relatives." So we find those families
with marine animal associations occupying hunting
territories near the sea ... Those highest in
social rank were the Bear and Squirrel from which
the chief of the families having land animal
tokens was choses, and the Frog and Sturgeon from
which the other side chose their chief.
(Speck 1940:213-14)

Though Siebert calls this only an "embryo dichotomy"
(Speck 1940:236), and Speck says that "no further politi-
cal links seem to have developed" (Speck 1940:209), both
Adney (MSS) and Eckstorm (1945:56) seem to have seized on
this distinction between saltwater families (those living
near the coast and bearing aquatic eponyms) and terre-
restrial families as a source for tribal divisions. Indeed,
their theories that the aquatic families inhabited the
coast and the terrestrial families the inland rivers finds proof in the fact that Penobscot chiefs have come mainly from inland families such as the Squirrel (Attian) family and the Passamaquoddy chiefs mainly from the Neptunes, the most noted aquatic family.

Without doubt, the development of the family hunting system was greatly stimulated by the fur trade for both institutions were peculiarly suited to the development of the other. If family ownership and inheritance of land is inherent in the family hunting system, then it seems unlikely that the system could have existed before the fur trade. In spite of the fact that a family hunting system is an ecological necessity where sedentary, non-gregarious animals such as beaver are sought after, the larger migratory animals such as caribou, moose, deer, and bear (which were likewise much sought after) required group hunting. Thus, it seems that before the fur trade caused emphasis to be placed on one type of animal (fur-bearer) and on an individual type of hunting (Leacock 1954:43), family hunting probably alternated with group hunting. Conceivably as the fur trade developed, the allotment system probably came into use (whereby the band chief would annually allot territory to individual families for a season). Although Speck seems to regard the family ownership of land as antedating white arrival, he and Eiseley do concede that "the concept may have been fluid and adjustable to the extent that both patterns may have been in use by the same
bands under differing conditions . . . " (Speck & Liseley 1939:276). Since we have no evidence of family ownership of land before the white man came, and since there is no real historical evidence until 1710 according to Raudot (Cooper 1939:73), we must conclude that the sense of family ownership was developed in the seventeenth century under the influence of the white man's concepts and the Indian's growing dependence on the trader. Therefore, by 1710 we come to what Speck describes as family ownership which was more correctly "usufruct tenure without title further than that conveyed by continued occupancy and use of its resources for the support of the family." (1940:203)

By 1820 family ownership of a specific territory according to Daniel Harmon was "as well known to the tribe as the lines which separate farms are to the farmers, in the civilized world." (Liseley 1947:680) Accompanying this mutually recognized system of exclusive tenure were concepts of game conservation, patrilineal inheritance, and family emblems used as territorial markers.

The purpose in tracing the foregoing development of the family hunting system was to illustrate how an element basic to the culture (the consanguineous hunting family) with an external stimulus (the fur trade) was developed into something which tended to divide the tribe even more permanently than ever before. It is an indisputable fact that during the latter 1600's and most of the 1700's the Indians still passed freely back and forth
from the St. John to the Penobscot. Since that area was relatively unaffected by the fur trade until the late 1600's (Bailey 1938:269) (and then only by the occasional "coureur de bois," French soldier or priest), the demands of the fur trade had not reached the proportions they had south of the Penobscot or to the north on the St. Lawrence. What territorial hunting there was was probably done on the yearly allotment basis and while an Indian may have identified with one of the main rivers as his home, the unity of feeling still existed and found expression in continual social intercourse between the three rivers of Penobscot, St. Croix and St. John. Once the permanent trading establishments were built on the St. John and the Penobscot (after the last Indian War in 1759) the tremendous necessities of the Indians and the fur traders demanded continual exploitation of hunting territories, which was most economically accomplished under a system of family ownership. Henceforth, the family hunting group became relatively sedentary and identified with the river closest to its territory.

From the preceding analysis the unity in the North-east must be seen as a highly elastic concept. Both the slight cultural variations between the three major groups and the semi-migratory life militated against the creation of a unity as we would conceive it; but as a whole the Wabanaki culture area was uniform in that it was shaped by a uniform environment. Agriculture was not confined to
the area south of the Kennebec but was practiced, though with less emphasis, as far north as the St. John River.

As for the semi-migratory life, this was common throughout the entire region with graded intensity from north to south. The cultural configuration in the Northeast was thus one of uniform gradation—gradation of northern elements from north to south and of southern elements from south to north. The most constant element in the north-eastern social organization was the consanguineous family which was peculiarly adaptable to all the gradations in culture elements and climate. It was thus in terms of this cultural uniformity that a unity was to be perceived in the Northeast. Moreover, this element in common led the families to seek each others' assistance, and thus by constant social intercourse was created a feeling of unity in spite of the apparent autonomy.

One small, but not unimportant, factor contributing to the feeling of unity for the Maine and New Brunswick tribes was the geography of the region, expressed best in the words of L. Tappan Adney:

The Indians from the Kennebec to the St. John were 'par excellence' 'River Indians.' The interlocking headwaters of the Kennebec, Penobscot, St. Croix and St. John, (the mighty St. John dominates in northern Maine), constituted a self-contained ecological and faunal area, the interlocking streams constituting the Indian roads, for easy communication by the canoe. (Adney MSS)

Not only do the interlocking headwaters make this a self-contained unit but so also do the many river systems
connected by short and well-worn portage paths. From the St. John it is possible to get to the St. Croix and the Machias River with one portage, and to the Penobscot by another route, with again only one portage, and still just one more portage to arrive at the Kennebec. Even in the early days Champlain commented on the quick communication from the Passamaquoddy Bay to "the rivers Norumbegue [Pembscot] and St. John" (1880:2:33), and John Gyles, who in 1689 was captured at Pemaquid, describes his trip "up that eastern branch of the Penobscot River" with two portages before arriving at "Medocktack fort which stands on a bank of St. Johns River" (1869:14) (see Appendices I and K). In consequence of the intricate system of waterways, frequent travel occurred throughout the territory, probably much more commonly in earliest times than in modern times. Fannie Eckstrom, remarking on this phenomenon, said that "... the Maine Indians have moved about as freely as the whites of one county intermingle with those of another." (1919:44) And certainly the historical evidence verifies this. A Jesuit Relation of 1647 noted Abenakis and Etchemins at a village in Quebec previous to the Abenaki emigration from Maine (Jesuits 1896-1901:32:221). Of the trading village at Tadoussac Quebec in 1677 Bailey, a contemporary ethnologist, remarks:

The four or five hundred who comprised the floating population of this point included also Indians of the Passamaquoddy and Penobscot, beside those of the St. John. They were described at this late date as nomads. . . . (1937:35)

Likewise, the Maliseet village at Madawaska in 1692 served as a rallying point "where the Canibas [from the Kennebec]
ordinarily retreat to when they fear anything in their country." (New York 1856-87:9:548) In the wars that followed we are furnished with innumerable instances of travel throughout the territory. Following the wars, two Indian censuses—one taken at Passamaquoddy Bay in 1780 (J. Allen in Kidder 1867:284-5) and the other at Meductic on the St. John in 1785 (Raymond 1896:270-2)—show much duplication of names indicating extensive travel between the two points. And, a few years later in 1693, John Allan reported that

On the Schoodic Lakes you will find numbers of Indians from Canada, St. Johns, Penobscot and the Micmac country pursuing their several employments agreeable to the seasons. (Kidder 1876:305)

Even as late as 1828 there is evidence of major movements between the tribes, for in that year thirty Maliseet families joined the Abenakis of Quebec, and this, Sylvester remarks, was "... not indicative of anything other than a disposition to change." (1910:2:43)

On the eastern side of the Maliseet territory, according to Ganong, the waterways were generally more rough and obstructed than the ones to the west of the St. John (1899:235) and hence were less traveled. It is probably due to this geographical barrier that the lack of Micmac-Maliseet social intercourse may be attributed, and likewise the divergence in speech which is so apparent today. As proof of this social isolation of the Micmacs, a Jesuit Relation has it that "... The Micmacs and Maliseets did not love each other much and have no close
relations with each other." (1896-1901:60:271)

To summarize, the strong feeling of unity, so apparent among Maliseets, Passamaquoddies and Penobscots, is largely a result of a culture characterized by a semi-migratory life, and of a geography so well fitted for travel; for both factors tended to promote a high degree of social intercourse and tended to maintain a cultural homogeneity throughout the entire New Hampshire, Maine, New Brunswick area. It thus made local cultural distinctions nearly impossible except where climate and diffusion created barely perceptible gradations. Finally, the unity in this area may now be seen as basically one of cultural uniformity enhanced by geographical factors. Within this framework the linguistic and political unity may be more readily perceived in the following chapters.
This culture group is classed as a taiga or boreal culture for purposes of culture reconstruction (Cooper 1946).

According to Brinton, the term Abnaki also included the Naskapi north of the St. Lawrence in the culture group (Mooney & Thomas 1913:1).

Abenakis had an incipient sib or clan organization with totemism and some exogamy.

"Lescarbot in 1610 calls the Souriquois and Etchemins "nomadic and divided."" (Jesuits 1896-1901:1:73)


Speck's book on Penobscot culture--Penobscot Man (1940)--was just such an attempt. So difficult is it to differentiate between the groups that even Passamaquoddies or Maliseets will indignantly claim the so-called Penobscot culture as, rather, their own.

Speck attributes some cultural differences as consequent upon climatic changes connected with Iroquoian diffusion (1926:286).

A comparison of Speck's Penobscot Man (1940) with the Maliseets' The Micmacs (1955) would reveal differences primarily in social organization, for diffusion of material culture is always much more rapid than other aspects of culture, especially in an area where ecological conditions are so similar.


"From the first land (which is Newfoundland) to the country of the Armouchiquois, a distance of nearly three hundred leagues, the people are nomads, without agriculture, never stopping longer than five or six weeks in a place. . . . But as to the Armouchiquois and Iroquois countries . . . they are not so sparsely populated and the people cultivate the soil. . . . Now, these people who cultivate the soil are stationary. . . ." (Lescarbot 1907-14:1:83)
Hadlock makes much of this distinction in his article "Warfare Among the Northeastern Woodland Indians" (1947).

Leacock (1954), Eiseley (1947), Cooper (1938 and 1939), Hallowell (1949), and Speck (1915a, 1917c, 1939, and 1940).

It seems that this academic debate ought to concern how much of the family hunting system was pre-Columbian rather than whether or not it was pre-Columbian.

On the Penobscot in 1604 Champlain noted that "... from the entrance to where we went, about twenty-five leagues, we saw no town nor village, nor the appearance of their having been one, but one or two cabins of the savages without inhabitants... So far as we could judge, the savages on this river are few in number and are called Etechemins. Moreover, they only come to the islands, and that only during some months in summer to fish and game, of which there is great quantity." (1907:44)

Exogamy existed between members of the same family in a local group, but not between members of the same family in two different bands; i.e., a Penobscot Francis could marry a Francis from St. John or Passamaquoddy (Speck 1940:204).


Although Speck concentrated on the family organization of the Penobscot, he has also noted similar "economic phenomena" among the Passamaquoddy (1915a:302) and among the Maliseet (1946).

The Penobscot Water Famine Legend explaining the origins of the two classes of family tutelaries (Speck 1940:216) has nearly identical correlations among the Passamaquoddy and Maliseet (Leland 1884:670) (Speck 1917b:480).

Hadlock notes that group hunting "... was employed to a much greater extent to the southward [in New England]. This might indicate that, indeed, the fur trade which did not reach southern New England had done much to upset the economic balance in northern New England.

Other factors south of the Penobscot intervened during this time period probably hastening the development of the family hunting system to the stage of family ownership—thereby cutting down the free movement and social intercourse between the Abenaki bands involved and leaving individual families open to exploitation by the whites, with a resultant loss of land.

Ganon (1899:239), Raymond (1896:223), and Kidder (1867:84) all remark on this amazing network of rivers.
CHAPTER IV

LINGUISTIC UNITY

The modern Indian languages of Maine and New Brunswick belong to the Algonquian family—the most extensive linguistic stock in North America, extending from Newfoundland to the Rocky Mountains, and on the east coast, south to Pamlico Sound. The Algonquian tribes on the Atlantic coast, separated from the western branches by the Iroquian stock, are subdivided into two groups—an eastern branch, from Virginia to Massachusetts or New Hampshire, and a northeastern branch, comprising the Montagnais group of eastern Quebec and the Abenaki group of Maine and the Maritimes, with which we are primarily concerned. Although the Abenaki group in the earliest days of white contact was consistently distinguished by three subdivisions, it included many dialects such as Micmac, Maliseet, Passamaquoddy, Arosaguntacook, Sokoki, Penobscot, and Norridgewock. (See Appendix E) Today, however, only Micmac, Penobscot, Passamaquoddy, Maliseet, and the composite Abenaki remain, and of these, Penobscot is rapidly dying out.

Although few scientific comparisons of these surviving languages have been made, their strong resemblances
in form (sound systems) and meaning (semantics) are significant of a real historical relationship, not simply in the common stock, but also in a high rate of borrowing (Greenberg 1953:268). Speaking of the eastern branch of the Algonquian family, Ives Goddard, a graduate student in linguistics at Harvard says:

... each district tends to be slightly different from the neighboring dialects on either side; in some cases the differences are few and the speakers of each can understand one another without much practice, (Letter February 20, 1966)

It is the intent of this chapter to show that differences were indeed few between the dialects of New Hampshire, Maine and New Brunswick and that the break was sharper between these dialects and those to the south (in Massachusetts) and those to the north (specifically Micmac).

As mentioned previously, practically all of the earliest explorers in Acadia (including all of the Maritimes and Maine as far west as the Kennebec) noted three groups with distinct languages in this territory (Lescarbot 1907-14: 1:73): from the Gaspe Peninsula to the St. John was the Souriquois; from the St. John to the Kennebec was the Étchemin; and from the Kennebec south was the Armouchiquois. Ideally, if adequate vocabularies were available from each of these groups taken at the approximate date of the first white contacts, it is believed that the differences in the Souriquois and Étchemin dialects (Lescarbot 1907:3: 114) would have been sufficient to preclude both a high
degree of social intercourse and much subsequent borrowing. It is, furthermore, presumed that the differences between the so-called Armouchiquois (at least around the Saco and Kennebec Rivers) and the Stechemins (east of the Kennebec) were so small that the greater similarities transcended the differences and led to a feeling of unity.

