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ABSTRACT

IDENTITY IN THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL RECORD: RICHARDVILLE, NATOEQUAH AND THE FUR TRADE IN NORTHEASTERN INDIANA

by Elizabeth K. Spott

The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 2018
Under the Supervision of Professor Robert J. Jeske

Gender, ethnicity and social class are powerful structuring components that influence the formation of personal identity and social groups, as well as constrain interpersonal interactions within social groups. The following dissertation is an examination of how gender, ethnicity and class were actively negotiated and employed by Native Americans, Métis and whites to construct personal and social identities on the frontier during the nineteenth century fur trade. This discussion of identity will focus on the example of John B. Richardville to examine how he used material culture to construct, portray and maintain multiple personal and social identities in the nineteenth century fur trade.

John B. Richardville served as the last civil chief of the Miami tribe (1816 - 1841) and it is argued that he actively drew upon elements of his ethnicity, gender, and class, while purposely utilizing material culture to create multiple social and personal identities. These identities were then strategically employed in different arenas of his life in order to secure his role within the Miami tribe, as well as within the dominant white, Euroamerican culture of the nineteenth century. A materialist approach framed within a gendered and identity based theoretical framework will be applied to the archaeological assemblages recovered from the Chief Richardville House (12AL1887) and the Chief Richardville House and Miami Treaty Grounds (12HU1013), as well as the structures themselves in order to examine how Richardville utilized
material culture to accomplish these goals. It is hypothesized that Richardville actively portrayed different identities at each structure, utilizing different types of material culture to do so, creating unique archaeological signatures at each location. An analysis of these archaeological signatures and materials recovered from these sites is expected to illustrate the different facets of Richardville’s social and personal identity presented in each location.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

This dissertation is an examination of how people created personal and social identities in the context of Métis and white interactions during the fur trade of the early nineteenth century in the southwest Great Lakes region. Miami Chief John B. Richardville (1760-1841) and his wife Natoequah are the focus of this research; specifically highlighting the influence of gender and ethnicity as they purposefully utilized material culture to construct, portray and maintain unique personal and social identities within the context of the nineteenth century fur trade. To compliment an examination of material culture from the Chief Richardville House, historical sources were also examined to gather more information on Richardville. Though he did not regularly produce written records himself or create written narratives of his activities, others documented some of Richardville’s activities, so he is part of the historical record. Richardville appears in accounts of treaty negotiations, Miami tribal activities, as well as personal accounts from individuals who conducted business with him or visited his home. Several historical biographies, overviews and syntheses have also been written about Richardville over the last fifty years which build upon those primary records (Anson 1964; 1970; Berthrong 1974; Birzer 1999, 2008; Calendar 1978a, 1978b; Carter 1987; Chaput 1978; Cochran 1990; Edel 1997; Edmunds 1996; Ericsson 1990; Font 1994; Gernand 1990; Glenn 1990; Jeske 1992; Leonard 1990; Lytle 2004; Rafert 1996; Stone 1978; Zoll 2000). While this dissertation focuses on artifactual evidence recovered from the Chief Richardville House, it is also informed by primary accounts of Richardville, as well as modern texts about Richardville and his activities.

Richardville’s Houses

Richardville constructed two houses during his tenure as chief, which will be the focus of
this study. Akima Pinsiwa Awiki, also known as the Chief Jean-Baptiste de Richardville House, is located at 5705 Bluffton Road in Fort Wayne, Indiana (Figures 1.1, 1.2). Within this dissertation this house will be referred to simply as the Chief Richardville House.

Richardville constructed an additional house in Huntington, Indiana, which is designated as (12HU1013) (Figures 1.3, 1.4). This structure is located on U.S. 24, west of Huntington. The National Register of Historic Places nomination form refers to the property as the Chief Richardville House and Miami Treaty Grounds, but also notes two other common names: Indian House and Forks of the Wabash. However, the property is also referred to as the Richardville/LaFontaine House in Ball State University reports (e.g., Cochrane et al. 1990; Zoll et al. 2000) and a Master’s thesis (Stillwell 1990). To avoid confusion with Richardville’s Fort Wayne home, the structure will be referred to as the LaFontaine House throughout this dissertation.
The naming discrepancies between the two sites were particularly troublesome when searching for documentation on the two sites. Both sites have National Register of Historic Places nomination forms, while the Chief Richardville House has a nomination form for National Landmark status and the LaFontaine House has a Historic American Building Survey (HABS) form (Appendix D, Appendix B). All of these documents contain valuable information about each structure and site but were difficult to locate unless the official name of the structure was known and used in the search.

Richardville’s Use of the Structures

Richardville and his family resided at the Chief Richardville House, never formally living in the LaFontaine House, though Richardville used the LaFontaine House as a trading and business location (Cochran 1990). LaFontaine and his family did reside at the structure and outside of a general residential use of the structures, the activities conducted at each site differed greatly while Richardville used the structures. These differences should be reflected in the material culture recovered from each site.

An analysis on two seasons of archaeological materials recovered from the Chief Richardville House and comparisons made to materials recovered from the LaFontaine House
are presented in this study and has elucidated the different patterns of consumption at each site resulting from different activities that took place at each location. Additionally, such an analysis will shed light on differential conspicuous consumption of material goods by Richardville and Natoequah as part of the process of constructing and presenting their identities within varying social contexts at each site.

This research and analysis will be grounded in a theoretical framework that provides an empirical examination of hypotheses derived from feminist and identity theory. This approach is particularly suited to examine how Richardville’s male, Métis identity and Natoequah’s female, Miami identity structured their lives within the nineteenth century fur trade. Examining how Richardville and Natoequah structured their identities will provide insight into these two individuals because their identities formed their personas, impacted their behavior and influenced their consumer choices—all of which should be reflected in the material culture recovered from the sites (Conkey and Gero 1997; Englestad 1991; Hendon 1996; Nelson 2006; Scott 1991, 1994a, 1994b; Spencer-Wood 1991, 2006; Stig-Sorensen 2006). More specifically, the reflexive nature of a feminist theoretical framework enables archaeologists to address and interpret how ethnicity and gender influenced the formation of multiple identities in pluralistic settings. The Great Lakes fur trade is a useful setting in which to view Miami, Métis and EuroAmerican gender roles, gender relations, gender ideologies, social hierarchies and their resulting material culture signatures. Utilizing a reflexive approach will account for agency in the past by the various actors and provide additional information on silent or underrepresented groups including Richardville’s wife, Natoequah.

Additionally, this approach integrates Social Identity Theory (SIT) and Identity Theory from the disciplines of sociology and psychology, which will bolster the discussions of identity
formation and the role that social factors of gender, ethnicity and social class have on identity and identity construction (Ashforth and Mael 1989; Berzonsky 2011; Hogg et al. 1995; Jenkins 1996; Korostelina 2007a, 2007b; Liu and Laszlo 2007; Swartz et al. 2011; Spears 2011; Turner 1982). In this dissertation the terms personal (individual) identity and social (group) identity are used to describe personas created by individuals and publicly presented to others as individuals and as a member of social groups. Drawing from literature outside of anthropology has proven to be advantageous since the psychology and sociology literature are robust in their definition and discussion of identity, personhood and the social factors and processes that contribute to them (Blake and Ashforth 1989; Hogg et al. 1995; Korostelina 2007; Lui and Laszlo 2007; Molony and Walker 2007; Schwartz et al 2011; Spears 201). However, anthropologists too have used these theoretical approaches to examine archaeological materials to examine identity in the past (Nassaney 2008, 2012; Nassaney et al. 2004).

Identity theory and social identity theory can explain the social behavior of self and the social essence of self within the context of intergroup relationships and interactions (Ashforth and Mael 1989; Hogg et al. 1995) as well as to elucidate intergroup interactions and the social processes that are active within groups. Conversely, identity theory is a sociological theory that is narrower in scope and much more focused, designed to examine behaviors related to specific social roles (Hogg et al. 1995). These theories define and elaborate upon the concepts of identity, personal identity, social identity and the socialization process in order to discuss how people define themselves socially in terms of self, and how they exploit this concept of self in different social arenas to manipulate access to different social groups (Ashforth and Mael 1989; Hogg et al. 1995; Nassaney et al. 2004).

Since material culture embodies and symbolizes meanings of the social climate it is
produced in, this gender and identity-based theoretical framework should help elucidate information about the people who purchased and displayed it (Dittmar 2011; Shanks and Tilley 1989; Stig 2006). The consumption patterns at each site represent a public portrayal of the different social and personal identities of Richardville, Natoequah and others at the Chief Richardville House and the LaFontaine House. An interpretation of these materials within their particular contexts will aid in recognizing the resulting signature of these identities within the archaeological record.

Dissertation Organization

Chapter two discusses the theoretical framework through which material analysis will take place in this dissertation. A discussion of the feminist theoretical framework within anthropological archaeology will be included to inform a discussion of gender and how it influenced Richardville and Natoequah’s identities. Additionally, an in-depth discussion of identity theory and social identity theory will take place that will focus specifically on personal and social identity formation. This theoretical discussion will also be tied into an examination of materialization, which is a process whereby physical objects are imbued with cultural meaning, making them salient social markers. Once cultural meaning is assigned to these objects, they are able to convey information when presented in social arenas. An examination of artifacts at the three archaeological sites will therefore permit an examination of how identity was publicly displayed at each site.

Chapter three is a survey of the culture-history of the Early, Middle and Late historic periods in the western Great Lakes. This chapter will explore the fur trade industry in the eighteenth and nineteenth century in the geographical area of the Great Lakes, the Miami presence in the Great Lakes and Richardville’s role in the Miami tribe, as well as his role in the
larger context of the nineteenth century fur trade in North America.

Chapter four will build upon this culture-history and place Richardville, Natoequah and the houses into an appropriate cultural context. Both structures will be described here, as will the archaeological excavations that took place at each site, the materials recovered from those excavations and expectations held about the materials recovered.

Chapter five will outline the analytical methods used on the dataset and discuss how they tie into or relate to the theoretical framework that was used. Specific methods for material analysis will be discussed, describing the efficacy of the methods on each material culture class.

Chapter six will present the results of the data analysis conducted for this dissertation, as well as compare the findings from the Chief Richardville House to those of the Lafontaine House.

Chapter seven will include a discussion of gender and identity as revealed by the analysis of material culture that took place in this dissertation. This discussion will focus specifically on the Chief Richardville House, as well as Richardville and Natoequah at the house. The LaFontaine House will also be discussed and comparisons made to the Chief Richardville House.

Chapter eight will include an assessment of how well the theoretical expectations that were held before analysis was conducted held up under empirical examination. Recommendations for future research are also laid out in this chapter.
Chapter 2: Theoretical Approach

Over the last forty years, feminist theory has been developed and applied in North American archaeology to expose androcentric bias within the discipline, but also to examine unrepresented or underrepresented social groups in the archaeological record in order to gain a more robust and inclusive perspective of the past (Claassen 1992; Conkey and Gero 1997; Gero 1985; Nelson 2006; Scott 1994b; Spencer-Wood 1991, 1994, 2006; Thomas 1992; Victory and Beaury 1992; Wylie 1992, 1997). While this approach was originally designed to examine women, it has since been broadened to examine men, children, as well as other genders, and has also drawn attention to the variability that exists in gender-relevant data. Every culture or society is composed of numerous and diverse groups, each of which has varying degrees of visibility within written or historical records; some groups are highly visible and present in the historic record, while others are less visible because they are omitted from the written records. These unrepresented or underrepresented people and groups are known as silent groups, or what Elizabeth Scott (1994:3) refers to as “those of little note.” Little is known about these groups because they did not keep written records themselves, they were not the focus of European historic documents and they were generally considered unimportant to Europeans in North America. Today, some people or groups choose to be undocumented for a myriad of reasons, however, there are other groups that do not consciously choose to be omitted from the written record but are also not actively incorporated into the historical record. These, or similar groups, were present in historical periods as well. While silent groups are acknowledged today because they are observable in the present, silent groups of the past are much less observable, which is problematic for archaeologists. Both women and children of the past fall into this category and while the feminist theory of the last thirty years has been utilized to find and see women in the
archaeological record, less work has been conducted along these lines to see or find children in the archaeological record. This is primarily because few artifacts (primarily toys) are correlated with the activity of children at archaeological sites and children are thought to use material culture other than toys in unusual and unpredictable ways when compared to men and women (Baxter 2008). As a result, children, like women are frequently underrepresented despite the fact that they were present and active in the past.

In contexts such as the fur trade, historical documents and records were created only by those who could read and write (primarily white EuroAmerican males) and had a need or desire to create and keep permanent records. Written records were generally kept in order to document or quantify things (e.g., inventories), record events (e.g., personal diaries, journals and personal accounts), record formal and legal business transactions (e.g., sales, land deeds, treaties, birth records, marriage records), communicate over long distances (e.g., personal and official letters or correspondence) and record events both mundane and of consequence (e.g., personal diaries, journals and personal accounts). Most historic documents were created by white EuroAmericans because a majority of Native Americans did not possess a system of writing and instead kept oral histories of past events. Consequently, most of the written records from this time period were created by a small number of people in select positions of authority including those involved in the business of the fur trade, the military and/or land speculation/sales or were affiliated with religious institutions. Given who was keeping these records and the purpose of them, it is no wonder that many people and groups are underrepresented or entirely omitted from the EuroAmerican historic record.

Historical archaeology occupies a unique position that incorporates information from written records and historical accounts but does not rely upon them alone. While historic records
are an important tool used to understand and interpret the past, historical archaeology also turns to the material culture left behind by the people themselves for information about the past. Archaeology therefore not only has the ability to corroborate or invalidate historical records and accounts but can also fill in the blanks and provide information about silent groups that is lacking in historical record (Deagan 1988; Scott 1991, 1994a; Shackel and Little). While Richardville was a prominent public figure throughout his life and is mentioned in several historical accounts, Natoequah falls into the silent group category; virtually nothing was written about her throughout her lifetime and she left no written records herself. Natoequah does appear briefly in some historic accounts, though she is usually mentioned in reference to others (like Richardville) and her presence or absence is merely noted (Birzer 2008). Unlike Richardville, her daily activities were not recorded and people did not record her appearance or her personality as they did Richardville’s. However, even Richardville may be considered part of the silent group in some ways because most accounts about Richardville pertain to his activities as a mediator, negotiator or Chief and his interactions and business dealings with EuroAmericans, while almost nothing is known about his domestic activities inside the home with his family. An examination of the materials recovered from the Chief Richardville House and the LaFontaine House will fill these gaps and provide information not only on Richardville’s domestic activities, but also provide more information on Natoequah’s activities as well.

Identity

Identity, very broadly, is the sense of self that people have, who they perceive themselves to be in social contexts, how they relate to those who occupy the world around them and the identification a person has with social groups based on socially sanctioned differences (Diaz-Andreu and Lucy 2005; Davis 2000; Jenkins 1996; Shoemaker 2006; Stets and Burke 2000).
Identity can also be thought of as the identification a person has with others in social groups based on socially sanctioned differences (Diaz-Andreau and Lucy 2005). It is a publicly mediated, active and dynamic process, as well as a state of being that is never settled, but always transforming and highly malleable (Beaudry et al. 1991; Breakwell 2014; Hodos 2010; Jenkins 1996; Nassany 2008).

While the term identity is used frequently, definitions of identity are not easily found within social science literature and when found, they are less than straightforward. Researchers often use differing definitions of the term, apply similar definitions to different types of identity (e.g. group and individual identity) and even use different criteria when discussing how one delineates or creates an identity (Berzonsky 2001; Jenkins 1996; Korostelina 2007a; Schwartz et al. 2011; Spears 2011; Stets and Burke 2000; Turner 1982; Vignoles et al. 2011).

Anthropological definitions of identity build on the general idea that identity is the sense of self that people have, add that identity also includes how people distinguish themselves from others in social relations (Leve 2011; Meskell 2002; Nassaney 2008; Smith 2007; Sokefeld 2001), consider identity to be multiply constructed, is salient in social interactions and is frequently examined in tandem with class, gender, ethnicity or religion (Babi 2005; Diaz-Andreau 2005; Diaz-Andreau and Lucy 2005; Franklin and Fessler 1999; Lucy 2005; Meskell 2002; Sleeper-Smith 2000). As a result, archaeologists have examined identity in many different ways and in different contexts producing rich results (Burley et al. 1992; Heath 1999; Nassany 2008; Smith 2007). However, Diaz-Andreau and Lucy (2005) point out that some ambiguity exists within definitions of identity and that the term is used to address both individual and group identity interchangeably. Within this dissertation sociological and psychological literature are highlighted to define identity, its components and discuss the processes by which it is created because
precise definitions of identity are provided and individual identity and group identity are
addressed independently as separate forms of identity.

However, that is not to say that there is not variation when it comes to definitions of
identity within sociological and psychological literature. For example, Parekh (2008) discusses
identity in terms of the key features that characterize something, make it what it is or what
differentiates it from other things while Jenkins (1996) characterizes identity as distinct
properties that humans possess as social beings. Conversely, Philogene (2007) describes identity
not as what people are, but instead highlights identity as identified by recognizing
contradistinctions to others and emphasizes the ability of individuals to understand distinction
from others around them. Likewise, Skevington and Baker (1989) describe identity as being
unique, idiosyncratic explanations of self that are based on distinctions from others. In a different
vein, Ashmore and Jussim (1997) refrain from providing a specific definition of identity
altogether and describe it instead as a phenomenon that eludes definition due to its dynamic
nature and its constantly changing state. They also go on to state that identity is not just one
thing, that each person does not have a single identity. Instead, people are able to create, hold
and display several identities concurrently, a characteristic referred to as multiplicity. Jenkins
(1996) takes this one step further and describes identity as a process of being or becoming
(Jenkins 1996:4). Therefore, identity is seen not only as a conscious state of mind, but it is also
an action as well as a physical state of being. Additionally, identity is consciously formed
through a reflexive process where people define themselves in relation to one another or other
groups based on commonalities or a feeling of belonging with some and differences to others
(Ashforth and Mael 1989; Stets and Burke 2000). For the purposes of this dissertation, identity
will be defined as a combination of self-defined and socially accepted sense of selves, which are
consciously constructed via identification with any number or combination of personal variables in social contexts in order to juxtapose an individual within the social world. Those variables include age, sex, gender, occupation, status, social class, economic class, life history, personal experience, language use and skin color, though this list is by no means exhaustive and additional criteria do exist (Berzonsky 2001; Jenkins 1996; Korostelina 2007a; Schwartz et al. 2011; Spears 2011; Stets and Burke 2000; Turner 1982; Vignoles et al. 2011).

All identities are based upon a unique combination of both biological and non-biological personal attributes. Each person will emphasize, mask or change any number of these attributes to form an identity or self-view in order to appear a certain way to others, whether it is to belong to a group or set themselves apart from others as an individual (Molony and Walker 2007). Each of these identities is unique due to the distinct combination of the attributes for each person. Identities are also highly dynamic because they are created in relation to others and will respond directly to social contexts, as well as group dynamics (Hogg et al. 1995; Stets and Burke 2000). It is important to remember that these characteristics are also imbued with social and cultural meaning and may be interpreted differently by others than an individual may have originally intended. Skin color for example, is frequently equated with race or ethnicity, though there is no relationship between biology and race. Instead, race is culturally constructed and varying meanings and values are assigned to different skin colors (Lavenda and Schultz 2010). People of one skin color will likely ascribe a different meaning or value to it than people in other categories do. Also, it will likely be interpreted by others with a unique lens due to preconceived notions and social or cultural bias held about that skin color, as well as social or cultural values attached to it.