Since we have not the necessary vocabularies to be used as a basis for a comparison of these early languages, it is of far greater importance to determine what the modern representatives of these languages are, in order to determine tribal movements and intertribal relations.

That Stechemin was the ancient counterpart of modern Passamaquoddy and Maliseet is contended by many linguists. Adney says:

There is unquestionable continuity of language between the Indians of 1604-5 and the present Indians. . . . The Indians encountered by Jaymouth and the party of Champlain and DeMonts were Algonkian-speaking and the ancestors in whole or in part of our present local Indians. (Adney MSS)

However positive the historians and linguists may be, their contention is based solely on two short vocabularies recorded in 1607 by Rosier (Purchas 1906:18:358-9) and Lescarbot (1907-14:3:114) and on a few miscellaneous words recorded by DeMonts (Purchas 1906 18:282) and Biard (Jesuits 1896-1901:2:29). Furthermore, these two vocabularies correspond only in part to the modern Passamaquoddy and Maliseet, there being some detectable Abnaki, Massachusetts and Micmac words or roots included. In the face of these obvious inconsistencies Hoffman concludes that the
Etchemin of these early explorers could be either the immediate ancestor of modern Malecite-Passamaquoddy or a separate, but now extinct, language which influenced the modern counterparts (Hoffman 1955:68). At least it is generally conceded that the Etchemins were closest linguistically to our modern Passamaquoddies and Maliseets.

To determine the modern counterparts of the Armouchiquois language we have even less to go on, for no vocabulary was recorded south of the Kennebec by the earliest explorers. Nearly all that we have is the word "Kennebec" itself, given by Champlain in 1605 as "Quinibequi" which is closest to the Penobscot "gunē-bek," meaning "long water." We also find the word "piousquemin" for "corn" as taken down by Father Biard while visiting the Kennebec in 1611 (Jesuits 1896-1901:2:37). This seems to have a more exact equivalent in the modern Maliseet rather than in the Penobscot or ancient Norridgewock: the Maliseet is "pies-kummul" while the Norridgewock as given by Rasle eighty years later is "skamoun nar" (Rasle 1833) and the Penobscot is "skamoonal." Since the Abenakis were located on the Kennebec by Father Rasle in the late 1600's, it can be fairly well assumed that the name Abenaki covered a part, at least, of the Armouchiquois who were also located there and to the south in the first decade of the same century. However, since we have no vocabulary taken on the Kennebec previous to Rasle's time, the linguistic evidence found only in the word for
"corn" seems to verify Champlain's statement that Etchemins, or Etchemin influence, reached as far west as the Kennebec, and had by Rasle's time receded to the east.

Returning to the question of the Armouchiquois--Eckstorm (1933) concludes from Champlain and DeMonts that the name (Armouchiquois) embraced both the tribes of southwestern Maine and the Natick tribe of Massachusetts, while Goddard defines southwestern Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont as the territory of the western branch of the Abnaki (Letter February 20, 1966). Therefore, the Penobscot and St. Francis Abenaki of today, which are nearly identical to the ancient Abenaki of Rasle (Maurault 1866:7) (Hale 1834:5), must be the surviving representatives of the ancient Armouchiquois speakers. (See Appendix G)

On the other hand, Speck seems to deny any claim to the former existence of a parental group such as Armouchiquois or Norridgewock. He says:

On the contrary, the Penobscot of the Penobscot River Valley, and the Aroosaguntacook (later the St. Francis Abenaki) of the adjoining river valleys westward were, at the time designated (1679) and earlier, distinguished by the graded differences in language and culture that we find characterizing the succeeding tribes occupying the river valleys eastward--the Maliseet, Passamaquoddy and Micmac. (Speck 1940:22)

These two points of view (two mother languages versus regional differentiation) may be reconciled by the theory that the Penobscot valley was prehistorically a common ground for both the Abenaki and the Etchemin speakers. For this we have primarily the evidence of place names which
change much more slowly than the languages for both literate and non-literate peoples. According to Eckstorm:

... The Penobscots whom Champlain met in 1604 at Bangor were in all probability Etchemins. The number of Maliseet place names found embedded in the nomenclature of the Penobscot River leaves no question but that at some time the Etchemins held the river as far up as they chose to range. (Eckstorm 1932:8)

Certainly Eckstorm's "tour de force," Indian Place-Names of the Penobscot Valley and the Maine Coast (1941) testifies to this conclusion to the fullest, particularly in cases where the place-name is derived from an Etchemin word which today has both similar form and meaning in Passamaquoddy, while the same meaning in Penobscot has entirely different form. One example is the Indian name for Belfast, "Passagassawakeag," meaning "sturgeon, his place" from the Passamaquoddy-Maliseet word "pah'sukus" for sturgeon. (The Penobscot word for sturgeon is "kebasé.") (Eckstorm 1941:69) Another example is found in the name for Bangor as recorded by Champlain--"Kadesquit" (today Kenduskeag) which means in Passamaquoddy-Maliseet "eel-catching place" from the Maliseet root "kat" denoting "eel." (The Penobscot word for eel is "nahurmo.") (Eckstorm 1941:15) On the basis of such evidence Siebert concurs with Fanny Eckstorm in his review of her book on place-names (Siebert 1943:506).

Other evidence that the Penobscot was a common ground is found in the vocabulary of Indians on the Penobscot both in the early 1600's as well as in the present day. While Siebert (1943:506) claims that the vocabulary recorded
by Rosier at Casco Bay is nearly pure Penobscot or Abenaki, it seems to have more than a few words with Passamaquoddy-Maliseet equivalents, which would indicate a language with definite Etchemin influence. In recent years, also, Siebert has found evidence of Passamaquoddy influence in the language of those present day Penobscots whose ancestors came from the Penobscot Bay, for he says that they use "some grammatical forms and vocabulary" similar to the Passamaquoddies while others whose ancestors came from the upper Penobscot and Kennebec use the "pure Abenaki tongue." He furthermore cites the use of the Passamaquoddy "n $\alpha$ n" for "five" by some and the use of the Penobscot "palenasky" by others at Old Town (1943:506).

Concluding from the linguistic evidence thus far, it seems that at the time of white contact, the Etchemins were and had been influential around the Penobscot Bay and that their influence was probably felt as far as the Kennebec. As for the Abenaki speakers, no explorers recorded any of their vocabulary south of the Kennebec or north of Bangor; consequently it is difficult to determine their linguistic affiliations or the center of their greatest concentration without resorting to other sources. Indeed, the lack of early Abenaki vocabularies leaves us entirely dependent on secondary sources such as the Abenakis of Quebec today, remarks gleaned from the pages of history, place-names, and the opinions of ethnologists or linguists.
Since the Abenakis of Quebec comprise survivors mainly from the Indian Wars of New England during the late 1600's and the early 1700's, they are a tribe of mixed origins. Judging from their linguistic affinities, however, with the ancient Norridgewock of Rasle, one could conclude that they are predominantly Abenaki.† (See Appendix G) The fact that history tells us where the Abenakis of Quebec came from gives us a clue to the extent of the western Abenaki. According to ethnologist Gordon Day, the St. Francis Abenakis "... were made up principally of tribes on the upper Connecticut River, the Merrimack and Piscataqua, from Pequasset and probably from the lower Saco." (Letter February 3, 1966)§ We know that a non-Abenaki language was added in 1754 by the inclusion of Scaticook Indians at St. Francis (Mooney 1913:404), and what non-Abenaki elements influenced the language previous to that date one can only guess. Consequently any inferences drawn from the modern Abenaki must be made with caution. However, the fact that place-names for the whole territory from the Connecticut River to all of Maine occur in a modern Abenaki vocabulary (Laurent 1884) would seem to reinforce the linguists' conclusions that Abenaki speaking groups reached as far as the Connecticut River.

Fannie Eckstorm concurs with Goddard in noting a dialect difference between the eastern and western Abenaki, for she groups the New Hampshire and Saco Indians in one dialect and the Androscoggin, Kennebec and Penobscot in another (1919:265). The same dichotomy was noted by Sullivan
in 1795 when he discussed the comparisons between a Pickwacket-Ossipee vocabulary and a Penobscot vocabulary. Apparently many similarities were found, but the differences were such that Sullivan was forced to conclude that "... The Saco River was an important dividing line between the savage nations of the east and west parts of New England." (1795:265) Going back to one of the earliest historical sources (1605), we find in Champlain that an Etchemin from the St. John, whom DeMonts had brought as an interpreter to the Saco River "... could understand only a few words of the Saco Indians as the language of the Armouchiquois (for that is the name of this nation) differs entirely from that of the Souriquois and Etchemins." (1907:61) Thus, the Saco River in historic times has always been a linguistic boundary; however, Siebert the linguist who has studied Penobscot for many years believes that Pennacook, the language of New Hampshire, was intelligible to the Penobscots (Voegelin 1946:189). Furthermore, the fact that the modern Abenaki, which is spoken by many of Pennacook descent, is so nearly identical to Penobscot would verify Siebert's belief. (See Appendix G)

Today in contrast to the experience of DeMonts, the Passamaquoddies (the most probable descendants of the Etchemins) and the Abenakis of Quebec (the descendants of Saco and Pennacook Indians) understand each other well enough to converse together (as mentioned in the last chapter). Since this apparently was not possible in DeMonts'
day, one is forced to conclude that social intercourse between the Abenakis and the Étchemins had gone on so far as to make their languages mutually intelligible before the separation of Abenakis from the Maine tribes in the late 1600's and early 1700's. Since that time very little contact between the two groups has been maintained except that a group of Maliseets from Viger, Quebec in more recent years joined the St. Francis Abenaki. Finally, in spite of the cultural differences between the western Abenakis and the other tribes in Maine, in spite of the occasional disputes with each other, something basic tended to throw these people together for eighty to a hundred years (from the time of white contact to the time of the Abenaki flight to Quebec). I contend that this basic element, in part, was linguistic similarity. (See Appendix F)

If Penobscot, Maliseet and Passamaquoddy could become so intelligible to the western Abenaki in the course of eighty to a hundred years it is a wonder that the Abenaki language in Maine as represented by Penobscot would not have merged almost entirely with that of the Passamaquoddy who occupied contiguous territory. But, considering the isolating effort of the reservations over nearly two hundred years, the continued dichotomy between the two languages is not so remarkable. Prince, nevertheless, notes a similarity in the systems of intonation in the two dialects which hints at some type of historical relationship. Assuming that these languages have always been separated, he seems to
rule out association or diffusion as the historical relationship, but he does imply that a similar and uniform system of intonation did exist at and before the time of Rasle (Prince 1902:20). Furthermore, the roots of the words in Weymouth's vocabulary have in most cases retained the same form and meaning in both Penobscot and Passamaquoddy. From these observations, two opposing conclusions may be drawn: either, as Speck asserts, above, the Penobscot region simply represented an intermediary dialect or it was the meeting ground of two slightly different dialects where diffusion was occurring at a high rate in early historic times. Whatever the conclusion, either relationship is evidence enough of the unity of feeling existing in early times.

The linguistic relations of the Passamaquoddy and Maliseet, on the other hand, represent a different problem. Except for the names of one or two birds (Adney MSS), the vocabularies of the two groups are entirely the same. Although the Passamaquoddy seems to have more vowels and greater tonality than the Maliseet, the same patterns of inflection are to be observed and there is virtually no barrier to free conversation. Thus, the nearly identical vocabularies confirm both the ethnologists' theories and the Indians' claims that the two groups were once one and that such a separation was of recent date (Greenberg 1953:284). Moreover, the recent separation of the two groups, made permanent by the international boundary line,
has increasingly continued to differentiate the two languages, as older Passamaquodties will confirm. 13

That the territory of the St. John River was familiar to both Maliseet and Passamaquoddy is apparent in the place-names which for both groups, in most cases, are identically translatable. Such place-names are Meductic (from "matowk'tic," "end of the road or carry"), Aucpack (from "ek-pahak," "head of the tide"), Oromocto (from "wil-a-muk'tuk," "deep river"), Aroostook (from "lus-tuk"W," "fresh water river"). An additional clue to the familiarity of the entire territory to both groups is the place-names in Passamaquoddy territory which were provided by Maliseet informants—Chamberlain's Maliseet Vocabulary (1899:58). Some of the places named were Grand Lake (K' tchi-kwis-pam), Pleasant River (Si-pa'yik), Kennebecasis River (Ken-i-pe'-ke'-sis), Magaquadavik (me-ki'-ka-te'-wek), Passamaquoddy Bay (pes'te-mo-ka'te-k), Campobello (E-pak-wit), and the St. Croix River (Kun-a-tauk'tuk).

At the same time no place-names were given which would fall in Penobscot territory. Thus, while there may be a question as to the linguistic relationship or identity of original groups around the Penobscot, there seems to be no doubt that the Maliseet and Passamaquoddy were very recently one group and that a gradual separation and linguistic differentiation has occurred in historic times.

Thus far, it has been shown that successive dialects of the linguistic group from New Hampshire to New Brunswick could converse intelligibly, but as in the case of the
the Etchemin of the Saco River, the most widespread dialects of the group had greater difficulty in conversing. According to Fenton, a language can comprise a unit, even if all dialects of it are not intelligible "... as long as contiguous dialects are mutually intelligible." He cites the example of the Iroquois Confederacy in which Seneca and Mohawk were mutually unintelligible (1948:497). In spite of our inept Etchemin interpreter, history shows that there was much social intercourse and that the linguistic barrier between the tribes of New Hampshire, Maine and New Brunswick were few. In fact Maurault claims that the Penobscots, Maliseets and Passamaquoddiies speak the same language as was spoken by the Kennebecs of Rasle. And he cites another Etchemin interpreter used by Father Dreulelles on one trip to the Abenakis of the Kennebec in the middle 1600's. Another authority also believes that Maine Indians needed no interpreter to understand each other (Lincoln 1831:311). Furthermore, John Gyles, held captive by Maliseets from 1689 to 1698, was thereafter used for his knowledge of Maliseet as an interpreter in treaty negotiations between the English and all the tribes of Maine, (Gyles 1869:59).