Whether these attributes are inherent or not, individuals are aware of the social significance
and meaning attached to them and are able to purposely emphasize or conceal these attributes in social contexts with the goal of forming unique social and personal identities. However, these identities are not singly decided and access to personal and social identity is dependent upon the recognition and acceptance of the identity by others. Identities are also limited based on social, cultural, legal or other rules assigned to the categories that make up identity. For example, a person must be at least eighteen years of age, but under the age of thirty-four, to enlist in the American Army. Also, a person must be a natural born U.S. Citizen of at least thirty-five years of age to become President, though some would argue that there are unwritten social rules that a person must also be male in order to be elected as President. A person will therefore work within the legal, social and cultural confines of their group to define themselves both as individuals and as group members.

*Social Identity Theory and Identity Theory*

Social identity theory and identity theory are used in sociology and psychology to examine how people define themselves as individuals (individual identity) and group members (social identity), as well as examine the process of identification and the social meaning of the identities created (Contrada and Ashmore 1999; Davis 2000; Hogg and Terry 2001; Jaspal and Breakwell 2014; Korostelina 2007; Tajfel 1978; Tajfel 1984; Woodward 2004). The main difference between them is one of scale and their disciplinary origins. Identity theory operates on the level of the individual and views personal identity as an individual achievement of self-creation, consisting of the idiosyncrasies, beliefs and values with which people define themselves as individuals in social situations (Abrams 1989; Ashford and Mael 1989; Ferguson 2000; Parekh 2008; Schwartz et al. 2011; Thoits and Virshup 1997; Turner 1982). This type of identity functions to define a person by distinguishing them from others, which is accomplished through
recognizing uniqueness, as well as highlighting distinctive attributes in broad social categories in juxtaposition to others (Ferguson 2000; Stets and Burke 2000’ Terry 2001; Thoits and Virshup 1997; Vignoles et al. 2014). Furthermore, personal identity serves to guide a person through their life, providing direction, as well as establishing personal norms within their culture. Personal identity also serves to elucidate how people structure their existence within the social world and the person they become (Parekh 2008). Additionally, as people grow and age, personal identity is constantly being constructed, adjusted and maintained and therefore varies within each social context because personal identity is dependent upon interpersonal and intergroup interactions that take place (Schwartz et al. 2011).

In contrast, social identity takes place at the societal level where commonalities with others are identified and similarities are highlighted, resulting in group or category membership of one’s self or others (Ashford and Jussim 1997; Ashforth and Mael 1989; Breakwell 2014; Ferguson 2000; Hogg et al. 1995; Jenkins 1996; Spears 2011; Turner 1982). Because they are social in nature, social identities are also active and therefore constantly maintained through group activities and reaffirmed through interactions between people within the group (Barth 1969, 1981; Giddens 1991). Group activities and norms are therefore just as important in maintaining group cohesion, as the members are themselves because those activities reinforce and strengthen social identities. Also, social identity is contextually fluid and has its roots in a shared depiction of a group of people who are communally referred to as us (Hogg 2001). As a result, an us versus them view of the social world is developed, and while this may lead to a somewhat ethnocentric perspective, such a view is also an important component of group cohesion that forms strong bonds between group members, creates solidarity, and contributes to the shared identity of the group (Beaudry et al. 1996; Jost and Elsbach 2001; Philogene 2007). In
addition, collective group norms promote or limit certain behaviors or actions and serve to regulate behavior of group members, making the group a social control mechanism (Korostelina 2007).

Because practitioners within the social sciences have demonstrated the utility of applying these theoretical approaches to modern, observable people and their behavioral patterns, it may be that these same approaches can be applied to people and groups of the past in order to draw similar conclusions about identity formation and performance based on the presence of material culture. Because a direct correlation cannot be made between present observable behavior and activities that took place in the past, certain caveats must be made when interpreting these residues and equating them to representations of behavior (Binford 1967). Wobst (1978:307) suggests the only way to accurately make analogical connections between material culture and behavior is through the use of “hypotheses in a framework of strong inference.” Likewise, Binford (1967) places a heavy importance on inference in analogy because similarities are not demonstrated but instead inferred based on presumed relationships between similar objects (Binford 1967:1). Therefore, if it is understood how individuals use material culture to create identities in the present, then analogy can be used to look to past materials to infer how Richardville and Natoequah created their identities through material culture. Despite the nearly 200-year gap between the present and Richardville’s lifetime, the concept of identity and the notion that a single person can simultaneously create and display multiple identities may still be applied to people in the past if these appropriate caveats and stipulations are recognized.

Among the most important subject-side concerns is the use of a presentist perspective, which always exists, despite attempts to couch such discussions in historical contexts. There is not an equal, one-to-one relationship between the 19th century and the 21st century. Even though
modern observable identity formation processes create certain material culture signatures, it is possible that past identity formation activities created very different material culture signatures. It is also possible that similar material culture signatures were created by different identity formation activities in the past. Richardville and Natoequah likely had motivations and needs that modern researchers can not recognize or do not understand, creating material signatures that escape our understanding. Lastly, it is highly likely that people in the 19th Century had very different ideas or conceptions of identity than we do today. So it must be acknowledged that throughout this dissertation I will be taking a Western, Educated, Industrialized Rich and Democratic (WEIRD) perspective due to my training and education, which will unfortunately introduce some form of bias (Heinrich et al. 2010).

Making connections between modern, observable behavior and past behavior is therefore never easy or cut and dry. Rather, making these connections is a complex process because the archaeological record does not contain actual behavior and instead contains residues and representations of past behaviors and activity. Also, even though the number of identities a person has based on roles, as well as the types of identities that a person is able to attain may have changed over the last two centuries, the ways that identity is publicly presented and recognized have very likely remained the same. Modern identity theory and social identity theory can therefore be useful to address how identity may have been created in the past via material culture, along with the use of strong inference and analogy.

Identity Formation via Identification

Due to public perceptions, biases and values attached to certain physical characteristics, a person may emphasize, mask or manipulate biological characteristics in an attempt to publicly portray a particular identity. However, these characteristics are only one part of a person’s
identity and in order to fully create an identity, a person will make conscious choices within the confines of their biological characteristics and embrace likes and dislikes, which are presented or performed in social contexts via physical objects (Ashford and Mael 1989; Hogg et. al 1995). People are attracted to, like, or identify with certain physical objects or characteristics and this begins cognitively with thoughts, beliefs or mental images of themselves possessing physical objects, occupying certain positions, wearing particular clothes or participating in specific activities. This cognitive process (referred to as identification) is then manifested in the physical world when people demonstrate or express their identity using these objects by conducting those activities, wearing the clothes, displaying certain symbols or possessing objects (Vignoles 2011). While this cognitive process was in operation in the past and was likely similar to the same process in operation today, this cannot be known for certain. Instead, one must refrain from projecting modern perspectives on to identities of the past because identities in the past are different in many ways from identities that exist today and the motivations for creating these identities were also likely very different. Our presentist perspective, personal experiences, education, the historical record and many other factors influence our perspective and our interpretation of past identities, which can create bias. Therefore, it must be acknowledged that Richardville’s motivations for constructing and portraying the identities he did cannot be known or understood with any certainty by modern researchers.

Identities can be formed around nearly any human variable ranging from physical characteristics to social relationships and even spiritual or cognitive beliefs and each of these variables is used to define the self or others because they are meaningful to both the individual and those around them (Ashforth and Mael 1989; Berzonsky 2011; Brown 2008; Hogg et al. 1995; Hogg and Terry 2001; Jenkins 1996; Korostelina 2007a, 2007b; Liu and Laszlo 2007;
Parekh 2008; Swartz et al. 2011; Spears 2011; Turner 1982; Vignoles et al. 2011). Whether or not aspects of identity are chosen or biologically inherent, they are not static, instead they are constantly changing and actively manipulated by the individuals that exhibit them.

While identification remains at the core of identity formation, identity is not constructed by individuals alone and is only part of the process of establishing an identity because all identities also need to be validated or accepted by others in social contexts (Jenkins 1996; Molony and Walker 2007). If the self-ascribed identity is not acknowledged or recognized by others in social contexts, it carries little weight and is not able to fully be enacted. The validation or verification of identity in social contexts, therefore, is just as important, if not more so, than the identification process itself, which highlights the very fluid and social nature of identity. However, identity verification can be a complex process, especially when multiple social groups are interacting and one of those groups is socially dominant over the others. In such a scenario, intragroup identities that are verified and recognized within a group may be less dominant and might not necessarily be recognized as valid identities in the more dominant group. As a result, people in subordinate groups may be stripped of their statuses and identities in varying social contexts where they are subordinate to more dominant groups.

Although personal and social identities may be varying facets of a single person, they are not mutually exclusive and some overlapping between identities does occur. Personal identities therefore often influence or shape social identities and are formed in the same way, through the process of identification (Ashforth and Johnson 2001; Korostelina 2007; Turner 1982). Because people can have several personal and social identities simultaneously and apply them at different times or in different social contexts, the identification process is an important way for people to determine which group they fit into in a given situation. Identification therefore helps people
cope with different groups and helps them distinguish between different groups based on shared ideology of members of the group (Liu and Laszlo 2007). Because identification is active in forming both personal identity as well as social identity, the term self-identification will be used to refer to the process of personal identity formation, while social-identification will be used to refer to the process of social identity formation in this dissertation.

Each identity that a person develops throughout their lifetime is used and applied in different social contexts for different purposes, each containing its own social motivation and each able to achieve its own social ends (Hogg and Terry 2001). A person may develop and maintain several social identities in order to obtain and sustain membership in a myriad of social groups in order to have access to the benefits that come with group membership. Likewise, a person may develop a number of personal identities that serve to distinguish that person from others, providing access to other social benefits as an individual. The important aspect here is that these identities are not mutually exclusive, nor are they static. Due to the nature and function of these identities, people will develop and maintain a repertoire of several identities that they will hold simultaneously and enact singularly or in unison at various times in appropriate social contexts.

**Gender and Identity Formation**

Gender is a structuring principle present in all social groups that informs a person’s identity and uniquely governs interactions between and among individuals and groups (Jenkins 1996; Scott 1994b; Thomas 1992). Gender is a social structure that may dictate appropriate activities for individuals, regulate access to resources (as well as to other individuals) and structure the social life of members of the group (Hendon 1996; Seiffert 1991; Spencer-Wood 1991, 2006). Because gender has such influence, it is certainly an important component of identity and plays a
significant role in identification. For example, in many societies, men are allowed more latitude in their gender roles than women, which results in a wider range of available identities to men and a narrower range of available identities for women (Parekh 2008). In addition to a wider or narrower range of activities or identities available due to gender, cultures often (though not always) assign a greater value to men’s roles and activities than those of women. Since gender ideologies fluctuate greatly from culture to culture and even within cultures, it is important to understand the cultural context in which the identity is performed or presented and the overall importance that gender plays in identity.

While gender can be a strict organizing principle consisting of a set number of categories in any given culture, it can also be very fluid, change with varying scenarios and change through time (Brumfiel 2006). For example, current American culture widely recognizes and accepts just two genders (men and women) though additional genders (transgender) are gradually being recognized and accepted in our culture (Hayes 2003). However, other cultures have long recognized alternative genders, including many Native American groups in North America that recognize the berdache as a third or alternative gender in addition to men and women (Schnarch 1992). From first contact with the Illinois, berdaches were recorded as a third gender within the tribe who were biological males that took on the female gender along with the social positions, roles and power that accompanied it (Huser 1990). The combination of their male biological sex and female gender roles constituted a unique gender within the tribe and as a result, they occupied a special social position within society. However, by the end of the end of the seventeenth century, the berdache had disappeared due to changing sociocultural trends within the Illinois (Hauser 1990).

Culture varies greatly between groups as this example demonstrates, so it cannot be
assumed that gender categories or values from one culture can be applied to another. It can also be difficult to recognize the variation of genders that exists in groups because the genders of one group may be hidden or misconstrued by that of dominant individuals and groups (Scott 1994b). Additionally, dominant ideologies of the present can easily distort our understanding of past genders, gender roles and gender ideologies because current dominant gender ideologies are different than those of the past and may unconsciously influence our analyses. Consequently, it can be difficult to accurately identify and discern all genders of groups that existed in the past.

*Application of Social Identity Theory, Identity Theory, Identification and Materialization*

The application of social identity theory and identity theory to archaeological materials is possible when artifacts are viewed as physical manifestations of past behavior, infused with social meanings that have the ability to convey various messages about identity (Beaudry et al. 1996; Nassaney 2008). Tangible objects physically represent cultural ideas and are able to convey meaning, ideas or status to others when displayed in social contexts (Durkheim 1915:226-228). People can therefore consciously use material culture to communicate various aspects of their identity and achieve social ends (Cook et al. 1996; DeMarrais et al. 2004). Artifacts then become salient social markers when presented in social contexts and a person’s identity is symbolically established through the consumption and use of artifacts (DeMarrais 2004; Heath 1999; Stig-Sorensen 2006).

However, much like identity, artifacts that are created or used to perform or represent facets of identity are negotiated in social arenas, which require others to recognize and validate the cultural meaning of those objects (Stig-Sorensen 2006). The concepts of materialization and negotiation are therefore cornerstones within the discipline of archaeology since archaeologists look to artifacts for information about their creators and what the artifacts might signify or
represent about them. In the process of materialization, an emphasis is placed on personal agency and people are viewed as active agents both in the present as well as in the past. When someone publicly displays a physical object, they are consciously communicating a chosen aspect of their identity and their culture to others around them in social contexts via that object. We can take this a step further and also look to the creation of objects, as well as the consumption of objects as meaningful social actions in identity formation as they are the first step toward displaying an identity once it is perceived cognitively (Cook et al. 1996).

Therefore, it is necessary to examine Richardville and Natoequah’s individual and social identities within the physical context of the Chief Richardville House and the LaFontaine House, as well as within the cultural context of Miami-Métis relations, Miami/Métis-EuroAmerican relations and within the larger cultural context of the 19th century fur trade. It is also important to remember that because Natoequah and Richardville occupied different genders and slightly different ethnicities (one was Miami while the other was Métis) they may well have utilized material culture differently to construct and portray their identities. Due to their unique identities, material culture itself takes on a different meaning when adopted or used by each of them. The Chief Richardville House, for example, was built in the Greek Revival style. The Greek Revival style built upon the established Federalist or Adams style that preceded it by utilizing a similar central entryway, low hipped rooflines and symmetry in the distribution of windows in its facade, but differed with the addition of cornice lines under the roofline and an embellishment of the entryway by including a full or half-height portico.

While the Chief Richardville House more closely resembles the Adams or Federal style in its present condition today, the original portico to the house was revealed in archaeological excavations, indicating that when it was originally built, the house contained more ornamentation
consistent with the Greek Revival style. When the house was built, the Greek Revival style was new and had not been previously introduced in Indiana or used by Hoosiers, Native Americans, the Miami or Métis in 1827. It appears that Richardville used the European symbolism of this new architectural style to construct a social identity that would be on par with that of elite, white EuroAmericans. The structure therefore played a key role in helping Richardville form his individual and group identities. The high style of the house coupled with the extravagant activities that took place at the house brought him great acclaim and demonstrated to his contemporaries that he did indeed belong among the upper-class, white Americans. After constructing his house, the style became popular and others began to copy him, constructing homes in a similar style. However, by living in the structure he also altered the local perception of high-style architecture. This structure has been known informally as the Chief’s House for years by the locals and before the Allen County Fort Wayne Historical Society purchased the structure, a wooden sign was posted near the driveway of the house labeling it as the Chief’s House. Such a label and local renown likely enhanced the public perception of Richardville and of Métis individuals locally.

World Systems Analysis

Richardville and Natoequah were active within the socio-economic system of the fur trade, a situation that is appropriately examined using a world-systems analysis (WSA) (Kardulias 1990). WSA is well suited to discuss and analyze the interaction that took place between the Miami, Métis, EuroAmericans and Europeans within the fur trade system because it allows for an examination of political and economic interaction between these various groups at different societal and economic scales (Hall 2000). The fur trade of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries entangled actors from dramatically different economic, social, political and religious
worlds, and bound them together in a system of cooperation and competition on an international and multicultural scale.

World systems-analysis is particularly applicable to the fur trade because it utilizes overlapping networks of cores, peripheries and semiperipheries to classify the actors within socioeconomic systems and to describe the role of each group within the system (Grimes 2000; Kardulis 1990). Also, because a world-systems analysis approach is flexible and multi-scalar, it provides an opportunity to discuss cores, peripheries and semiperipheries at varying levels within different contexts. Such an approach is particularly useful here because Native Americans, Europeans, and EuroAmericans were all active in the fur trade world-systems and their role in the world-systems was contingent upon the other people with whom they were interacting. European nations operated solely as cores, whether they were interacting with other European cores, the colonial semi-peripheries or Native American peripheries via the colonial semi-peripheries in North America. The other entities involved in the fur trade world-systems however, were able to change their position in the world-systems depending on with whom they were interacting and the role they played. The colonies for example, operated as semi-peripheries to the European core, but they would become semi-cores or even cores when interacting with Native American peripheries on the frontier. Likewise, individual periphery actors (like Richardville) would serve as a periphery to the colonial (and eventually American) core but would become a local semi-periphery or even semi-core when interacting with the Miami, other Native American tribes and individual traders on the frontier in Fort Wayne. Because a world-systems approach offers such flexibility, a larger discussion and analysis of the Miami’s participation in the fur trade is possible, but because a world-systems analysis is multi-scalar, a more specific discussion of Richardville’s actions as a trader and as the Miami Civil Chief within
the economic system of the fur trade in the middle ground can take place. However, before an exploration of these matters in detail, a general introduction to world-systems is warranted.

World-systems theory (WST) was pioneered by Wallerstein (1974) in order to examine the rise of the modern capitalist economy and the persistent poverty of non-developed nations (Chirot 1982). It was designed to examine capitalist economies based on goods that were produced for exchange (Wallerstein 1976). A large misconception of the application of WST is that it is a view of the whole world and the interaction among all cultures in it. While it can be used at that scale, it can also be used on a much smaller scale, such as North America in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

When Wallerstein first introduced WST, his goal was not to examine the whole world of interaction, but one world of self-contained, social interaction and the people contained therein (Hall 2000). Therefore, rather than viewing the world as the entire globe, the world in a world-systems perspective should instead be viewed as a self-contained system; it consists of everyone and anyone involved directly or indirectly (down-the-line) in an economic system, essentially existing as its own world (Chase-Dunn and Grimes 1996; Hall et al. 2011; Kardulias and Hall 2008). While the world-system may not include the entire world, it is always made up of more than one culture or group, making it multicultural or multisocietal in nature. This is not to say however, that these multicultural networks of interaction were necessarily small. These economic networks encompassed entire continents at times and linked numerous cultures together in a multi-continent world-system. Since its inception in the 1970s, WST has been widely applied within the social sciences to examine various socioeconomic situations and the social actors therein (Chase-Dunn and Grimes 1995; Hall et al. 2011). When Wallerstein laid out his initial WST approach it was designed to examine modern, capitalistic economic systems and
was not intended to examine systems that existed before the sixteenth century (Galaty 2011; Wallerstein 1976). However, archaeologists recognized the utility of WST’s materialist approach (see Schneider 1991) and have applied it—with some significant modifications—to pre-capitalistic and prehistoric socioeconomic systems with promising results (Chase-Dunn and Hall 1991b; Dietler 1995; Frank; Jeske 1995; Kardulas; Kuznar 1999; Peregrine 1991;). As a result of these modifications, WST has been applied successfully, if somewhat controversially, to archaeology (cf. Frank 1999; Jeske 1999, 2006; Stein 1999).

The most significant modification is that the seminal idea has been shifted away from the narrow case of the formation of European capitalism to the general notion that a web of external trade relations can create internal economic and cultural restructuring within a society (Chase-Dunn 1991a; Peregrine 1991; Schneider). For example, in North America, continent-wide trade networks were in place beginning in the Archaic Period. It is clear that Native Americans participated in their own world-system—with identifiable cores, peripheries and semiperipheries—changing mobility patterns, architecture and site layouts, mortuary formats, dietary regimes, and social hierarchies as they interacted with each other (Delaney-Rivera 2004; Jeske 2006; Kardulas 1990; Kuzner 1999; Peregrine 1991; 1995). However, when Europeans arrived, it brought Native Americans into a capitalist, global world-systems, even if they did not recognize the full scope of their interactions. However, world-systems are flexible, so peripheries were able to negotiate their involvement in the economic system, particularly on the frontier where groups were truly on the periphery of the economic system and they had the ability to choose their level or scope of involvement (Moore 2012;).