Resorting again to place-names, an examination of a map of New Hampshire, Maine and New Brunswick would reveal many place-names common to both Abenaki and Etchemin territory, although the spelling frequently differs. Most outstanding is "Schoodic" (from skw-atek, a "burned field" or "open place"). This word is the same in all the surviving
languages of this group and is simply the locative form of
the Norridgewock "skoutar," for "fire.") It occurs just
north of Maine in Quebec, in Maine (Schoodic River), and in
New Brunswick. Other examples are the Kennebec River in
Maine and the Kennebecasis (-sis is diminutive) in New
Brunswick, Norridgewock in Maine and Nauwegewauk on the
Kennebecasis. Although Connecticut appears only once geo-
graphically, its Abenaki form as "Kwenitegok," "long river"
(Laurent 1884:209) has an equivalent in the
Passamaquoddy "Gwnat'icut," "length." (Michael Holmes)

From such an analysis it is not difficult to perceive
a uniformity in speech pervading New Hampshire, Maine and
New Brunswick. However, in order to perceive the unifying
effect of what was linguistically common to the several
dialects in the area one must also examine the differences
between this group of dialects and those bordering on the
north and south. One must isolate what is typically North
American (such as the agglutinative construction), what is
typically proto-Algonquian or Algonquian (such as the
aspirant \*w or "Algonquian whistle"), and what is peculiar
to the group in question. One can thus attribute similari-
ties noted between the Micmacs and Maliseets (in Chapter I)
as being a consequence first of common Algonquian stock and
secondly of somewhat limited diffusion.

Although little has been done in the way of scienti-
fic comparison between the Micmacs and the Maine-New Brunswick
group, the remarks of linguistic students of the two groups
will serve to clarify the distinction which is so often made.
Lincoln attributes the differences mainly to vocabulary and grammatical differences (1831:319), while Chamberlain agrees with Lincoln, adding also phonetic differences and he goes on to suggest that these differences were caused by the presence in prehistoric times of a non-Algonquian language in Micmac territory (A. F. Chamberlain 1902:135).

In contrast, Adney expresses his partiality for the Maliseets by asserting that the Micmacs were relatively new arrivals in their territory and that their language "... appears to contain a mass of corruptions of Malecite forms." (Adney MSS) That all of these students were to some degree correct is shown by Siebert in a brief discourse on the Micmac language (Siebert 1940:332-3). While he notes many similarities with Passamaquoddy, Maliseet and Penobscot, particularly in word cognates and in the dual of intransitive verbs, he does illustrate that much of the Algonquian or proto-Algonquian element more nearly resembles Western or Central Algonquian than Abenaki-Maliseet. \(^\text{18}\)

(See Appendix F) He further goes on to list aberrant elements in Micmac, particularly in vocabulary, seemingly confirming the theory of a non-Algonquian influence. Thus, Siebert concludes that Micmac "would seem to form a definite sub-type by itself at the same time fitting marginally into a loose northeast division." (1940:333)

The utility of determining what the precise linguistic differences are here again lies in pointing the way toward determining what the historical relationship was
between the Micmacs, Passamaquoddies and Maliseets. This can be done either directly by subjecting our knowledge of linguistic differences to scientific linguistic method for determining historical relationships, or indirectly by applying our knowledge of linguistic differences to place-names, thereby determining a boundary between the two types of speakers. Of the two methods, the former awaits further scientific inquiry, while the latter has been bandied about by several amateur linguists. Ganong in his "Place Nomenclature in the Province of New Brunswick" (1896:187-189) lists place-names of Indian origin according to the tribal territories to which they belong. While he was recognized as the foremost authority on the Indian languages involved, his conclusions are based not only on linguistic considerations but also on historical proof and Indian verification. While he has listed several place-names which occur in both Maliseet and Micmac territory (1896:92), he has not distinguished enough characteristics to differentiate Maliseet from Micmac territory. On the evidence presented by several early explorers we know that the Souriquois were found on the coast at least as far eastward as the river St. John (by comparing a Souriquois vocabulary provided by Lescarbot (1907-14:3:119) with Rand's Micmac vocabulary (1875) we conclude that the Micmac are the descendants of the Souriquois); however, how far north or east they ranged has become an academic dispute based on analyses of place-names. Ganong believes that Nashwack
and Jemseg on the St. John are of Micmac derivation (MS),
while Eckstorm claims that Matinicus, Metinic and Monhegan
on the Maine coast are likewise of Micmac origin (1941).
Adney, on the other hand, discounts any such theories and
insists that the Micmacs never even occupied the St. John,
explaining such an error as "due to the unfortunate attempt
to explain various place-names by reference to Micmac
roots..." And he then bases his own conclusions of
the originality of the Maliseets on the St. John by
reference to Maliseet roots (MS).20

Whatever the conclusions of the linguists as to
the original territory of the respective groups, the mere
question of the derivation of place-names on the lower
St. John is, in itself, highly indicative of dual occupancy
at some time. In addition, the presence of place-names
from the St. John in Rand's Micmac vocabulary (1875) and
the similar recording of place-names now in Micmac terri-
tory in Chamberlain's Maliseet Vocabulary (M. Chamberlain
1899) seems to prove that some social interaction has
occurred between the two groups, which must have resulted
in some linguistic diffusion, regardless of the historical
facts.

Thus, in spite of the social intercourse between
the two groups, the significant linguistic differences
noted first by early explorers indicate a separation from
the common Algonquian stock at a much earlier (or perhaps
much later) prehistoric date than any of the other dialects of northeastern Algonquian, thereby precluding much feeling of identification in common with the Abenaki and Etchemin speakers in New Hampshire, Maine and New Brunswick.

To the south of our Abenaki group was another Algonquian group of dialects for which little has been recorded. Because this group was the first to really feel the effects of white pressure, it is now virtually extinct, save for a few scattered remnants. However, we do have a few specimens of these related dialects, notably in Dr. Edward's comparative vocabulary (1823) (Appendix H) and Eliot's The Indian Primer (1877). Comparisons made between these southern New England dialects and those of northern New England according to our earliest sources center on one difference or peculiarity—the interchange of "r" and "l." According to Wood:

"Every country doe something differ in their speech, even as our Northerne people doe from the Southerne, and the Western from them; especially the Tarranteens [Abenakis], whose tongues runne so much upon R, that they warle much in pronunciation. When any ships come neare the shore, they demand whether they be King Charles his Torries, with such a rumbling sound, as if one were beating an unbrac't Drumme." (1865:103)

Hutchinson likewise remarks: "The Tarranteenes founded the R easily." (1795:1:432) And more modern students such as Eckstorm (1945:80) and Schoolcraft note the same difference between the northern and southern New England dialects.
While little of significance can be discovered in a comparison of northern and southern dialects outside of natural vocabulary gradations in contiguous Algonquian dialects, and though we know little of what the original systems of intonation or grammar were like, it is safe to assume that these did not vary to any great extent from those of the Abenakis. Hence, the greatest difference appears to be that of the use of "r" by the Abenakis where the southern dialects used "l."

This interchange of "r" and "l" represents a very curious historic relationship between the two sections of New England, for although "r" predominates in all the early vocabularies of the Abenakis, Etchemins, and even the Micmacs, these Indians at some point in history began substituting "l" in places where an "r" would normally be found (i.e., Mali for Mary, Piel for Pierre). Moreover, today "l's" are very prominent in the speech of the modern representatives of these groups. At first thought, one might attribute the recording of "r" instead of "l" to French orthography since the French "r," more than the French "l," is a better approximation to the gutteral Indian "l." This thought would be reinforced by the fact that the French were in most cases the first to record the speech of the Micmacs and Abenakis—Rasle (1833) at Norridgewock and Lescarbot (1907-14:114) at St. John and Port Royal. Also, according to Prince (1910:183-4), Father Aubery wrote a manuscript vocabulary that has since been lost, but which displayed the same phenomenon.
of the "r." However valid this conclusion may seem, it is weakened first of all by Wood's description above of the sound of Abenaki speech. Secondly, it is destroyed by the fact that Rosier, an Englishman, recorded no "l's" and mostly "r's" in his vocabulary from Casco Bay.21

This contradiction is further and conclusively supported by the English spelling of Indian names with "r" instead of "l" on the innumerable treaties (i.e., Arexis for Alexis, etc.).

Without drawing on history extensively, a few conclusions on the change from "r" to "l" made by Eckstorm may be noted. She believes that Massachusetts or Connecticut Indians, survivors from King Philip's War in southern New England, made their way into Abenaki country to escape the retaliatory measures of the English armies. To support her theory, she presents a Latin quotation from Nudenan's Radicum Wabanakaeum, a manuscript dictionary from 1760, which she translates as "Mahigan, a village of Woodland Wolves, who use almost the same dialect as the Wabanaki, with 'L' displacing 'R,' and who are called Amahiganiak, or Wolves." She also cites Rasle's mention of a group of "Amalingans" in 1697 about a day's journey from Norridgewock; and finally she mentions that a village at Farmington Falls was supposed to have used "l" instead of "r" (1945:80). Since the "l" began appearing in names on Maine treaties during the 1700's, some outside
factor must be seen as the cause for the appearance and Fannie Eckstorm has indeed presented the most plausible factor. If her thesis can be further verified historically, it will represent an important example of the role of linguistic historical reconstructions.

In conclusion, we find a linguistic unity once existing in Maine, New Hampshire and New Brunswick in spite of minor distinctions, such as between Eastern and Western Abenakis and between Abenakis and Etchemins. The fact that the differences between these dialects and the Micmac and Massachusetts were more prominent than the differences between the three similar dialects tended, even more than cultural similarity, to weld the groups in question together. The differences in dialect to be noted today between the Penobscots (descendants of the Abnaki linguistic sub-group) and the Passamaquoddies (descendants of the Etchemin sub-group) are to be explained by two factors: (1) That the Penobscots represent a composite of Eastern and Western Abenaki (and perhaps some southern New England) linguistic elements brought to the Penobscot by various historic migrations; and (2) that the reservations have tended to inhibit social intercourse and linguistic diffusion between the two groups.
Informants Andrew Dana of the Penobscot, Peter Paul of the Maliseet, and Michael Holmes of the Passamaquoddy all testify to the similarity of sounds and word meanings. The primary differences observed by all are the varying degrees of tonality, the additional syllables on the ending of the Penobscot words (Maliseets tend to chop words), the prominent (obviative) "-l" in Passamaquoddy and Maliseet (only a lingual touch in Penobscot), the absence of "sh" in the Penobscot, and the occasional vocabulary differences in all dialects. As for the modern St. Francis dialect, Prince (1902a, 1910 and 1914) has discovered a minimum of differences from the Maine and New Brunswick dialects. The major differences in the St. Francis dialect lie in the absence of the obviative "-l" and in the presence of the nasal "-n."

Since the French rarely explored, or familiarized themselves with, the region south of the Kennebec, they tended to group all the languages from the Kennebec to Cape Cod (the extent of their occasional excursions) as Armouchiquois.

Siebert claims that this vocabulary is nearly pure Penobscot with some Passamaquoddy words (Siebert 1943:506). However, the "sh" of Rosier's Indians at St. George's is today absent in Penobscot speech.

According to Ganong, Lescarbot's Etchemin numbers "are evidently a mixture" of Abnaki, Massachusetts and Etchemin (Lescarbot 1910-14:3:114). Also perceptible in this vocabulary is some admixture of Micmac, especially in the numbers for six, nine and ten.

Moreover, "Almouchiquois" was a term used only by the French and is probably of Micmac origin. The English grouped most Indians as savages, making no distinctions except perhaps by rivers. They did use the word "Tarantine," however, for Indians northeast of the Penobscot.

The name Sagadahoc is also given by early explorers for the Kennebec and is closest to the modern Penobscot word "sankedelak," "where the river flows out."

"The main differences are of a phonetic nature, the Penobscot being more archaic than the modern Abenaki." (A. F. Chamberlain 1906:134)
Adney says that "there are no important or old place names in Maine in the so-called Abenaki, which is a mixture of dialects of tribes that fled from the English colonists and found refuge at the Kennebec after King Philip's War 1675-6." (MSS)

Prince, however, has observed slight differences in intonation and vocabulary, a not-so-peculiar consequence of two hundred years apart (1902a:19).

See A. F. Chamberlain (1906:134-5).

The question of this relationship merely points out the need for more extensive scientific study of the two languages. By using Greenberg's technique (1953:265-286), the percentage of vocabulary differences would probably indicate a prehistoric, rather than historic, date of separation, thus lending credence to the theory that there were two dialects instead of a gradation. This conclusion, nevertheless, is drawn only on the basis of the close Norridgewock-Penobscot relationship, and on the basis of the more marked dichotomy between Passamaquoddy and Penobscot. If a split had occurred in a formerly intermediary group on the Penobscot, it is unlikely that such a wide linguistic divergence, as is known today, could have resulted—unless other factors intervened.

Maliseets say that Passamaquoddy sing their words; and probably on this basis, all recognize the affinity of the less tonal Maliseet with the nearly monotonous Penobscot.

Seventy-four year old Margaret Socoby of Princeton and sixty-two year old Michael Holmes of Pleasant Point both recognize modern Maliseet words which they recall from their childhood, but which have since fallen into disuse among the Passamaquoddy.

All of these place names, translated by Passamaquoddy informants, were confirmed by the Maliseet, Peter Paul.

Peter Paul of Woodstock will likewise confirm this statement, for he has in his possession a typewritten copy of Rasle's dictionary which he claims differs from Maliseet only in spelling (due to Rasle's French background) and in trivial errors, such as the translation of Indian for "ash tree" merely as "tree." Such errors as the latter of course arise from the agglutinative construction of Indian words and sentences. Instead of using generalities such as "tree" and defining them with adjectives, the Indians would use one word which would contain within it the noun and its adjective, and perhaps even an entire phrase or sentence.
17 "Norridgewock" according to Adney (MSS) is derived from the Passamaquoddy "nadji," meaning "going," or from "nollidgewock," "goes repeatedly." Passamaquoddies, Penobscots and Maliseets translate it variously as "going along the river," "deep-flowing river," and "river going out of sight."