Another change to WST was an examination of the goods that were being exchanged and traded. Wallerstein focused on economic systems in which commodities, staples, raw materials
and necessities were moved and exchanged in large quantities, while little attention and lesser importance was placed on other goods (Chase-Dunn and Grimes 1995). Over the last few decades however, it has been accepted that movement of bulk goods is not the only force driving economic exchange and attention has been paid to other goods as well (Galaty 2011). Political/military exchange, luxury/prestige goods exchange and information exchange also take place in a world-system, each of which may take place at different scales (Hall 2000; Jeske 1999; Peregrine 1991; Schneider 1991). All of these exchange categories drive the socioeconomic world-system in slightly different ways and are dependent upon the demand of the goods, as well as the supply. These trends can be observed today and evidence of similar exchange patterns can be seen prehistorically in the archaeological record. Due to these refinements and modifications in WST, what began as a model to explain the rise of European capitalism has been expanded into a larger conceptual framework used to examine various socioeconomic systems and the cultural interaction within them (Hall et al. 2011). Because it has been transformed into a widely applicable framework focused on a general understanding of cultural interactions and is now often referred to as World-Systems Analysis (WSA) (Hall et al. 2011).

The central tenets of WST have remained intact in WSA. For example, when Wallerstein first introduced WST he laid out three types of world-systems including world-economies, world-empires and ministystems, which are still in use today (Wallerstein 1976). Each of these world-systems are defined partly by their mode of production, but more so by the level or type of involvement in the system, their control within the system and how those in the system interact with one another. World-economies are world-systems that consist of independent interacting groups that lack a unifying political structure (Wallerstein 1976). In world-economies there is still interaction between several different states or groups, and while inequalities and hierarchies
do exist within the system between cores, peripheries and semiperipheries, they do not always exist and the political affiliation between the cores and peripheries does not necessarily exist (Hall 2000). A world-empire on the other hand, is a world-system where multiple social groups interact just like a world-economy, however, the inequalities between the groups always create a hierarchical relationship (where cores always dominate and control peripheries/semiperipheries), resulting in interdependence of the groups and political domination of cores over peripheries and semi peripheries (Hall 2000; Wallerstein 1974). Such a hierarchy was present in the Inca empire, where Cuzco dominated the surrounding peripheries and semi peripheries through the use of a standing army in the sixteenth century (Kuzner1999). The third system described by Wallerstein is a mini system, which are systems composed of interacting non-states that are physically small and temporary, lasting only a few generations, (much like the Hopewell or Red Ochre culture) that can be hierarchical but are not always so (Wallerstein 1976). Because Wallerstein’s perspective was highly Euro-centric, these mini systems interested him little, but, since his initial work, others have since followed-up in this area with success (Chase-Dun 1991; Jeske 1999; Kuznar 1999; Schneider 2015; Stein 1999).

In a hierarchical world system, cores are generally diversified, wealthy and powerful societies that are often, but not always dominant over peripheries and semiperipheries in the world-systems. Peripheries, on the other hand, are weaker, natural resource-rich and usually impoverished due to exploitation by cores of the world system (Steiber 1979). Due to their military and political power, cores are able to exploit the peripheries (and to some extent the semiperipheries) for labor and resources, through unequal exchange (Chirot 1977; Galaty 2011; Grimes 2000; Hall 2000). This exchange is unequal and favors the core, which simultaneously increases periphery/semiperiphery dependence upon the core. Also, because cores supply the
peripheries with finished goods, cores often influence the nature of the peripheries (and to a lesser extent the semiperipheries) while the peripheries/semiperipheries typically have little influence on the nature of the core (Kardulias and Hall 2008). As cores increase exploitation of peripheries/semiperipheries, incorporation occurs, which further increases the power of the core while decreasing the power of the periphery while simultaneously constraining the development of the periphery/semiperiphery to prevent upward movement in the world-system (Chase-Dunn and Hall 1997; Hall et al. 2011).

Semiperipheries are unique in that they occupy a middle ground between cores and peripheries. In terms of their socioeconomic development they encompass some qualities of both cores and peripheries, but they may also occupy a physical geographical location somewhere between a core and a periphery or even between multiple cores (Chase-Dunn and Hall 1997). Semiperipheries are often exploited by cores, but they also possess the ability to exploit smaller peripheries, making them semiperipheries, but equally semicores as well (Straussfogel 1997; Van Hamme and Pion 2012). Within such a hierarchy the core not only exploits the periphery but also has political control over it, resulting in a shift from a world-economy to a world-empire (Kardulias and Hall 2008). Ultimately then, the goal in the world-system is for cores to exploit the resource-rich peripheries in order to not only increase their imports of raw materials, but also to benefit from the export of finished goods to semiperipheries and peripheries.

While core control is quite common in world-systems and this control generally drives the world-system in many cases, it is not always the case. There are cases where peripheries or semiperipheries can mitigate the conditions on which exchange takes place and exhibit some power or control (Kardulias and Hall 2008). There are also situations where cores and peripheries may participate in mutually beneficial exchange where peripheries are not
necessarily subordinate to the core and peripheries and semiperipheries have much more agency in how they interact with the core. On the obverse, actors in the core must rely more on cooperation and partnerships than those in a world-empire or hierarchical model. These non-hierarchical core-periphery relationships are often part of early or non-state level relationships (Chase-Dunn Hall 1991; Jeske 1999). In this way, one can see the French fur trade interaction with Native Americans was akin to a non-hierarchical core-periphery relationship, while the British and Americans followed the World Empire pattern.  

In reality, core/periphery relations exist on a continuum rather than fitting squarely in either of these categories and can include relations that range from highly stratified and core-centered core/periphery relationships to those with very little stratification, which approach equality between cores and peripheries within the system. One should not always assume total core dominance within a world-system and instead understand that a range of interactions take place in the present as well as in the past, where people in the peripheries exhibit some control within the system, particularly among and between each other.  

One last area of concern with the application of WST is that of perspective. The WST approach is frequently focused on the core and often defines the world-system and interactions within the system based on the core and the core’s interaction with peripheries and semiperipheries. As a result, much information, documentation and analysis is from the perspective of the core, rather than that of the periphery or semiperiphery. Although the core tenets of WST and WSA pertaining to world-systems are quite similar, the WSA perspective is slightly different in that it focuses on the peripheries/semiperipheries and discusses the world-system in terms of their interactions with the core. WSA can also be applied to pre-modern, pre-capitalist and prehistoric contexts, making it more inclusive and therefore more dynamic (Chase-

The use of world-systems in this dissertation fall within the temporal and economic system parameters of Wallerstein’s WST, as well as those of the later developed WSA. However, due to the robust nature of WSA, this dissertation will utilize the WSA approach in order to examine how the exchange of furs for European goods drove the economy of the Great Lakes, as well as the North American and European economy in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. WSA will be used to examine how the European and American cores exploited the Native American peripheries in the Great Lakes to obtain animal furs and eventually obtain Native American land so as to allow westward expansion in North America. In this dissertation, the focus of the WSA analysis will be on Chief Richardville, the Miami and their role in the fur trade, as well as in the Native American removal process. As a result, the use of WSA analysis in this dissertation will be on the periphery/semiperiphery rather than the core.

Applying WSA to the fur trade is an interesting endeavor because the fur trade brought EuroAmericans and Native Americans together in a complex multicultural, socioeconomic enterprise that lasted for centuries. Essentially, the fur trade can be viewed as a single portion or segment of a world-system, a smaller portion of a whole system (Kardulias 1990). Native American participation in the fur trade world-systems was voluntary at first and the Native Americans chose to embrace the fur trade and became specialized in fur acquisition, hide preparation and trading. However, the system was unevenly weighted to favor Europeans, which complicated the fur trade for Native Americans and eventually created Native American dependency on the trade (Kardulias 1990). Within the whole fur trade system there were a number of European cores interacting with many semi-cores, semi-peripheries and peripheries in North America. As a result, a fairly large and complex world-system was developed in the North
American fur trade that connected the Native American tribes to the European colonies in North America, as well as to Europe itself.

Within the context of the North American fur trade, the EuroAmericans constitute the core, while the Native Americans (like the Miami) compose the periphery. However, core/periphery categorization and definitions are not as simple as this, because of variation and fluctuation of core/periphery statuses and core/periphery relations within the system. For example, when the American colonies were established by the British Empire, the colonies themselves were a semiperiphery, acting between the main British core and the Native American peripheries. The colonies exported raw materials to England where goods were produced and exported back to America for consumption. England was politically dominant over the American colonies making this world-system a world-empire and the core/periphery relationship one of a core/periphery hierarchy. England was not alone in the colonial venture in North America and multiple European countries had colonized different portions of the continent, which created multinational peripheries, each with legal ties to its colonizing European core. As a result, the North American fur trade world-system was quite expansive and encompassed two continents and multiple countries. While the British colonized much of northeastern North America, the French established colonies in Canada and the Spanish colonized the southeastern United States, so at its outset, the American colonies were first and foremost peripheries to European powers, existing in a world-empire world-system, and more specifically exhibiting a core/periphery hierarchy. However, while each European nation had legal and political control over their individual colonies in North America, that does not mean that interaction, trade and exchange did not occur between the North American colonies or between the colonies and other European nations.
The North American colonies turned into successful ventures for multiple European nations and as the American colonies grew, the EuroAmericans occupying the colonies continued to expand westward, thus creating the American frontier. While this frontier was new to the EuroAmericans, it had been inhabited for centuries by indigenous Native American groups. As EuroAmerican settlers moved in and established themselves, the frontier became the new periphery in North America while the older colonies on the Eastern seaboard then developed into semiperipheries. As semiperipheries the original colonies acted as cores to the newer American frontier periphery, but also still served as a periphery to the original European cores. The relationship between the original colonies and the European cores did not change (world-empire system, core/periphery hierarchy) but the world-systems that developed in-situ in North America were different. At their outset, the world-system was a world-economy and the relationships between the semiperipheral colonies (acting as a core) and the peripheries (Native Americans) were core/periphery differentiations. Whether you view colonies as periphery or semiperiphery depends on the scale of analysis that is undertaken.