18 He points out the proto-Algonkian cluster "-sk-" which becomes "-sk-" in many Algonkian languages; he also notes common Algonkian terms (i.e., for egg, dog and fish) along with specific cognates in Cree and the common Algonkian dubitative mode ("-tok-"), (Siebert 1940: 332-3.

19 The Maliseet diminutive suffix is "-sis," while the Micmac is "-chich"; the suffix meaning "place of occurrence" is "a-quak-dik" in Maliseet and "akadik" in Micmac. (Ganong 1896:193). This latter suffix incidentally is claimed by Grant (Lescarbot 1907-14: 4:211) to be present in place names such as Acadia, Shubenacadie, Tracadie, and Passamaquoddy; although Ganong says that the resemblance in Acadia is "merely coincidence" (1876:193).

20 Considering the various changes in spelling of Indian names by many different French and English explorers, it is often difficult even to determine the Indian roots, and yet more difficult to distinguish between the Micmac and Maliseet roots since, of all the linguistic elements, the roots probably vary the least in two Algonkian dialects.


22 Nevertheless, it is difficult to conceive of such a pervasive linguistic change as this change from "r" to "l," even in English words where "r" normally belongs. The task, therefore, will be to illustrate historically the causes for the tremendous impact of this factor on the entire speech of a group of people.
CHAPTER V

POLITICAL UNITY

Two or three groups of people may have many things in common such as culture or language, but unless they actually identify with each other there can be no unity. It is in the political aspects of life that such unity finds its ultimate expression, and for this reason the following analysis will be made. First to be analyzed will be the most obvious political association—the Wabanaki Confederacy, which will include discussion of its immediate causes and effects. Then, in more comprehensive analysis, it will be shown that this Confederacy did not rise merely out of external stimuli, but, rather, had its roots in the social and political organization of the groups in question, as discovered by the earliest explorers.

Much has been made of the attitude of awe and fear held for the Mohawks by the tribes of New England and the Maritimes. Indeed, Indian legend runs rife with stories of Mohawk encounters by Penobscot, Passamaquoddy, Maliseet, and Micmac alike.¹ For all, the word Mohawk became so hated that it has become a common word of reproach.²
Reasons for this ancient conflict are implied in the legends as arising out of an apparent intrusion of the Mohawks into Algonquian territory. Thus, in speaking of the "May-Quays" Joe Nicolair in his Life and Legends of the Red Man says "... After many years these scattered people came together and located themselves on the west shore of the big river [Connecticut] ..." (1893:127). Another legend cited by Ganong as current among the Maliseet states that the Mohawks in former times were located in the valley of the Restigouche River to the Nepisiguit on the northern bounds of Maliseet and Micmac territory (1899:218). Still another legend implies an antagonism between the two groups as rising out of the fur trade. This legend tells how the Maliseets used to go to Montreal evidently for trading purposes in accordance with treaties with the English (N. Smith 1957:27). If this were so, in fact, then the Maliseets must have had to cross country claimed in historic times by the Mohawks and their allies.

According to Jenness and Hadlock, both of these reasons apparent in legends of territorial intrusion and trading competition were complicated by cultural differences. Hadlock notes that the aggressiveness attributed to the Iroquois was due to their agricultural economy with its more complex political organization, and due to their recently acquired interest in dominating the fur trade in the St. Lawrence (1947:211). On the other hand, Hadlock adds
that where warfare for the Algonquian was probably formerly only "a means of gaining prestige and an outlet for their emotions," it had become a necessary means for defending the valuable fur trade (1947:220). Jenness concurs in this threefold explanation:

With increasing territorial pressure from demands of trade, the Mohawks with their more highly organized social and political structure were much more able than the loosely united Algonquians to make concerted war effort. (1942:30)

To show how the wars and contacts with the Iroquois acted as the stimulus creating a political unity among the tribes in the Northeast it is necessary to trace the history of the Iroquois influence.

When Jacques Cartier visited the St. Lawrence in 1534 he met Indians there whom he did not identify. He did, however, record a vocabulary for numbers from one to ten which Lescarbot later compared with a vocabulary taken from the same region in 1607 (Lescarbot 1907:14:3:111). Noting a total dissimilarity, Lescarbot surmises that "...it has been caused by the destruction of a tribe; for some years ago the Iroquois assembled themselves to the number of eight-thousand men, and discomfited all their enemies whom they surprised in their enclosures." (1907:14:3:117) Lescarbot here implies the war that Cartier found being waged by those Indians speaking that same tongue, with certain Indians to the south called "Toudamans." Hoffman, in trying to establish the identity of the Indians found by Cartier, concludes that, since Micmac legends tell of
ancient wars with a people called Kwedeches, supposed to have lived toward the north, the Tadoussac Indians in 1534 must have been the Kwedeches or St. Lawrence Iroquois. Using various shreds of evidence, he then proceeds to establish a date of destruction of these St. Lawrence Iroquois (at Hochelaga) by southern Iroquois as sometime between 1580 and 1603 when Champlain found Iroquois war parties but no Iroquois tribe established on the St. John (Hoffman 1955:78). Therefore we can infer that the Mohawk-Wabanaki relationship of war is probably very ancient, beginning concurrently with or before the earliest explorers in the region.

When Champlain entered the St. Lawrence in 1603 we get a better picture of the war relationship:

They were three nations when they went to war, the Stechemins, Algonquins and Mountaineers /Montagnais/, to the number of a thousand when they went to war against the Irocois, whom they encountered at the mouth of the river of the said Irocois, and slew an hundred of them . . . and they feare the said Irocois very much, which are in greater number than the said Mountaineers, Estechemins and Algonquins. (Purchas 1906:18:192)

It was approximately at this time when the European fur trader was beginning to make excessive demands on the Indians. (Beaver came into fashion in Europe toward the end of the 1500's.) Hence whatever the antagonism between the Iroquois and Algonquians that might have existed previously, it must have been, around 1603, more intense than ever.

From Champlain's time to 1613 when the English took possession of the region we find occasional references to
the Iroquois-Algonquian conflict, but after 1613, whatever occurred in the course of the conflict we know very little, for the English were really only nominally in possession. The Indians of the territory were generally hostile to English encroachments, and as a result attempts by the English to settle the region were few (at the Kennebec, the Penobscot, and at Port Royal), and they were little concerned with intertribal relations. After 1632 when Acadia again fell to the French, attempts to settle the area were stepped up, and around 1638 or 1639 we find more references to the Mohawks again on the St. Lawrence near the Restigouche River and the Gaspé Peninsula (Gesner 1847:29). Here, once again, the conflict stemmed from trade relations, for the Mohawks were said to have driven the French from Gaspé and to have fought with the Micmacs who were totally in the interests of the French.

Around this time (1640) according to Maursault, who cites a Jesuit Relation of 1641, a treaty of alliance was made between the Kennebecs of Maine and the Algonquian tribe of Three Rivers (1866:10) at the behest of the French, who undoubtedly viewed such an alliance as a necessary precaution for the protection of their trading interests, both from Mohawk depredations and English encroachments on the Kennebec. Thus did the Indians south of the St. Lawrence begin to perceive the benefits of an operative political
unity. Moreover, with continued wars between the Mohawks of Gaspé and the Etechemins (Jesuits 1896-1901:28:205) during the decade of the 1640's, the already existing feeling of unity between the tribes of Maine and New Brunswick grew into an actual political unity identified as Abenaki or Wabanaki (from the name of their Norridgewock members who had first formed the alliance with the Algonquins in Quebec). 7

In 1650 the French in the person of Father Dreuillette (popular among the Kennebecs) petitioned the New Englanders at Boston for aid against the Mohawks, who had seriously begun to threaten the position of the French and their Indian allies in Canada. After being repeatedly denied aid by the English, who could not afford the wrath of the Iroquois nations (nor who savored any alliance with their colonial opponents the French), the French succeeded in persuading more of the politically allied Abenaki nations (Sokokis, Etechemins and Micmacs) in addition to the Abenakis proper (of the Kennebec) to ally themselves with the Algonquins in Quebec. By 1653 these nations had formed such a formidable front that the Iroquois were at last convinced to make peace with the French.

The peace, however, was not enduring, for in 1656 a new conflict arose when the Iroquois, jealous of the thriving fur trade between the Ottawas and the French, began attacking trading parties of Ottawa Indians on the St. Lawrence...
and Ottawa Rivers. And by 1660, according to Trelease, the Mohawks had begun incursions into Maine (1960:128). Although the Dutch made a treaty with the Mohawks the following year at Fort Orange in New York, the conflict between the Abenakis, east of the Connecticut, and the Mohawks to the west had become irreconcilable by 1662 when the English and Dutch tried to conclude a treaty between the two Indian nations (New York 1856-87:2:462). Retaliatory raids back and forth continued for another two years, when, after losing between two and three hundred warriors in a raid on the Sokoki, the Mohawks finally sued for peace. Still, however, the Abenakis were irreconcilable so the wars continued with the bulk of the fighting occurring now in Mohawk and Dutch territory.

By 1666 all the tribes north and south of the St. Lawrence symbolized their unity in the face of a common enemy by sending representatives to the installation of a new chief at Tadoussac, and it was this event that prompted Bailey to remark on the emerging political consciousness of the time:

These people who had formerly been separate entities organized on a kinship basis, now became a corporate body having a political existence based on a territorial tenure in the feudal system of New France. (1937:93)

In addition to this overall political consciousness, it is very probable that a sense of local identity was likewise being developed. First of all, due to the continued Mohawk threat in Maine from 1660 on, there must have been a
tendency to consolidate small bands into perhaps one or two fortified villages per river. In fact, the Penobscot Captain Francis declared that the Old Town village was established in this way at that time because, being an island, it was easily defendable (Fickstorm 19:5:77). The second reason for the growing sense of local identity was inherent in the nature of the alliance—the necessity to have local representation.

By 1669 the Maine tribes, according to Horton, were finally subdued by the Mohawk and forced to pay tribute to them. Shortly thereafter, the feeling of political unity that had been growing as a result of the Mohawk wars was cemented into its ultimate expression at the Great Council Fire at Caughnawaga, and south of the St. Lawrence a new political entity emerged in the Wabanaki Confederacy.

Although it seems from the preceding discussion that this confederacy held an identity in relation only to the Great Council Fire, the fact that the Great Council Fire was not established apparently until 1675 or 1676 would indicate another causative factor. Looking to southern New England, this factor is to be found in King Philip's War which had broken out in 1675. As this war cloud blew northward over New England slowly absorbing all the tribes as far as Nova Scotia, it was only natural that the formation of the Wabanaki Confederacy should gain added strength from the need for self-defense.

Returning to the Great Council Fire at Caughnawaga,
it would appear that in its creation all conflict with the Mohawks would have hitherto ended, but such was not the case. The Iroquois of New York had reckoned it more to their advantage to remain neutral rather than to join either the French or the English. Thus, when the hostilities commenced in Maine the Mohawks remained neutral, joining neither the English colony of New York under Governor Andros (Maine was claimed by New York according to a grant of 1664) nor the Abenakis, their new allies in the Great Council Fire. When Governor Andros recaptured Pemaquid and looted Pentagoet in 1677 the Abenaki alliance with the Mohawks in the Great Council Fire was considerably weakened in the resentment for Mohawk neutrality. And when war was declared again in 1689 between the Abenakis and the English, both sides made repeated attempts to secure the support of the Mohawks. The Mohawks, however, were still maintaining their position of non-involvement in the English-Abenaki struggle, but had once again become involved with the French in a dispute over trade, and ignoring both English and Abenaki entreaties they proceeded to attack the French at Lachine. Thus, while the Great Council Fire was probably still recognized in these years, old enmities and alignments were beginning to crop-up inserting a wedge between the two great confederacies. As a result of this political separation, the Abenaki nations though originally deriving their identity as a confederacy from the Great Council Fire, gained added significance by their independence from it.
On the other hand, because of the political independence of the Wabanaki Confederacy, it was too weak to defend its homeland from the encroachments of colonists. Consequently, with each signing of the many treaties of agreement and submission, more and more land was conceded to the English, leaving the Abenakis more and more dependent on the white man even for their own subsistence. The Treaties of 1693 and 1696 were of this nature (conceding land and stipulating the establishment of truckhouses) (Mass. Archives 30:338 and 438).

Because of their greatly weakened state, as in 1669, the Abenaki tribes were again easily induced to submit to the Mohawks. In the "Submission of the Eastern Indians to the Mohawks" of 1700, it is manifest both that the English were still trying to win the support of the Mohawks, and that the five Abenaki Sachems who signed had no idea what they were signing, nor did the thirty tribes which ratified it in the following year (Trelease 1960: 363).

During the years that followed the ratification we hear little of the Great Council Fire, for up till 1713 the Abenakis were again involved in futile attempts to protect their lands. After another Submission to the English in 1713 (Mass. Archives 29:1-5) they seemed to be involved in peaceful attempts to solve land and trade disputes until conditions became so intolerable that hostilities again broke out in 1721. Under the influence of
the French once again the Indian alliance of the Great Council Fire was promoted. For the first time we have an enumeration of the constituent tribes of the Abenaki Confederacy and the allied nations of the Council Fire appearing in a letter of 1721 (obviously written by the French, though expressed as a "Letter from the Eastern Indians to the Governor.") The lack of Mohawk inclusion on this list is outstanding evidence of their continued neutrality which lasted till a Mohawk-Abenaki Treaty in 1749 (Speck 1946: 359).

What is perhaps more significant is that at this time the first statement was produced that is evidence of Indian identity with the political unit of the Abenaki nation or confederacy. This is found in a letter written about 1725 as follows:

Les Abenaquis répondirent que leur terre commençait à la Rivière de Gounitegon [Connecticut], autrement dit la longue rivière, et qui est à l'ouest part de la Boston, que cette rivière était autrefois la borne qui séparait les terres des Iroquois et celle des Abenaquis... au Port Royal qui était la borne de separation des terres des Abenaques et de celle des Micmacs. (Bigot MS 1725)

Not only does this clearly illustrate that identity was made with a large political unit, but also that this political unit coincided with the geographical unit as occupied by those speaking related dialects.