When the whole North American fur trade world-system is examined it becomes clear how intricate world-systems can be. Minimally, the fur trade world-system included European countries like France and England, as well as the North American colonies and multiple Great Lakes Native American populations, with additional groups through down-the-line trade and exchange, making the North American fur trade world-system quite large. While a detailed analysis of the entire North American fur trade world-system would be fascinating, the scope of this dissertation will not allow for such a discussion. Within the context of this dissertation, the discussion of the North American fur trade world-system will be limited to the interaction that occurred within the Great Lakes region and discuss these interactions within the context of fur
demands from the European cores.

*The Miami, Richardville and Natoequah in the World System Fur Trade.*

Within this context of the nineteenth century fur trade, Richardville, Natoequah and others at the Chief Richardville House and the LaFontaine House in Indiana did not exist in a vacuum. Rather, they were continually interacting and trading with Native Americans and Euro-Americans at the local and national level. It is clear from historical accounts that Richardville himself was active in the fur trade world-system, brokering the commodities that were of most interest to the Euro-Americans (mainly furs and land). Because entire Native American communities (including the Miami) participated in fur procurement and processing, it can be viewed as a type of craft specialization. Additionally, Native American participation in the fur trade required a specific knowledge base and skills (which is a key hallmark of craft specialization) and eventually the fur trade became the focus of Native American activity, as well as the central means for Native Americans to obtain other resources (Kardulias 1990). Such trade, interaction and intensification created an economic interdependency between the Native Americans and Euro-Americans in the socioeconomic system of the fur trade.
Chapter 3: The Western Great Lakes

Introduction

The Great Lakes region was consistently inhabited by ancestors of various Native American tribes from the Paleoindian period onward through European contact. It is acknowledged here that the activities and interactions that took place in the prehistoric and Protohistoric periods did lay the groundwork upon which interactions of the Early, Middle and Late Historic periods took place, however, the focus of this dissertation will remain primarily on the Middle Historic (1670-1760) and Late Historic (1760-1820) periods in the Great Lakes. Some discussion of important events in the Early Historic period (1610-1670) that directly impacted those of the Middle and Late Historic periods will be included when necessary.

Geography of the Great Lakes

The western Great Lakes also referred to as the upper Great Lakes is a geographic area that encompasses approximately 222,000 square miles of land and surface water (Figure 3.1) This area includes Lake Michigan, Lake Superior and Lake Huron, as well as their drainage basins which are extensive. Although the surface area of these Great Lakes accounts for approximately 77,260 square miles, another nearly 145,000 square miles of land compose the drainage basins that feed these lakes (Quimby 1960).
The geography of this area is a direct result of the Pleistocene glaciation, as well as the warming and the subsequent glacial retreat that occurred when the Holocene began. Prior to approximately 10,000 B.C. the Great Lakes area was heavily glaciated and covered by various lobes of ice during the Wisconsin glaciation (Boatman 1989; Dragoo 1976; Ericsson 1990; Mason 1981; Myers 1974; Quimby 1966). At the end of the Pleistocene, flora and fauna moved into these areas after the glacial ice retreated northward, which provided a diverse array of resources for the Paleoindians that followed shortly after.

Historically the western Great Lakes were covered primarily by deciduous and conifer forests consisting of various spruce and conifer species along with maple, beech, hickory and birch. The southern extent of the western Great Lakes consisted of grassland-forests containing grasslands with oaks and hickory, while the westernmost extent of the Great Lakes consisted of only grasslands (Tanner 1987). The central portion of the Great Lakes region contained northeast hardwoods of birch, maple, beech and hemlock. Lastly, the northern region of the western Great Lakes contained a conifer forest that included white pine, jack pine and Norway pine (Quimby 1960). Such an environment filled with hardwoods and conifer forests bordered by grasslands and interspersed with lakes, rivers and streams was favorable to northern fur bearing animals.
including beaver, muskrat, lynx, marten, fox, bear, otter, ermine, mink, sable and wolf (Axelrod 2011). These animals had long been hunted by Native Americans and were necessary for making clothing and shelter for living in the harsh environment of the Great Lakes. Europeans, however, saw furs as luxury clothing and accessory items including hats and the collars and trims of coats, clothing and boots. When Europeans learned of the ubiquitousness of fur bearing animals in the Great Lakes, they moved in and began exploiting the animals, as well as the Native Americans who helped procure them.

*The Basis of the Fur Trade*

In the most basic sense, the fur trade was a socioeconomic system driven by the European demand for furs as a core and the supply of furs from the Native American periphery in North America. Furs were in high demand by Europeans and had been an essential part of elite European fashion for centuries because fur bearing animals were used to make hats, collars and trim for clothing. Several sumptuary laws were passed in Europe restricting the clothes people could wear, reserving finer clothing (including furs) for the clergy, nobility and royalty (Axelrod 2011; Dolin 2010; Juen and Nassaney 2012; Greenbie 1929). However, these fashion trends took their toll on the fur bearing animals of Europe and the depletion of the fur resources required Europeans to turn to new markets in Russia, Scandinavia and eventually North America to meet their demands (Axelrod 2011). The fur trade and colonialism went hand in hand because the fur trade paved the way for successful North American colonial development by multiple European nations.

The Dutch, the French, the Spanish and the British all had a hand in the North American fur trade and their exploration, colonization and competition in North America became the most prevalent force influencing economic and political development of the North American continent.
Cleland 1999; Dolin 2010; Ray 1998). Each had a distinctive approach to the trade industry along with different expectations of the Native Americans and different rights afforded to the Native Americans and their territories. Conducting business with multiple European nations meant that Native Americans had to adapt their behavior within the fur trade world-systems to accommodate each of these cores in varying situations. At the largest scale, Native Americans in North America acted as peripheries to all European cores, however, when interactions in the fur trade are examined in more detail, it is clear that the role Native Americans played was contextual and changed throughout the fur trade. Much of the time Native American tribes were true peripheries, but at times they were more influential and instead acted as semiperipheries on the frontier. Once Native Americans entered into the fur trade world-system, they were able to adapt to the world-system and fill the necessary role to gain access to resources and trade goods.

As a true periphery, Native Americans had access to fur resources and were amenable to trade them for the European goods they desired (metal kettles, hatchets, knives and cutlery, firearms and ammunition, milled blankets and woolen cloth) (Davidson 1967[1918]; Glenn 1990; Ray 1998). Both parties were surprised that the other would give up what they considered to be luxurious items in exchange for seemingly basic amenities. However, the value placed on trade goods was determined by the importance of the good within the trade network and the culture-specific value assigned to the items in question (Kardulias and Hall 2008). Europeans considered metal kettles and knives to be basic, everyday items, just as Native Americans considered animal furs to be ordinary, utilitarian goods. However, the metal European items were much more durable than Native American ceramic vessels or chipped stone tools and were therefore in high demand, and Europeans viewed furs as highly valued, restricted luxury items.

However, a core-periphery differentiation soon developed in the fur trade world-system
where European cores held power over the Native American peripheries. One leading factor in this change was the transition from a true trade system, where actual goods were exchanged, to a credit system where goods were exchanged on credit. Under this new system, Native Americans obtained European goods based on the promise that they would provide furs at a future date. When the fur trade was in its prime these debts would easily be paid off, however, as fur bearing animals became increasingly scarce and European fashions trended away from furs, Native Americans found themselves in debt. Native Americans continued to trade on credit to receive European goods, though they did not have a means by which to offset their debt, increasing the power and influence of Europeans in the core-periphery differentiation. Native Americans therefore became increasingly dependent on the European cores and resulted in greater European pressure on Native Americans to relinquish their land (Rafert 1996).

The Early Historic Period (1610-1670)

The Early Historic period in North America was a time of European exploration of the Great Lakes, resulting in contact between European travelers and Native Americans, as well as friendships, alliances and at times, conflicts (Quimby 1966). The trading of furs had taken place since the initial arrival of Europeans in the New World, but the earliest form of trade was on a small scale. In the sixteenth century, European explorers searching for routes to the Gulf of Mexico and the Northwest Passage and fishermen in the North Atlantic, encountered Native Americans who were outfitted in furs of various animals. Before the fur trade formally developed, these European fishermen and explorers traded with individual Native American groups on a case by case basis in the areas they fished and explored (Juen and Nassaney 2012; Greenbie 1929; Morton 1966; Phillips 1961; Trigger 1965; Turner 1891).

Jacques Cartier entered the St. Lawrence River valley in 1534 and reached the western
Great Lakes and Quebec by 1535. Samuel de Champlain ascended the St. Lawrence in 1603 and founded Quebec in 1608, while Jean Nicolet and La Salle followed in 1634 and 1679, respectively (Axelrod 2011; Boatman 1989; Borneman 2006; Caruso 19761; Juen and Nassaney 2012; Lecompte 1993; Mason 1981; Myers 1974; Quimby 1966; Schweikart and Birzer 2003; Slocum 1905; Smith 1973; Trigger 1976). These early Europeans did not actively seek out the Native Americans to trade because they were invested in fishing and exploration, which placed the effort of the trade solely on the Native Americans. The Native Americans were eager to trade with Europeans and willingly traded furs for nearly any possessions the fishermen or explorers had at the time. While the fishermen were not furriers, they were still aware of the value Europeans placed on furs and were surprised that multiple furs could be traded for basic goods.

Once the news of plentiful and inexpensive furs reached the continent, Europeans began to actively pursue the fur trade in North America. However, the desired fur bearing animals did not occupy land bordering the coasts, so Europeans relied on Native Americans acting as middlemen to bring the furs to them (Carlos 1986).