Up until this time the tribes had always acted in concert testifying to their confederated relationship. However, with the signing of the Treaty of 1725 the Penob-
scots were almost entirely won to the interests of the English (Penhallow 1726:119), and in succeeding years almost without exception up to the final Treaty of 1760 they maintained this loyalty even to the disadvantage of their brothers on both sides. In terms of the Confederacy, this naturally might be taken as a disintegrating element. But, in terms of survival and the power they retained due to their bargaining position with the English, in the long run they did more to insure the survival of the Confederacy well into the 1800's and a corresponding continued participation in the Great Council Fire. 20

Before describing the function of the Abenaki Confederacy some explanation of the Great Council Fire at Coughnawaga is in order, since the Confederacy derived initial identity from this association. According to Speck (1915c:495), the Council Fire (Ktci skwudek) was formed out of the Mohawk desire to have the Abenakis join the Iroquois after the Abenakis had been defeated by the Mohawks. Instead, Speck continues, they managed only to get the Abenakis to form an alliance of peaceful co-existence. Eckstorm would have us believe this was an alliance of subjugation by the Mohawks, but Speck does not suggest this and Adney adamantly denies it. 21 The Ottawas because of their prestige were chosen as mediators and referred to as "our Father." The Council was held every three years at Coughnawaga, with, according to Leland (1902:341-359), fourteen
tribes participating (Iroquois, Abenaki, Micmac and other tribes north of the St. Lawrence). All negotiations and laws were recorded in the wampum belts, and in these mnemonic documents we have the only record of the proceedings (Prince 1916). 22

As for the Abenaki Confederacy itself, most authorities seem to agree on the tribes comprised by it. 23 They were the Nipmuck of New Hampshire (to which the Pennacook and other tribes belonged), 24 the So:okis (including Ossipees and Pigwackets) on the Saco River, the Anasagunticooks (and sub-tribe Pejepscots) on the Androscoggin and St. Francis Rivers, the Kennebecs (including the Norridgewoocks and Sheepscots) on the river of that name, the Wawenocs of Knox and Lincoln Counties, the Penobscots (and Pentagoets), the Passamaquoddy of Machias and St. Croix, and the Maliseet of the St. John River. Although part of the Wabanaki group, culturally speaking, the Micmacs, politically as well as linguistically, stood apart from the Abenaki nations of the Confederacy (M. Chamberlain 1904:280-281). They were rarely mentioned as members of the Abenaki Confederacy though they have been known to participate in its affairs (Gesner 1847:115-6), particularly in wartime efforts against the English. Speck's comment on their relationship to their Abenaki neighbors is particularly enlightening:

On the whole the Micmac seem to have been less intimately united with the other three tribes (Penobscot, Passamaquoddy and Maliseet) of the Wabanaki group proper than they were with the Mohawk (Kwëdetck their ancient enemies) and the larger aspects of the Confederacy. (Speck 1915c:505)
Judging from the tribes included, one would have to infer that such was the makeup of the Confederacy at the beginning of the French and Indian Wars (1675) when all of the Abenaki tribes were still intact. However, it is known that by the close of the last Indian War (1759) only four of these former tribes remained in New England and New Brunswick. Though we know little of the operations of the Confederacy during the course of the war, we can surmise that the operation of the war effort must have been the main function of the Confederacy. And, therefore, due to various factors, internal dissension over the operation of the war brought on the end of the Confederacy as it was formerly conceived. Interest in self-preservation dominated on the Penobscot over the interests of the Confederacy to the extent that Penobscots in several instances refused to support the more western tribes of the Confederacy which were feeling the direct impact of English encroachment. Consequently, in the long course of the war, the Abenaki tribes in southern Maine and New Hampshire, deprived of Confederacy support, were slowly swallowed up, either by annihilation, fragmentary migration to Canada, or merger with other tribes. From this apparent weakness in the Confederacy some authorities such as Adney or Chamberlain deny that there ever was a Confederacy. To counter such assertions, it might well be asked what kind of unity it would have taken to survive in the face of so many divisive factors as were involved in the French-English conflict,
especially when the conflict centered on winning the support of the very group involved. The fact that the Confederacy, though greatly diminished in size, still functioned long after the Indian Wars (when actual need for a confederacy no longer obtained) is proof of its existence.

As the whole territory in the New World, disputed for so long between England and France, fell irrevocably to the English with the fall of Quebec in 1759, the only surviving groups of the former Confederacy now were the Penobscot, Passamaquoddy and Maliseet. The St. Francis Abenakis, made up of remnants of those former Abenaki tribes west of the Penobscot, were too isolated and too broken (especially after the destruction of their village in 1759) to participate in an active political union. (Moreover, due to their separation from the Confederacy during the wars while they still resided in Maine, they never again could have been reconciled to the Confederacy.) Now with the French power crushed in the New World, the Indians, without their former allies in the French, had no recourse but submission to their new masters. No longer enjoying the bargaining position of pawns, peace was to be obtained only on English terms, and as Weston phrases it, not only were the wars ended, but also "...even the political existence of the Indians in Maine." (Weston 1834:28) Although this was, in fact, not true, as proved by the continued existence of the Confederacy, it well describes the English opinion of the Indians, who were no longer a political threat to English domination in Maine.
With the close of the last Indian War and the signing of the Treaty of 1760, the Abenaki Confederacy took on a new function in its final phase of existence. According to Gesner in 1847, the Confederacy met annually to "... renew their friendship and establish regulations for the public weal. Each tribe has laws peculiar to itself, and the measures adopted by the Grand Council prevent collision in hunting and fishing." (1947:115-116) Thus, as conceived in 1847, it functioned to preserve the common cultural and linguistic bonds that had always existed, and the political bonds that had been especially strong at the beginning of the Indian Wars (as evidenced by the formation of the Confederacy itself in 1765 for representation at the Great Council Fire in Coughnawaga). Now, however, the Confederacy which seemed to have less purpose than during the wars gained augmented importance to the whipped tribes now remaining. To them, the common humiliation of defeat was enough to strengthen the common bonds, but the added humiliations that followed their submission aroused them to strengthen this last symbol of their lost dominance—their Confederacy.

One of these humiliations was the demand to supply hostages as insurance of their fidelity to the Treaty; another was their subjection to exploitation by independent traders at the government-established trading houses on the St. John and Penobscot (Raymond 1943:252). But these were not new humiliations. They had experienced these with the
signing of previous treaties; however, this time they could not fight except at the conference table.

What was fairly new to these surviving groups were the encroachments on their land. In the years between 1763 and the American Revolution, great strides were made by the English in settling the Penobscot Bay, the St. Croix region, and the St. John River. It was, therefore, probably dating from this period that land and land ownership became an issue of concern to the Confederacy. Without doubt, up to this time, the land between the Penobscot and the St. John had been common ground to all three groups, but by the time of the Revolution the constituent tribes of the Confederacy probably had clearly delineated territories, for, according to a treaty with the Passamaquoddy and Maliseet Indians, their lands were defined as those "... which lie between the river St. Johns and the westerly branch of the Narragaguas extending back northward to the river St. Lawrence." (Bateman 1909:19) (See Appendix I) That the Confederacy in later years served to define the respective territories more precisely we find evidence in testimonies of Indians during the middle and latter 1800's while the Confederacy, or memory of it, was still strong. Thus, according to Young Sebattis, a Penobscot, in 1836:

Before the white man came before he began encroaching on Indian territory the Penobscots claimed as their hunting ground all that embraced in the territory from George's River to Machias." (In Eckstorm MSS)
In 1887 Louis Mitchell of the Passamaquoddy likewise confirmed what the role of the Confederacy had been in a speech before the 63rd Legislature as follows:

The Indians of the Abenaki Nations used to have a constant war among themselves, and a dispute as to their hunting grounds. But at last they tired of fighting. So they held a Grand Council of all the tribes of the Abnaki nations, and the resolution of the Council was that their hunting grounds should be equally distributed.

The Passamaquoddy territory as defined by him extended from the Preaux River in New Brunswick to the Cherryfield or Narraguagus River near Machias and north to the heads of the Machias and St. Croix Rivers (Mitchell 1887:6).

Among the Maliseets as well, even as late as the 1940's, Speck derived from Gabe and Newell Paul a clear boundary between their tribe and the Penobscots and Passamaquoddies on the east as follows: Beginning at the Preaux River and face Bay northwest to Magaguadaswik north close to Pokiok River to the border of Maine and sources of the Mattawamkeag, then northward and westward parallel to the St. John. See Appendix J) The eastern corder between the Maliseets and Micmacs was equally well-defined by these same informants as beginning fifty miles east of the St. John extending north along the heads of tributaries to the Petticodiac to the headwaters of the Miramichi, Nipisiquit and Restigouche northwest to the St. Lawrence River (1946:363).

As to the function of the Confederacy and the role of its member tribes, Speck gives us a little insight in
telling us that the Penobscot were called "our elder brothers" and the Passamaquoddy, Maliseet and (he includes) the Micmac as "our younger brothers." Though he states that Old Town was the capital of this Confederacy (1915c:499), it later appears, however, that Pleasant Point became the central meeting place of the Confederacy, for it was there that Gesner (1847:115-116) noted annual meetings in 1847. So accordingly each year delegates were chosen from the member tribes to attend the meeting, and of these delegates one was chosen to preside. One important function of this representative delegation was the election and installation of chiefs for each of the member tribes. As to other functions we can only surmise from concerns of Indian representatives at occasional conferences with whites between the last Indian War and the American Revolution. Almost always these involved trade difficulties, hunting rights, or land encroachments. After the Revolution the three tribes whose ownership of vast stretches of territory prevented free settlement by the Americans and English, were induced to surrender almost all of their Confederacy-defined territories in return for small parcels of land and promises of annual support. Henceforth, the function of the Confederacy as a sounding-board for complaints concerning land encroachments, trade difficulties, or hunting rights was effectively terminated. To complain at this juncture would have meant cutting-off their source of sustenance, for after all, without their former hunting territories, they were now almost totally dependent on the respective governments of Massachusetts and
Canada, and the treaties did seem equitable. In spite of being deprived of a true mediating function, the Confederacy continued to hold regular meetings until the middle 1800's, but its function in those post-Treaty years was reduced to a mere ceremony, symbolic of a once powerful Confederacy.

As far as the operation of the Confederacy is concerned, we can only deduce from its representative nature and from its election of chiefs that it was very democratic. As for the strength of its authority, once again there is little evidence except that during the Indian Wars it did not have much influence in keeping its member nations aligned. After the wars, however, its established territorial delineations seemed to have been well recognized and abided by. Later on, the role it played in the 1800's in the deposing and re-election of Penobscot chiefs testifies to the strength of its authority well into the last century (Vermillion 1566:104-110).

As somewhat of an appendix to this chapter it would be well to describe the impact of the Mohawk Wars and the Great Council Fire on the culture of the Abenakis. As Speck claims:

It is an axiom of history that long-continued warfare between peoples does not prevent the interchange of traits of their culture. This applies to the political contacts between the Wabanaki bands and the Iroquois of an early period. (1946:359)

Therefore, up to 1749 when the Mohawk-Abenaki Treaty was made, the diffusion of Iroquoian cultural elements was
occurring, particularly in the sphere of war techniques.\(^3\)\(^4\)

Afterward, when the Mohawks had finally entered into a full alliance with the Abenakis at the Great Council Fire, Speck goes on to say that "The culture complex of the Iroquois then became still more familiar to them, and the political aspects of life, as well as the material life took over Iroquois traits to a degree which is decidedly perceptible."

(1946:359) According to Mechling, this second stage of Iroquoian diffusion, which actually began after the last French and Indian War (1759), had its greatest impact on the political relationships of the Abenaki tribes as is apparent in the organization and ceremony of the Abenaki Confederacy (Mechling 1959:270).\(^3\)\(^5\) Aside from these political and ceremonial aspects, much cultural diffusion went on in the material\(^3\)\(^6\) or religious\(^3\)\(^7\) aspects of life. While the Penobscot and Western Abenakis seemed to have resembled the Iroquois and southern tribes more closely in their social organization (family clans or gens), these other elements of Iroquoian derivation seemed to have been diffused evenly throughout the Abenaki area attesting to the strength and consequences of the political associations between the Abenaki tribes.

In spite of all the apparent contributions to the Abenaki culture, theirs was still one of predominantly Algonquian substance, for Mechling says that the Iroquoian elements "are neither deep-rooted nor affect greatly the life of these tribes." (Mechling 1959:270) Speck, nevertheless, was more precise in saying that "... Iroquoian
contact could not educate them out of their individualism and into the community sphere." (1915:507) Thus, we see that the political nature of the Confederacy, as conceived after the Indian Wars, was the most important Iroquoian element, but was still basically an overlay on the essentially Algonquian social organization.

Having described the causes and nature of the most tangible evidence of a political unity as it existed in the Northeast, it is now essential that the pre-Confederacy conception of political unity be examined. According to Adney, there never was a Confederacy as such—only a recognized bond "of kinship and language" that acted in such a way as to unite the tribes for such occasions as the election of the chief (Adney :355). This may have been so before the realization of the Confederacy, but the fact that the Confederacy was an actual political reality cannot be denied. Speck resolves this problem in the following remarks:

As I have always indicated, the Penobscot, Passamaquoddy, Maliseet and he inconsistently adds again/ the Micmac, forming the Wabanaki group, had a certain national identity, based, of course, upon their close ethnical relationship. No doubt, the political bonds which linked them together existed long before the alliance with the Iroquois and their neighbors. (1926:285)

Before proceeding to prove that this was, in fact, so, evidence to the contrary must first be presented and reconciled.