When European explorers finally did begin to penetrate the St. Lawrence, the Great Lakes and beyond, they found that the Native Americans were already invested in the fur trade and had already been introduced to European goods through down-the-line trade with other tribes. These early explorers also discovered that conflict and competition between the Great Lakes Native American tribes (including the Huron, Ottawa, Chippewa/Ojibwe, Iroquois, Potawatomi, Winnebago, Menomonee, Sauk, Fox and Miami) was already underway due to the Native American desire for European goods (Trigger 1965). Early in the fur trade only some trade goods (mainly metal goods like iron knives, bayonets, awls and fishhooks) were incorporated into Native American cultures and simply used in place of traditional items (Quimby 1966). While
culture change in the Early Historic period was limited in terms of cultural practices and adoption of new material culture by Native Americans, the limited European contact caused drastic changes in other ways.

By the seventeenth century, European focus shifted away from exploration and discovery of North America to the exploitation of fur bearing animals and eventually to other natural resources (Brown 1980). Even though the earliest stages of the fur trade were more passive, the presence of Europeans in the continent caused a great deal of movement among the Native Americans and the resultant cultural landscape was fluid and constantly changing. While England colonized the Atlantic coast of North America in the early historic period, the French founded New France in what is now Quebec, Canada, dominating the St. Lawrence seaway and the western Great Lakes (Tanner 1987). Despite its northern center, New France’s influence extended deep into the continent due to their presence in the Mississippi River Valley, which acted as a gateway to the Gulf of Mexico and a large portion of the North American continent (Borneman 2006; Davidson 1967[1918]). Spain’s presence in the New World was centered on Texas, Florida and the headwaters of the Rio Grande, while the Dutch established the New Netherland Company (under the Dutch East India Company) and trading posts on the Hudson River (Fort Nassau), as well as in Albany (Fort Orange) (Borneman 2006; Bryce 1968 [1904]; Davidson 1967[1918]; Tanner 1987). As these New World colonies and posts grew, it became apparent that certain areas of the continent were more advantageous than others. The Mississippi River and Ohio River valleys, for example, were highly advantageous because they served as transportation routes, linking the Great Lakes to the Mississippi River drainage and providing seemingly endless possibilities for both the fur trade and colonial expansion into the New World.
The Middle Historic Period (1670-1760)

By the latter half 17th century the French developed forts, Catholic missions and trading posts in key areas on the interior, strengthening ties to Native Americans, and increasing Native American dependence upon European trade goods (Stone and Chaput 1978). Places like Fort St. Joseph, Michilimackinac, Kaskaskia and Green Bay became large trading centers, as well as religious centers and rendezvous location for traders, trappers and local Native Americans as well (Birmingham et al. 1997; Phillips 1961; Tanner 1987). The first Jesuits reached Quebec in 1625 as part of a world-wide campaign by the Jesuit missions focusing on converting, baptizing and saving indigenous populations (Tanner 1987). However, Jesuits were also interested in Native American cultures and served spiritual and secular roles, often acting as peacekeepers on the frontier (Schweikart and Birzer 2003). The Jesuits were so useful that it became standard practice for priests to accompany all exploring parties into the frontier wilderness. Religion became important because it supported kinship (fictive and biological) and economic connections on the frontier (Stone and Chaput 1978).

The French fur traders bypassed the middlemen in the trade and traveled into the interior of the continent, interacting closely with the Native Americans and treating them like partners in the fur trade (Charles 1986; Morton 1966). Initially, independent courier de bois (runners of the woods) and later, state-sponsored voyageurs, navigated the complex networks of rivers and streams in order to reach remote Native American groups that actively hunted and trapped fur bearing animals (Dolin 2010). While living in the remote areas of the frontier for extended periods of time, these men became close allies with the Native Americans and often intermarried with them because their success, livelihood and survival depended upon it.

The British also increased their presence in the Great Lakes and influence on the Native
Americans, but interacted less on a personal relationship with Native Americans and worked to open up larger areas for permanent European settlement. The English utilized the coastal factory model where EuroAmericans occupied settlements surrounding the factories, creating a network where fur processing began before usable furs were then sent to Europe to be finished (Axelrod 2011). Although a limited number of furs were gathered under this system (due to the number of Native Americans who could make the journey to the post), the British were able to exert direct control over the trade and as a result, were able to build a vast trading empire in North America centered on Hudson’s Bay (Charles 1986).

In addition to an influx of Europeans, the Hudson’s Bay Company (HBC) was created in 1670 and it greatly changed how trading was conducted because it required traders to gain an official license to trade legally, like the voyageurs. A limited number of licenses were issued, which then limited the number of traders, as well as the number of furs that were harvested and traded. While the licensing system was designed to control and limit trading, it also standardized fur prices. At the time it was argued that licensing would prevent Native Americans from being taken advantage of, reduce tensions on the frontier and engender positive relationships with the Native Americans (Dolin 2010). Although this system was well intentioned and licensed traders conducted a majority of the trade, illegal trade continued as people ventured into the wilderness to trade without licenses. During the Middle Historic period relations with some Native Americans did improve, but few tribes remained truly neutral and they instead sided with either the French or the British. At the close of the middle historic period, the French and Indian War broke out, which greatly divided Native Americans and restructured the political landscape of North America.
The Late Historic Period (1760-1820)

As the fur trade continued, it intensified and additional fur trading companies were founded in North America including the North West Company (NWC), the XY Company (the New North West Company) and the American Fur Company. The NWC was established by the French in 1779 (but was not formally active until 1783/1784), was centered between Grand Portage and Lake Superior and controlled the Red, Assiniboine and Saskatchewan rivers (Axelrod 2011). The NWC also extended west of the Rocky Mountain chain and had a hand in the fur trade of the Pacific northwest. The XY Company was a Canadian company created by Simon McTavish in 1798 when he split off from the original North West Company (Bryce 1968[1904]). Other, smaller trading companies were soon founded, though their success was limited and short-lived. For example, the American Fur Company was founded in 1808, the Pacific Fur Company founded in 1810 (both by John Jacob Astor), while the Missouri Fur Company was founded in 1809 and the Rocky Mountain Fur Company was founded in 1826 (Ewen 1986; Juen and Nassaney 2012; Schweikart and Birzer 2003).

Despite these smaller companies, the HBC and NWC controlled the majority of the furs that were obtained in North America and exported them to Europe. Both companies became powerful and influential, which made competition difficult for smaller companies. The HBC and NWC companies were so powerful in the fur trade industry that Charles (1986) goes so far as to say that together they created a full duopoly on the fur market in the North American continent, leaving little room for competition. However, the duopoly held by the NWC and HBC was greatly impacted by the French and Indian War, as well as the American Revolutionary War. When America won its independence, the American Fur Company rose to power and the HBC and NWC eventually merged under the Hudson’s Bay Company name in 1821. Due to these
pressures and other factors, the XY Company had already rejoined the North West company by 1804 and the American Fur Company failed by 1842 (Nute 1987). However, before the demise of the fur trade due to changing fashions and resource depletion, the American Fur Company enjoyed a monopoly in the American fur trade following American independence (Bryce 1968[1904]).

Long-term participation in the fur trade and interactions with Europeans in general, significantly altered Native American groups and by the late historic period Native American groups of the Great Lakes had been fully subsumed by the fur trade enterprise. Even though the European goods served a similar purpose as traditional Native American material culture, they became subversive, changing the meaning and symbolism of older native material culture and generated new meaning and symbolism (White 1991). Even furs took on new meaning because they could be traded and metamorphosed into European goods, so rather than simply being furs or clothing, they became much more valuable because as a commodity they could be traded for a variety of objects. According to Quimby (1960), such an abandonment of traditional material culture and adoption of European material culture had created a Pan-Indian culture in the Great Lakes, consisting of a myriad of Native American tribes that were intensely invested in the fur trade. This pan-Indian culture replaced the separate and distinct tribal cultures that had existed during the Early and Middle Historic periods. While this might be an oversimplification (because a single, homogenous Native American culture did not fully develop), the fur trade greatly changed Native American culture and much of the cultural heterogeneity that existed among tribes was lost with the assimilation that took place during the fur trade. The meanings of trade goods also changed as the fur trade progressed. Much like the beaver pelts that were viewed in terms of the European goods they could garner, all European goods also held additional
meanings and became symbolic of alliances that were formed through the fur trade that was conducted in the middle ground.

*Conflict in the North American Fur Trade*

As the fur trade developed and intensified in North America, so too did interactions between Native Americans and Europeans, resulting in conflict ranging from minor skirmishes, to all out warfare. Several wars occurred in North America in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and while some had their roots in historical tensions between European nations, many were due to the pressures that the fur trade and colonial expansion in North America put on local populations. No matter the source of the conflict, treaties followed, which were negotiated by Europeans. These treaties resolved the conflict for the Europeans, however Native American groups were rarely considered during the conflicts or the treaty process, even though they occupied the lands in which the conflicts and treaties took place. The Native Americans found themselves disadvantaged throughout the process and rarely found peace with the treaties. Instead, Native Americans were viewed as the weaker, subordinate group and when they were considered in treaties, they were usually told where they were to live, where they could go or who would get their land. As a result, treaty negotiation created a great deal of animosity between the Native Americans and the British, followed by the Americans and laid the groundwork for future conflicts, rather than fully resolving them. The French and Indian War and the American Revolutionary War are two conflicts of note here, though it is the result of these wars that are of interest rather than the wars themselves.

*The French and Indian War.* Because the French and the British were the two prominent players in the North American fur trade, competition between them became fierce, particularly in the Ohio River Valley where both parties laid claim to the land. While the French are credited
with initially discovering much of the Ohio Valley and placing territory markers in the Ohio Valley, the British were actively occupying the Ohio Valley (Borneman 2006; Bryce 1968 {1904}; Fowler 2005). While the French could point to their territory markers as proof that the land was French, the British could point to the fact that they were already inhabiting it, making it theirs. Because boundaries and territory on the frontier were unclear, they were often contested. Formal war began in 1754 when the French seized Fort Duquesne and war lasted until 1763 (Tanner 1987). While the details of the war are interesting, it is the aftermath of the war that is relevant within the context of this dissertation. The discussion therefore will only include the aftermath of the war, not the war itself.