Most of the evidence implying that local autonomy seemed to prevail throughout New Hampshire, Maine and New
Brunswick is derived from the Relations of Biard, as for example:

"... Loving justice, they hate also violence and robbery, which is truly wonderful in ones who have neither laws nor magistrates. For each man is his own master and protector. They have certain sagamores, that is leaders in war, but their authority is extremely precarious if it is indeed to be called authority, where there is no necessity of obedience. (Jesuits 1896-1901:2:72)"

In another relation he states that "These Sagamores divide up the country and are nearly always arranged according to bays and rivers. For example, for the Ponteauet River there is one Sagamore; another for the St. Croix; another for the St. John." (Jesuits 1896-1901:3:67) Other early authorities seem also to cite apparently autonomous chiefs all along the coast, such as Onemochin of Saco, Marchin of the Androscoggin, Sassanoa of the Kennebec, Meteormite of the Sheepscott, Asticou of Mount Desert, Oagimont of Passamaquoddy Bay, Chkoudun of St. John, and Kembertou of Port Royal. All this would correspond with the cultural tendency in the Northeast to form local bands (and certainly this was one of the strongest factors leading to the breakdown of the Confederacy during the Indian Wars).

Two facts which would seem to prove that the band element in the region was not as strong as Biard leads us to believe are, first of all, the semi-sedentary nature of Wabanaki life, (unlike the migratory life of the bands north of the St. Lawrence), which naturally strengthens political structure and authority; and secondly, the derivation of
"Sagum" or Sāngāma (the name for chief) which Speck translates as "strong man" or "hard man" (1940:239).

An additional fact pointing to a political unity, rather than local autonomy, is that one local chief, not mentioned above, was found by all the earliest explorers as holding power over subjects east of the Penobscot to an undefined extent, and west of the Penobscot at least as far as the Saco. Champlain in 1604 names the chief as Bessabez whom he met near the falls of Kadesquitt on the River Norumbegue (Penobscot). (1907:46). In 1605 Rosier, with Weymouth, near Pemaquid, noted that to the east was to be found "the Bashabe (whom wee take to be their King, or some great Commander)." (Purchas 1906:18:346) Purchas himself later enumerates ten rivers over which he believed Bashaba held power, claiming that it was "bordcred on the East side with a country, the people whereof they call Tarrantines." (1906:19:400-405) If Bashaba were chief at Kadesquitt he must have been an Etchemin, and if we believe that the term Tarrantine comprised the Etchemins plus some Micmac war parties, then Purchas is wrong (unless there had occurred some kind of split between the Etchemins of Bashaba and the Etchemins called Tarrantines). In 1607 Popham locates "the bashabe" on the Penobscot and says that his authority ". . . streatcheth unto the river of Sagadahock [Kennebec] . . . ." (Burrage 1906:405) Yet he lists such "principall Sagamores" as Sassenow (of the Kennebec) and Abermet (Oagimont of the St, Croix?) and implies that "the Bashabas" was their king.
In 1612 Biard met Betsabes, "the most prominent Sagamore" at Castine and definitely identifies him as an Etchemin (Jesuits 1896-1901:2:19), thus establishing beyond doubt that that very group north of the Penobscot identified as Tarratines by Popham in 1607 and Smith in 1611; was, in fact, a group of Etchemins over which "Betsabes, the Sagamore of Kadesquit" held power (Jesuits 1896-1901:4:85).

The last primary source we have on Bashaba is found in the writings of Captain John Smith, who in 1614 with the Plymouth Company settled at the mouth of the Kennebec. He, too, provides a detailed description of the territory and people falling under the Bashabe, but since he went only as far as the Penobscot, he does not tell us how far north Bashaba held power (1856:26). Toward the south, the last river he named was the "Aumoughcanagen," probably the Androscoggin or Anasaguntacook. Of the people within this territory, Smith was the first to state that common bonds, other than political authority, held them together:

All these, I could perceive, differ little in language, fashion or government: though most be Lords of themselves, yet they hold the Bashabes of Penobscot, the chief and greatest among them. (1856:26)

In this statement, too, we have the proof that whatever the band element in Maine may have been, it was superseded by linguistic and cultural bonds and cemented together by the political authority of Bashaba.

In 1612 the Etchemins (Tarratines to the English) on
the east side of the Penobscot Bay were obviously under Bashaba's authority according to Biard, but when Biard was taken captive in the English attack on Mt. Desert in 1613, we lose track of these Etchemins north of the Penobscot until Gorges in 1615 comments on a war between the Indians east and west of the Penobscot. Strangely enough, Bashaba, now identified with those only on the west bank, was at war with the Tarratines, "who (as it seemed) presumed upon the hopes they had to be favored of the French that were seated in Canada." (Gorges 1837:6:90) Thus, Bashaba, who was formerly friendly to the French at Castine, was in 1614 opposed by them, along with the Tarratines--apparently a seceding group of Etchemins. This conclusion in fact is (for once) agreed upon by Fannie Eckstorm, who, though she believes the Tarratines to be exclusively the Micmacs, states the following:

... We know that the story of a revolt among his /Bashaba's/ own people, borne out by the French account of the defection of the Etchemins to the Micmacs, swept from him the rule over southeastern Maine. (1919:51)

In conclusion it is possible to infer that the various "Sagamies" noted by Biard along the coasts of Maine and New Brunswick were at least politically allied, if not united, under Bashaba in 1604. In this powerful chief is the evidence of a more sedentary life in the region in prehistoric times. In him, too, is the proof that the tribes here were not simply autonomous bands, but politically associated in common recognition of authority. The reason for
Biard's apparent oversight in calling the chiefs' authority "extremely precarious" is that by his time (1612) Bashaba's authority indeed was precarious, for not long after, in 1614, he was at war with a discontented branch of his own people. And in 1615, according to Gorges, chaos reigned in Maine:

... The Tarentines surprised the Bashaba, and slew him and all his people near about him, carrying away his women and such other matters as they thought of value. After this death, the public business running to confusion, the rest of his great Sagamoses fell at variance among themselves, spoiled and destroyed each others' people and provision. (Gorges 1837:6:89)

In the years following Bashaba's death Lescarbot (1907-1914:2:368) tells us that Asticou, "brought down from the back country," followed Bashaba as chief, but he apparently never attained the position of authority his predecessor did, for the previous split in the Etchemins was never to be reconciled, especially after the Plague of 1616 struck the whole coast of Maine as far north as the Penobscot.

Although it is not to be here discussed, the reasons for the divisions between bands of different locales, some understanding of the causes for the secession will help clarify the apparent autonomy of the tribes in Maine and New Brunswick that colonists and others have since assumed. Judging from the remarks of Lescarbot and others (Lescarbot 1907-1914:2:125) (Brereton 1843:85-6), the Micmacs and the Maliseets of the St. John in the late 1500's and early 1600's had achieved a position of importance as middlemen
in the trade between the French and groups to the West. Since trade hardly exists without some dispute, and since there is evidence of at least one dispute between the Etchemins of the St. John and the Armouchiquois of Saco (Lescarbot in Purchas 1906:18:265), it will be consistent to assume that the trade, in upsetting the native economy, also went a long way toward upsetting the harmony between the local groups. Once the tremendous rupture had occurred within the "one" nation of people, once the political authority had been undermined, the spirit of unity was not to be easily revived, especially when the rupture was aggravated by plagues, by conflicting colonial interests, and by constant trade disputes.

Consequently, nothing approaching the magnitude of Bashaba's authority appeared in the region until the 1700's. However, toward the end of the 1600's there appeared a few prominent names, notably Egeremet and Madockawando. According to Weston, Egeremet, a Sagamore of Machias or Passamaquoddy, was involved in the fighting of 1688, in the attack on Jells in 1692, and signed the Treaty of 1693 as a representative chief of the tribes between the Saco River and Passamaquoddy Bay (Weston 1834:25). Madockawando or "Mataquando" of Castine was the father-in-law of Sieur de St. Castin and was, according to Charlevoix, a Maliseet who in 1694 favored peace with the English, much to the dismay of French officers and missionaries (1872:9:256). And in 1695 he became chief of the St. Johns tribe after the death of the St. John
chief—signifying a revival of old political bonds. The additional fact that the names of both of these leading chiefs figure in important negotiations of the time and appear, quite often together, on deeds for land around the Casco and Penobscot bays would indicate that their authority extended from the St. John to Casco Bay, at least, and might also indicate that they were forebears of that powerful family of Neptunes later found occupying coastal regions (Speck 1940:221).52 (Indeed, judging from the magical powers supposed to be possessed by later Neptune chiefs, and judging from the coastal locations of Egeremet and Madockawando, Fannie Eckstorm proceeds to hypothesize by the derivation of their names—as pertaining to magic—that these chiefs were, in fact, forebears of later Neptunes.) (1845:101) Evidence that their power was enhanced during the Second Indian War (1689-1699) by the political ambitions of the French is to be found in the writings of French officers such as Villebon (Journals MS), and DeVillieu (M. Chamberlain 1904:249). Whether due to the Indian chiefs' authority or to French desires, the united front presented by the Indians from the Kennebec to the St. John is testimony that old political bonds had finally been revived.

In 1696 Egeremet was treacherously killed by the English at Pemaquid and in 1698 Madackawando disappears from the records. In that latter year, the Submission and Agreement of 1693 (Mass. Archives 30:1:39-40) was signed again by Indians from the Penobscot southward. Since it is
apparent that in 1698 Pentagoet was still the main village of Maliseets between the St. John and Penobscot, there was no need to designate on the treaty any other rivers such as the St. Croix or St. John, for they all fell under the leadership of Pentagoets on the Penobscot. However, in the years following and especially after the village at Pentagoet decreased in importance, there came into existence a distinction between those of Penobscot and those of Passamaquoddy. Adney claims that this distinction was based on family band distinctions only, for he states that still the Passamaquoddy

... were of the Penobscots, that is the town on Passamaquoddy Bay was the headquarters of the chiefs whose authority extended coastwise to the Kennebec estuary and Mount Desert, and perhaps to all the Penobscot basin. Old Town above Bangor was a meeting place of the interior or River families, while Passamaquoddy Bay was the meeting place of the Saltwater families "Neptunes", the paramount authority of the Passamaquoddy chiefs probably extending to the whole of the Penobscot River. (Adney MSS)

Fannie Eckstorm, likewise, implies this division on family lines in the following:

Lewey Mitchell was probably right in saying that all the Penobscot Neptunes came from Passamaquoddy; but speaking topographically, it would be more correct to say that the Passamaquoddy Neptunes had probably moved eastward from Penobscot. (1945:66)

At any rate, in spite of the distinction being made between the Penobscot and Passamaquoddy there is still evidence in 1725 that one family still held pre-eminence over both groups, indicating yet a political "oneness."
This evidence is found in the fact that Neptune Peter Paul, Chief of Passamaquoddy, who ratified the Treaty of 1725 (photocopy in Akins 1869) at Falmouth in 1749 was believed by Eckstorm to have been the brother of Hassongk, who signed for the Penobscots in 1726 (1945:67); and both, she tentatively concludes, were sons of Madockawando.54 This phenomenon of there having been chiefs of the same family at Old Town and at Passamaquoddy is explained by both Eckstorm and Adney as a result of war disasters.55 Both claim that the last of the Etchemins had withdrawn from the Penobscot region after 1723 when the English destroyed Old Town. And shortly afterward, with the final destruction of Norridgewock in 1724, the inhabitants of that village fled—some to Quebec and others to the destroyed village at Old Town and, according to Adney, "established there a Kennebec culture..." (Adney MSS) Now, as Eckstorm surmises, the loss of major chiefs in the Norridgewock battle had left the new Old Town inhabitants without a head, so the powerful Neptunes moved back at this time to take up leadership (1945:82). With this theory Adney agrees and goes on to state that now "The Passamaquody Maliseets at St. Andrews on the St. Croix had their main town, their Chief Place, residence of the head chiefs whose authority still extended to the Penobscot. Many of their chiefs had residence on that river such as the notable dynasty of the Neptunes." (Adney MSS) Although this theory is highly tentative since
the historical details are lacking, the most conclusive proof is found in the linguistic evidence of today which would indicate a tremendous influx of Abenaki speakers into the Ftchemin territory of the Penobscot River.

Of greater significance than simply the historical details of the Old Town re-establishment are the consequences wrought by such an influx on the political unity of the tribes. In spite of the fact that Massangk, a chief at Old Town, and Neptune Peter Paul, chief at Passamaquoddy, were brothers; in spite of the fact that Neptunes, well into the 1800's, continued to hold positions of authority in both tribes, it remains that the rift noted earlier between the two tribes grew rapidly after the signing of the Treaty of 1725. According to Prince, the reason is simple: "There can be little doubt that the Indians now called Penobscots from their residence near the river of that name are descendants of those of the early Abenakis who, instead of fleeing to French dominion, eventually submitted themselves to the victorious English." (1902b:31) Certainly, the Indians on the Penobscot, whether Ftchemin or Abenaki, had, since Madockawando's time, had leanings toward the English, and in 1726 with the ratification of the treaty their relationship with the English was the strongest ever. Indeed, it was so strong that in the same year as the treaty ratification Loron, a Penobscot, denied that Madockawando had been a Penobscot, but insisted, instead, that he belonged to "Mechias" (Maine Historical Society 1853:385). Moreover,
according to Sabine, Wenogonet, the Penobscot chief maintained a personal correspondence with Governor Durrier many years after the Treaty of 1725 (1857:32).

In conclusion, then, by 1726 no longer was there a real political unity or a head authority in Maine or New Brunswick; and even John Gyles, who was formerly so well acquainted with all of the Indians, notes only separate villages with their own governments and chiefs (1853:354-358). Henceforth, throughout the course of the Indian Wars the groups in each locale acted autonomously except in a few instances. While they did not forget their former feeling of unity, their political identity as one was ultimately to be broken until, one by one, all the tribes were scattered or forced to submit.
CONTEST FOOTNOTES
 CHAPTER V

1Legends of Mohawk Wars: Penobscot (Nicolar 1893:127); Passamaquoddy (Leland 1883); Maliseet (Mechling 191:106-110); Micmac (Wallis and Yallis 1955:448-469). All informants, furthermore, still mention the Mohawk as traditional enemies.

2When asking questions of the Passamaquoddies, this writer was once seriously accused by a suspicious woman of being a Mohawk.

3This intrusion of Iroquoian groups into the north extending down the St. Lawrence valley in early historic times is a fact generally accepted by archaeologists, historians and ethnologists.

4By comparison with Iroquois numbers, Cartier’s vocabulary from the St. Lawrence has been shown to be nearly the same.

5This term most probably refers to the Micmacs and includes undoubtedly the Etchemins.

6All of this evidence tallies precisely with Kidder’s claims (1867:166): “... that they [the Iroquois] had an affinity with the Micmacs, who may have been originally a colony of theirs, who passing down the St. Lawrence, where some of the Iroquois were found by Champlain, then finally reached Nova Scotia.”

7Speaking of the Abenakis (from the Penobscot to New England) Charlevoix says: “The subsequent necessity of defending themselves against the English and their allies having forced them to unite with the Etchemins or Malecites living near the Penobscot [Pentagoet], and the Micmacs or Souriquois, the native inhabitants of Acadia and all the eastern coast of Canada, the close union formed between these three nations, their attachment to our interests and to the Christian religion, and striking correspondence between their dialects, have quite commonly led to include them all under the general name of Abenaki nations...” (1872:2:200-1)

8Maurault relates two battles in 1661 when 30 Mohawk warriors, on a raid on the Abenakis, were all killed but for one. In revenge a larger force was sent by the Iroquois which destroyed an entire band of Abenakis near Sebago (1866:161). Trelease also tells of a raid by Mohawks in 1662 on Abenakis near the Penobscot in which approximately 80 captives were taken and which was followed by two weeks of Mohawk occupation in the territory (1960:130).
Sketches of Old Town (1881:12) quoted by Eckstorm (MSS) who remarks: "This is the only printed reference I recall about our tribe having been conquered and paying tribute, though father and grandfather both knew of it."

The Council Fire included the Wabanaki (Penobscot, Maliseet, Passamaquoddy, and Micmac), the Ottawa, Mohawk, Coughnawagan, Okan and Têtes de Boule tribes (Speck 1915:494).

Likewise, from the English point of view there did not seem to be any other cause for unity outside of King Philip's War—the only factor apparent to New Englanders. Thus Williamson could remark that "... no confederacy or union existed between any two of the three great Abenaki (Massachusetts), Abenaki and Etechemin people mentioned, until Philip's War when a common interest softened their asperities towards one another, and urged them into general warfare against the colonists." (1832:1:498)

The Abenakis, at the close of the first Indian war, were forced to sign agreements of submission to the English both of New York (1677) and of Massachusetts (1678) (Trelease 1960:236).

Letters of Col. Bayard refer to the Wabanaki as Onongonques—the Mohawk and Dutch name for members of the confederacy in northern New England.

Governor Bellomont of New York could neither induce the Mohawks to help subdue the Abenakis in 1697, nor could he induce them to sign a peace with the Abenakis after the Abenakis had been forced to sign an agreement of submission in 1699 (Trelease 1960:334).

The treaty reads in part as follows: "Now we leave the Govr of Canada for the many cheats he hath put upon us, especially for giving us the hatchet in hand and instigating us to fight against New England. . . ." (New York 1856-87: 4:758)

Adney, on the other hand, asserts that "popular belief has it that the grand assembly and the peace celebration at Coughnawaga was an Iroquois get-up, the Algonkians having come to them to make peace and pay tribute. Our Indians (Wabanaki) never paid tribute to the Iroquois... The Iroquois got their story in first and publicized." (MSS)

Dispossessed of Acadia by the Treaty of Utrecht (1713) the French clung to the insistence that the land between the Kennebec and the St. John was not part of Acadia;
This letter was signed by the following Abenaki villages: "Narantrak /Norridgewock/, Pentagoet /Pentagoes/, Narakamigook /Narankamigook/, Pigwacket /Pigakki/, Meduteck /Meductec/, ekspahky /Aukpack/, Pesmokanti /Passamaquoddy/, Arsikantigok /Arasaguntacook/, Janakin /Mawenoc/," and by the following allies: "Iroquois du Sante, Iroquois de la Montagne, Algonquins, Hurons, Mikemakes, Montagnes, Papinachois." (Mass. Archives 31:105)

The fact that some Mohawks participated in English raids on Abenaki villages during Dummer's War (1722-25) is evidence only of continued antagonism between Mohawk and Abenaki. Mohawks as a tribe did not support the English.

The Council Fire was still operating in 1850 according to Eckstorm (MSS) and Nick Smith (1957:21). Speck, however, dates the break-up of the Council Fire as 1862 when the Penobscots withdrew, followed by the Passamaquoddies in 1870 and the Micmacs in 1872. (1915c:492).

Adney's assertion (MSS) is based on Joe Nicolar's description of the Council Fire (1893:130), which presents it as an alliance against the Mohawks-"Odur wur" (Ottawa) being the father, "War-bar-nar-ki" (Abenaki), the eldest son, and "Mik-mur" (Micmac), the youngest son (1893:138). That there was more antagonism than alliance between the Mohawks and Abenakis would seem to find proof in the history of Mohawk-Abenaki relations, in spite of the Council Fire.

With the death of Sappiel Selmore "keeper of the wampum record" in 1903, the last person able to read these records passed away.

M. Chamberlain (1898:41) and Eckstorm (1919:43-4). Adney, however, denies that it existed "except as a misconception." (MSS)

Apparently the Nipmuck formed a sub-confederacy on the Merrimack River, which included Pennacook, Pentucketts, Wambesitts, Souhigans, and possibly Gowassacks on the upper Connecticut." (Sylvester 1010:2:29-30) This sub-confederacy would correspond to the linguistic unit designated as the western branch of the Abenaki.

These tribes in common . . . called upon each other for aid against outside enemies and held meetings to treat upon matters which affected their common interest. So apart from their association with the Confederacy at large /the Great Council Fire/, they formed a sort of independent group of allies. . . ." (Speck 1956:499)
Trading interests, military influences, French versus English military tactics, fluctuating colonial boundaries, disease, etc. all militated against a united Indian front as the factors were variously felt by different members of the Confederacy.

According to Adney, "The oft-repeated statement of there having been an 'Abenaki Confederacy' though a loose one has no foundation except as a misconception." (MSS) Montague Chamberlain likewise claims that "The tribes were not confederated. They were avowed friends..." because they had no head chief, and, he even states, no legislative or general council. (1898:45)

One wonders how long these groups could have survived had the French and English Wars continued.

Sabine defines Penobscot territory as extending "from the seacoast at Camden, and northerly to the headwaters of the Penobscot River with its banks east and west to the sources of its tributaries..." (1857:53) Andrew Dana today states that the Passamaquoddy Penobscot boundary reached from Cherryfield to Vinecboro and the headwaters of the Penobscot.

The line as drawn at Machias was clearly a more recent development, for Speck (1940:9) states that Passamaquoddy territory reached close to the Penobscot Bay including Mt. Desert (probably at some time previous to the Confederacy allotment) and in early historic times we have evidence that it reached as far as Bangor.

Ganong seems to agree with Mitchell on the Penobscot-Passamaquoddy line: "The boundary between Maliseets and Passamaquoddies practically one tribe as they were, was not a sharp one; but such as it was, it would naturally begin on the coast at Point Lepreau and follow the watershed. I do not know where upon coast the boundary between Passamaquoddies and Penobscots began but the topography would suggest that it was not far west of Machias." (1899:218)

It appears, however, that the Machias River (Drisco 1904:7) and the St. John (West 1827:225) were also favorite locations for Confederacy functions.

The Passamaquoddy wampum records are, in large part, concerned with this ceremony for the installation of chiefs. (Prince 1916).

In reference to the Passamaquoddy Treaty of 1794, the tribal attorney says that "On its face, the Treaty would seem to be enormously one-sided. It meant that they were to surrender all their hunting grounds, the very means of their
livelihood in return for the slim privilege of being able to retain a few tiny slivers of land. For the Indians it was a giving-up, moreover, of the greatest single essence of their Indian culture and identity, as huntsmen from time immemorial. But Massachusetts wanted the territory and she wanted it badly enough to simultaneously promise the Indians that, as compensation for their surrenderings, she would provide for their annual support forever." (Letter July 13, 1965)

Cooper itemizes such elements as torture of prisoners, burning at the stake, ball-headed clubs, scalping, gauntlet-running, adoption of prisoners, and eating of dogs' flesh (1946:279). Bailey adds that "It is possible that the elaborate ceremonies and jurisdictions that appertain to the office of chief today are the result of the political lesson which was learned from the Iroquois allies of the French in the eighteenth century and which culminated in the Wabanaki Confederacy." (1937:91)

Iroquoian ceremonial elements listed by Cooper are the use of wampum for negotiations and for compensating murder, the political interpretation of curved designs, invitations by sticks, and eating the bear as a slain enemy (1946:279).

Material aspects according to Cooper (1946:279): Turtle-shell rattle, splint basketry, effigy pipes, catlinite pipes, deer hoof rattle, pump drill, and woven animal hair.

Mythical or religious aspects (Cooper 1946:279): Blowing by medicine man in curing, thunder-beings, milky-way as path to land of souls, and myth of twins quarreling before birth.

Such was the attitude of Speck: "The loose political organization of early times permitted little importance to develop in the office of the chief. The Penobscoets were at best only weakly governed." (1940:239)

Concluding from Rosier's Relations (in Burrage 1887) Sewall (1859:44), however, locates the home of Bashaba as at Damariscotta on the Sheepscot River, thus making the Wawenocs the immediate subjects of the Bashaba. Williamson likewise concludes that "Besides his immediate dominions extending probably from St. George's to Kennebeck, the tribes westward to Agamenticus [York], and even farther, acknowledged him to be their paramount lord." (1832:1:494)

It is not known exactly where Purchase derived his information, but it seems that the first river he named
"Quibquesson" with the towns of Asticou and Abermot must have been near Mount Desert, for there Biard met Asticou. (If this river had been the boundary of Bashaba's territory than the people to the immediate east called "Tarratines" were the Etchemins, since we know the Etchemins occupied the St. Croix region.) The last river named defining the southern extreme of Bashaba's territory was "Shawakotoc," which Eckstorm probably correctly associates with the Saco.

In the same year Lescarbot (1907-14:2:368) said that Bessabas succeeded chiefs Olmechin of Saco and Marckin of Androscoggin, which would indicate that, when those local chiefs died, Bashaba's authority was extended to those rivers.

The names of the people that Smith lists as falling under Bashaba's authority are nearly unidentifiable in terms of known tribes, except for the first--"Sagotago"--which could possibly be Schoodic, for those in the Schoodic Lakes region near Passamaquoddy Bay.

This Bashaba had many enemies, especially those to the east and northeast, whom they called Tarentines; those to the west and southwest were called Sockhigones /Sacos/ (Gorges 1847:61-2).

Ethnohistorian Gordon Day of the National Museum of Canada implies but does not admit that such a secession could have occurred: "I think all we can safely assume about these bands is that they were--about 1605--under the head chiefship of Bashabe. The fact that his domain extended from the St. John to the Saco shows his subjects (?) spoke more than one dialect. We can only guess whether they were all contented with the arrangement or whether some had been drawn in by conquest or had made an alliance for protection against some tribe they liked even less. If Maliseets were involved in the attack on Bashabe, it could have been some malcontents of this sort. But I think it was the Micmacs." (Letter February 3, 1966)

It is from this secession that, I submit, the whole controversy over the identity of the Tarratines was begun.

Other causes for this unity may perhaps be found in the common threat of Mohawk attacks if any stock can be taken in Champlain's description of their strength on the St. Lawrence.

Lescarbot goes on to claim that the English, not the Etchemins or Tarratines, killed Bashabe, while Williamson credits the Tarratines and their French allies with the murder of Bashabe (1832:1:215).
According to Murray (1938:365) the French had established a fishing industry on the Grand Banks and in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and were employing about 1000 ships per year. In 1580 traders from Malo, France, were making tremendous profits on the fur and fish trade in the Gulf. Lescarbot (quoted by Bailey 1937:16) commented in 1607 on the extent of European influence at that time: "Indeed they have been so long frequented by the Basques that the language of the coast tribes is half Basque."

Whereas hitherto Cape Breton had been the area of maximum contact, the founding of Port Royal indicates that by the beginning of the seventeenth century the fur trade was leading to the penetration of areas beyond those affected by the fisheries." (Bailey 1938:266) It seems, moreover, that at the time of early contact this split had begun to occur, for Oagimont of the St. Croix was repeatedly used as a mediator between groups on the St. John and groups farther south (Champlain 1907:106) (DeMonts in Purchas 1906:18:287), but by 1614 we hear little of him and can well assume that he had joined the dissident group north of the Penobscot (Lescarbot 1907-14:IV:360).

"The war had consumed the Bashaba and most of the great Sagamores with such men of action as followed them, and those that remained were sore afflicted with the Plague, for that the country was in a manner left void of inhabitants." (Gorges 1890:2:19)

Eckstorm identifies him as an Etchenmin adopted by a Kennebec chief and establishes his period of authority at Castine as extending from 1669 to 1698 (1919:60).

The Treaty of 1693 proves that Egeremet and Madockawando were cousins for "Wenungahewet, cousin of Madockawando and EdgerEmitt" was left as a hostage to guarantee the good faith of the Indians (Mass. Archives 30:338).

Wenongonet (Wagungonet), the cousin of Madockawando and Egeremet, succeeded Madockawando until 1726. Evidence that in 1701 the tribes between the Penobscot and St. John were united is found in the Baxter MSS (Maine Historical Society 1916:21:37) where "Weenognett chief sachem of Penobscot and St. Johns" attended a conference at New Harbor.

She makes this tentative assertion on the basis of an informant's testimony that a son of Peter Paul Neptune was the grandson of Madockawando, the chief at Pentegoet (Eckstorm 1945:109)
55"During Dummer's War when they were pursued by the English who burned their fortified town at Old Town in 1723, the Etchemins withdrew to Machias and the St. Croix, while the Abenakis from the Kennebec, driven out by the destruction of Norridgewock in 1724, filled-in and took their places up the river; the coast was long left vacant after the sea-faring Maliseets withdrew. Thus is explained why the modern Penobscots speak Abenaki now, instead of Maliseet as formerly." (Eckstorm 1945:18)

56 Other causes for the split may be found in the trade advantages shared by the Penobscots and Kennebecs who were closest to English trading posts on the Kennebec while the Passamaquoddy and St. Johns Indians, well inside the territory still claimed by the French, were not promised with any trading houses as provided in the Treaty of 1725.
CONCLUSION

It has now been shown that the tendency for political unity was indigenous in New Hampshire, Maine and New Brunswick, for under Bashaba in 1605 was one of the strongest political organizations in the Northeast. Although his authority was quickly undermined by external factors, the Indians in this area still tended to identify with each other. Thus, in time of need was formed the powerful Confederacy which comprised the groups formerly known as Aramouchiquois and Etchemin and later known as Western Abenaki, Eastern Abenaki and Maliseet. But, by the end of the Seventeenth Century, after two Indian wars, the majority of the Abenaki divisions had been disbanded, so that the only surviving groups with any political vitality left were the mixed group on the Penobscot, the Passamaquoddy, the Maliseet, and the alienated St. Francis Indians. From this time forth, the unity as was frequently expressed throughout the remainder of the Indian wars involved only the ancestral groups of the three surviving tribes today which have managed to retain some sense of common identification.

Having analyzed the nature of the unity in the territory in terms of the cultural, linguistic and political, it would be beneficial from two points of view to
make a critical survey of the actual operation of the
unity—specifically, in the course of the seven major
Indian Wars. Such an analysis would reveal innumerable
instances which would document our thesis that the tribes
in the area were actually unified. And secondly, the
analysis would provide much information of ethnological
significance, for the bulk of the ethnological record of
our Indians is to be found in the accounts of wartime con­
flict and negotiation. Although the French-English con­
flict began in 1613, the Indian Wars did not begin until
half a century later in 1675. Up to this latter date, the
concerns of the colonial powers in the New World had been
primarily exploratory or economical, i.e., the fur trade.
Hence, very little of ethnological importance is to be found
in records of this period. Some excellent descriptions are,
however, to be found in the Jesuit Relations (1896-1901),
but as in the case of most missionaries, the concern of
the Jesuit was not with a political unit, but with the
individual.

By the time the wars had arrived, the major interests
of the Indian and the white man were oriented toward each
other, for both represented a threat and an advantage to
the other. The Indian, faced with loss of land and bene­
fit from the trade, was still in a position of dominance
as was manifested in his Confederacy. Because of this
Confederacy the position of the English in the New World
was considerably threatened, while the fur trade, where
successful, represented an important advantage to colonists in lessening the threat of the Confederacy. This situation was tremendously complicated by the territorial conflict between the French and English, both of whom recognized the advantage of Indian support. Hence, throughout the French and Indian Wars careful attention was given to Indian sentiments, interests, alignments, and movements.

However, a survey of the Indian Wars will not be made here, for it would merely be a chronological documentation of our thesis rather than an analysis, which has already been made quite thoroughly. Furthermore, it would tend to be interminable, for the illustrations of unity during the wars are countless. Finally, a discussion of the wars would inevitably involve discussion of the various disunifying factors and events which became more and more effective in transforming the tribes from mastery to submission as the wars proceeded. Indeed, the wars were so effective in bringing about this change in roles (from dominance to dependence) that the story of the years following the last Indian War, and especially after the American Revolution, would make the most dismal chapter. Having forced the Indian to submit to superior power, the white man was not content. He had aimed to shatter not only the Indians' political unity but also his territorial unity, and in this he succeeded.
Though it has been shown that the surviving groups have retained to this day some sense of common identity, their political unity was so weakened by the wars that they were quickly confined to reservations, isolated and forgotten—no longer to enjoy their rightful and natural roles as masters of their own land. Hence this study has been devoted to that most vital aspect of Indian history—the unity of the tribes in New Hampshire, Maine and New Brunswick as it existed before the Indian wars.
MAP OF MAINE, NEW HAMPSHIRE AND NEW BRUNSWICK
SHOWING LOCATIONS OF MODERN TRIBES
Du Creux's map has been undervalued by geographers as an imperfect copy of Sanson's 1655 map of New France. It was prepared to illustrate the text, and hence is in Latin. The map, however, deserves study, and is of special value on account of the inset map of the Huron country, the improved outline of the lakes, especially Lake Ontario, and Georgian Bay, the marking of the trails to the Hudson Bay and of the new route discovered by Grosciliers and Radisson from Lake Nipigon. Those who read Latin will be entertained by the ingenuity expended upon the Latinising of place-names. In emphasizing the Iroquois position as a menace to New France and laying stress on Hudson Bay as the real source of the fur-trade, the map was presumably intended as an additional argument for the projected separate colony of Quebec.
MAP OF THE NEW ENGLAND COAST, A.D. 1650.
FROM DOCUMENTS COLLECTED IN FRANCE.

Massachusetts Archives, Vol. XI. p. 61.

(Gorges 1890:2:184)
MAP SHOWING LOCATIONS OF VARIOUS DIALECTS IN EARLY MAINE, NEW HAMPSHIRE AND NEW BRUNSWICK
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>IV. Algonquins</th>
<th>Old Algonkins</th>
<th>Miwok</th>
<th>Emb连线</th>
<th>Akanchi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Man</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>esqu</td>
<td>assinap</td>
<td>kwew</td>
<td>oktap</td>
<td>secmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Woman</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>nooakw</td>
<td>muskw</td>
<td>nesama</td>
<td>sepat</td>
<td>matsena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Father</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>shawere</td>
<td>nesimo</td>
<td>migha</td>
<td>matsena</td>
<td>mestana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mother</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>squax</td>
<td>nesimo</td>
<td>nesima</td>
<td>nesima</td>
<td>mestana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Son</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>squax</td>
<td>nesima</td>
<td>nesima</td>
<td>nesima</td>
<td>mestana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Daughter</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>squax</td>
<td>nesima</td>
<td>nesima</td>
<td>nesima</td>
<td>mestana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Head</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>intewak</td>
<td>ootikwan</td>
<td>ootikwan</td>
<td>kanahe</td>
<td>kanahe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Hair</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>miskilis</td>
<td>foss</td>
<td>foss</td>
<td>foss</td>
<td>foss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ear</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>miskilis</td>
<td>foss</td>
<td>foss</td>
<td>foss</td>
<td>foss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Eye</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>miskilis</td>
<td>foss</td>
<td>foss</td>
<td>foss</td>
<td>foss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Nose</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>miskilis</td>
<td>foss</td>
<td>foss</td>
<td>foss</td>
<td>foss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Mouth</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>miskilis</td>
<td>foss</td>
<td>foss</td>
<td>foss</td>
<td>foss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Teeth</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>miskilis</td>
<td>foss</td>
<td>foss</td>
<td>foss</td>
<td>foss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Hand</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>shivitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Finger</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>shivitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Feet</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>shivitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Blood</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>shivitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Bones</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>shivitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Room</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>shivitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Axe</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>shivitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Knife</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>shivitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Spoon</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>shivitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Sky</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>shivitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Sun</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>shivitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Moon</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>shivitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Star</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>shivitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Day</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>shivitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Night</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>shivitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Full</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>shivitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Water</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>shivitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Rain</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>shivitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Snow</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>shivitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. River</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>shivitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Stone</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>shivitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Tree</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>shivitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Reed</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>shivitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Neat</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>shivitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Leg</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>shivitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Knee</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>shivitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. He</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>shivitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Men</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>shivitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Women</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>shivitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Old</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>shivitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Young</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>shivitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Child</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>shivitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Poor</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>shivitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Rich</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>shivitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Pauk</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>shivitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Jib</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>shivitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Tool</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>shivitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
<td>sahitsh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>En</th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>medal</td>
<td>medal</td>
<td>ten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n'asalajin</td>
<td>n'asalajin</td>
<td>nemisantzin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pi'na</td>
<td>pi'na</td>
<td>I love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td>very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achimowangon</td>
<td>onjimowangon</td>
<td>A.N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a'gim</td>
<td>a'gim</td>
<td>nahnegi'mah'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tawtad</td>
<td>tawtad</td>
<td>i'sindegan'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>E.</td>
<td>tale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nagi</td>
<td>nagi</td>
<td>angem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ke'gtes</td>
<td>ke'gtes</td>
<td>chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>E.</td>
<td>friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nabi</td>
<td>nabi</td>
<td>E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>petegowgangok</td>
<td>petegowgangok</td>
<td>E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A and O.N.</td>
<td>A and O.N.</td>
<td>water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mena'sis, a little</td>
<td>mena'sis, a little</td>
<td>ball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kebatsu</td>
<td>kebatsu</td>
<td>E and A.N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ona'sa'is, rather</td>
<td>ona'sa'is, rather</td>
<td>a little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>I.</td>
<td>seven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idam</td>
<td>idam</td>
<td>he said</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k'ehl, big</td>
<td>k'ehl, big</td>
<td>neka'so'kki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>E.</td>
<td>I am big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n'isda</td>
<td>n'isda</td>
<td>three times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.</td>
<td>O.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alemos</td>
<td>alemos</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>awemoch</td>
<td>awemoch</td>
<td>aremos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.</td>
<td>O.N.</td>
<td>abennos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alnohe</td>
<td>alnohe</td>
<td>AN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apad'ak'wek</td>
<td>apad'ak'wek</td>
<td>arenahpe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.</td>
<td>O.</td>
<td>apanatchesi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngwudahs guo</td>
<td>ngwudahs guo</td>
<td>neg'uda'teg'8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ö.</td>
<td>AN</td>
<td>hundred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w'dalidahoszi</td>
<td>w'dalidahoszi, he con</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nsuk</td>
<td>nsuk</td>
<td>sider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.</td>
<td>O.N.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'o'kan</td>
<td>'o'kan</td>
<td>AN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.</td>
<td>U.</td>
<td>-a'ku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kiu'na</td>
<td>kiu'na</td>
<td>hunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nio'na</td>
<td>nio'na</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.</td>
<td>O.</td>
<td>we (excl.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pudawasi'na</td>
<td>pudawasi'na</td>
<td>we (incl.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td>they take counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sukhamid</td>
<td>sukhamid</td>
<td>standing upright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.</td>
<td>O.N.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngwedohs</td>
<td>ngwedohs</td>
<td>six</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kashunkaw</td>
<td>-kashunkaw</td>
<td>-ten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.</td>
<td>Vowel inherent in N.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngwedohs</td>
<td>ngwedohs</td>
<td>neka'dans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.W.</td>
<td>A.W.</td>
<td>six</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngwedohs</td>
<td>ngwedohs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.W.</td>
<td>E8 and AO.</td>
<td>four times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iavoda</td>
<td>iavoda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kashunkaw</td>
<td>-kashunkaw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.W.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tebawawo'is</td>
<td>tebawawo'is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.W.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f'monwawinnok</td>
<td>f'monwawinnok</td>
<td>people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.W.</td>
<td>E.W.</td>
<td>four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iaw</td>
<td>iaw</td>
<td>E8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.</td>
<td>U.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pii'kiesi'k</td>
<td>pii'kiesi'k</td>
<td>little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHEGAN.</td>
<td>MASSACHUSETTS.</td>
<td>PENOBSCOT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Froth Edwards.)</td>
<td>(From Eliot.)</td>
<td>(From Father Rale's MS. Dictionary.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. To die (I die)</td>
<td>27. U-ehuntun (to die)</td>
<td>27. Nuppo (he died)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Fire</td>
<td>32. Sawk</td>
<td>32. Sawk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. A spirit (a spectre)</td>
<td>34. Manito</td>
<td>34. Manito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. How</td>
<td>35. Tunun (5)</td>
<td>35. Tunun (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Shoo</td>
<td>40. Mit</td>
<td>40. Mit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Sit down</td>
<td>42. Mattipeh</td>
<td>42. Mattipeh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Where</td>
<td>43. Toha</td>
<td>43. Toha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Winter</td>
<td>44. Hypon</td>
<td>44. Hypon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Wood</td>
<td>45. Metooue</td>
<td>45. Metooue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A COMPARISON OF NEW ENGLAND DIALECTS**

(Edwards 1623:136-141)
Map of Maine showing boundaries of Penobscot tribal territory, location of family hunting districts (denoted by numerals), and neighboring tribes.
MAP SHOWING MALISEET TERRITORY

(Speck & Hadlock 1946:356)
MAP No. 12.—MAP OF NEW BRUNSWICK ON THE PENDENTIF (Curtis's) System.
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ABSTRACT

The purpose in writing this ethnology was not to prove that the tribes in Maine, New Hampshire and New Brunswick were unified, but rather, to illustrate the extent to which they were unified. With this general end in mind, my research therefore could not follow only one line of inquiry. It had to be divided into various sub-topics to cover my various orientations to the problem. One of my first orientations was that of validating my belief in a former unity through fieldwork among the Indians involved. This orientation provided the basis for my first chapter, which was considerably augmented by the advice and opinions of various experts in the fields of Ethnology and History. Convinced of the validity of my belief, I then proceeded with an historical orientation to the problem by attempting to clarify the confusion of terms and to identify the several groups of Indians, modern and historical. As intended, this line of inquiry verified my belief and suggested the area for further research. The earliest known tribes of Indians here were identified as ancestors of certain modern tribes, the Etchemin and Armouchiquois (later the Abnaki) being the ancestors of
the four surviving groups in question—the Maliseet, Passamaquoddy, Penobscot, and St. Francis Abenaki. The confusing relationship between the two historic terms (Etchemin and Armouchiquois) was precisely the relationship sought for further clarification.

Having exhausted most of the historical sources for this clarification, I turned to another line of inquiry—the bases for identification of the tribal groups. The cultural basis for identification was found to clarify to some extent the distinction between Etchemin and Armouchiquois, though on closer inspection local cultural differences were found to exist throughout this region rather than merely between two major groups. Furthermore, these differences were minor when compared to the high degree of cultural uniformity which contributed in no small way to the feeling of unity between the two ancient groups. The linguistic basis for identification likewise clarified the distinction between Armouchiquois and Etchemin; however, once again the linguistic differences were found to grade from North to South rather than to exist in one sharp break.

The final basis for identification—political—confirmed my belief in the former unity of these tribes, sporadic as it may have been. This line of inquiry illustrated that in spite of distinctions such as Armouchiquois or Etchemin, Indians of both groups united at various times for various purposes, at first under Bashaba and later under the Abnaki Confederacy.