The Treaty of Paris was signed by Great Britain, France, Spain and Portugal following the war in February of 1763. This treaty gave British control of the North American continent east of the Mississippi River including Canada, while the Spanish maintained control of land west of the Mississippi River and in present day Florida, while France lost its foothold in the New World altogether (Caruso 1961; Schweikart and Birzer 2003). In October 1763 the Royal Proclamation was issued by King George II, which established the Proclamation Line along the Appalachian divide and forbade colonial settlement west of this line, reserving the area for Native Americans (Borneman 2006; Fowler 2005; Primarydocuments.ca, 1763: Royal Proclamation, No. 1; Rafert 1996).

Along with the change in land ownership following the French and Indian War, came a change in sociopolitical system and regime, which translated into a change in European-Native American relations. British control of the Great Lakes resulted in their control of the fur trade at great expense to the Native Americans. Additionally, French trading posts on the interior of the continent were abandoned, which required the Native Americans to make the journey to
Hudson’s Bay posts to trade their furs (Davidson 1967[1918])). Another large change that took place was the cessation of gift-giving that always accompanied French trade because the British saw no need to persuade Native Americans to trade by giving them gifts (Borneman 2006; Brandao 2003). Additionally, the British refused to sell rum to the Native Americans and the goods offered to Native Americans were overpriced and were not desired by Native Americans (Fowler 2005). Despite these changes, other parts of the fur trade continued in the French tradition, including the utilization of voyageurs and canoe men to obtain furs from remote, inland areas, as well as the French language and French culture among traders (Fowler 2005; Nute 1987).

*The Revolutionary War.* Following the French and Indian War there was a short period of peace in the Great Lakes among European nations. The British/Spanish conflict in the southeast continued. The British controlled most of the continent east of the Mississippi River and while they tried to maintain boundaries and limit white settlement of the frontier, increasing numbers of white settlers pushed past the Proclamation Line and skirmishes between encroaching settlers and Native Americans broke out frequently. Along with the newly established European boundaries, a growing European presence on the frontier also limited Native American movement and hunting, which had a great impact on the tribes of the area. The North American colonies also continuously grew discontent with their colonial and semi-peripheral status. Because the British imposing rising tariffs on common imported and also instituted new and higher taxes, all of which were designed to pay for the French and Indian War (Borneman 2006). In the end, the American colonies revolted and formally declared independence in 1776. Various Native American groups allied themselves with the Americans, but the Miami allied themselves with the British, which had consequences after the war ended
When the war had finished and the second Treaty of Paris was signed in 1783, Britain recognized the independence of the United States, which included thirteen colonies and all of the land east of the Mississippi River, while Spain retained control of the land west of the Mississippi and Canada remained in the possession of Great Britain. Now that the British were limited to Canada and the Americans had control of the continent north of the Gulf of Mexico and east of the Mississippi, the Native Americans had to again adjust to a new sociopolitical environment. Unlike the former British system, however, the American system did not create a formal frontier boundary to separate the Native Americans and white settlers. Instead, the Americans continued to expand west. With the Louisiana Purchase in 1803, the Native Americans became the only roadblock to Westward expansion by the Americans.

The Americans utilized the factory system from 1795 to 1822, which was a government-regulated form of trade (Hyde 2011). Government factories, often operated by factors who were not experienced fur traders, established, standardized prices for furs, which reduced competition in the trade. While the factory system represented an effort of the government to control the fur trade, it was also designed to develop positive relationships with Native Americans while also furthering Native American dependency on American trade goods (Hyde 2011). However, the factory system did not help bolster government relations with Native Americans because personal connections were not established between the factors and Native Americans (Dolin 2010). Private traders treated Native Americans better than factors and provided gifts with trade, gave them better deals and also offered alcohol as a trade good (Way 1919). So in 1822 the factory system was dissolved when congress passed the Trade and Intercourse Acts, which allowed the free market to regulate fur prices and opened the fur trade to competition (Hyde
Marriage and the Fur Trade

In order to survive in the natural and culture environments of the Great Lakes, French traders sometimes married Native American women, taking on the role of husband, brother, son or tribal member that resulted from the marital union. These Frenchmen often assimilated into Native American culture, adopting their dress, culture, as well as their hunting and trapping methods (Morrissey 2013; Morton 1966). Such unions provided much needed familial support on the frontier and also provided access to an extended kinship network in which they conducted their trading. The practice of intermarrying and assimilation that accompanied it was said to “Indianize” the Europeans (Morton 1966:158) and be the “Frenchification” of Native Americans (Morrissey 2013:104).

The form of marriage that took place during the fur trade was not the traditional marriage in the European sense and was not necessarily recognized by law or the church. Instead, this was “marriage in the custom of the country” (Podrunchy 2006a: 249) or a marriage that was a temporary, yet committed and monogamous relationship (Brown 1976). These couples participated in a fluid monogamy where marriages could be easily entered into or dissolved, lasting for a single month, an entire season, a year or even a decade, after which a new monogamous marriage would then take place (Brown 1980; Podruchny 2006b; Van Kirk 1991). Because access to trading networks and fur resources was dependent upon kinship ties with other Native American groups, French traders married a female member of the Native American tribe with whom they were conducting business, most commonly the daughter of the chief of the tribe (Morton 1966; Peterson 1988). These kinship ties made the trader a member of the tribe and therefore granted him access to the extended kinship network and resources (Brown 1976, 1978,
1980, 1993; Brown and Schenck 2002; Faragher 1988; Gilman 1982; Morrissey 2013). These marriages became common in the eighteenth century and it would have been rare to encounter a fur trader in the Great Lakes that did not have a country wife (Brown 1978; Podruchny 2006b: 270). In addition to the benefits of kinship, trading networks and access to furs, these marriages also provided companionship, which cannot be understated since the fur traders were living on the frontier in remote areas for long periods of time, often multiple seasons. Although fur trade marriages may seem one-sided, favoring only the French (like many other aspects of the fur trade) Native Americans did have authority and agency in these relationships. At times Native American women actively pursued these marriages because they elevated the status of women among her Native American peers (Juen and Nassaney 2012; Sleeper-Smith 2000). As a result of these marriages and other, less formal unions, a new group called the Métis arose in the Great Lakes region of North America.

*Métis.* In the broadest sense, Métis refers to the resulting offspring of unions between Native American women and European men, most often the French (Brown 1979, 2008; Devons 1992; Hatt 1969; Kinietz 1983; Morrissey 2013). More specifically, Métis has served as a racial or ethnic term to identify individuals of mixed-blood descent, often with a negative “half-breed” connotation, and also has served as a socio-cultural term used to refer to a group of people (Brown 2008: 172; Morton 1966). The racial or ethnic status of métis was typically assigned by outsiders to label those who failed to meet the accepted social or legal definitions of Indian or white in the historic period (Hatt 1969). However, the term métis was also often used to describe people of a certain occupation bridging the gap between Native Americans and EuroAmericans, containing characteristics of each. The métis category therefore, was fundamentally defined in reference to others, primarily Indian or white, rather than the people who actually made up the
category (Brown 1993; Morton 1966). Of course, these terms were coined and used primarily by whites in various ways to order or categorize non-whites because white EuroAmericans did not have conceptual categories or definitions for intermediate racial groups. This is particularly evident in the name itself, which derives from the French term *métissage*, meaning mixed race (Burley 2000).

The term *Métis*, has also been used as a socio-cultural and even political term to identify a distinct indigenous culture that arose from individuals with mixed European and Native American ancestry (Brown 2008; Kinietz 1983). According to Kinietz (1983:4) when this latter description is used, Métis are considered to be a “distinct Euro-Aboriginal hybrid society”. While the term Métis is commonly used in Canada, it did not survive the colonial period in the United States and is therefore not a widely used or recognized term in the United States today (Brown 1993). Although much of the literature is focused on the Métis of Canada and the Pacific Northwest, specifically the Red River Valley (Brown 1976, 1978, 1993; Brown and Schenck 2002; Foster 2006; Hatt 1969; Madill 1987; Peterson 1988, 2001; Peterson and Brown 2001; White 1999), the basis of these analyses can be applied to the Métis population of the Great Lakes region as well. Much like Canada and the Pacific northwest, the Great Lakes region was a place of diverse cultural interaction where Native Americans closely interacted with white European traders and created a unique subculture, which is defined by the mingling and mixing of their ancestry and culture. However, the Métis population in what would become the United States faced slightly different social, economic and political pressures than the Métis of Canada, which has uniquely influenced each group. For example, during the Indian removal in the 1830s, most Métis were exempt from removal because they were considered to be more white than Indian. They were therefore considered to be part of the white American culture, not Métis or
Native American. In Canada, however, the Métis retained a separate status from whites. Within the context of this dissertation, the term Métis will be used rather than métis, referring to this distinct socio-cultural group, or rather subculture, that arose within the unique cultural context of the fur trade in the Great Lakes. No matter the term used to discuss this group, it is likely that the Métis considered themselves as a distinct group because they were not European, nor were they fully Native American and instead embodied and exhibited cultural practices and physical characteristics of both groups (Foster 2006).

The fur trade in the Great Lakes region was built securely on this foundation of relationships between European men, Native American women and their resulting Métis offspring (Brown 1980; Cleland 1965; Foster 2006; Glenn 1990; Phillips 1961a; Morrissey 2013; Podruchny 2006a, 2006b; Sleeper-Smith 2000). As a result of their heritage and knowledge of both the European and Native American cultures, many Métis developed specialized skill sets that were vital to the success of the fur trade. Specifically, Métis were often bilingual, had access to Native American kinship networks and possessed a variety of European skills that gave them the ability to work within the new multicultural environment of the fur trade (Foster 2006).

Richardville was one such Métis individual, and like many others, he was able to successfully bridge the gap among the four worlds of the French, British, Miami and Americans and exploit his access to each group at different times in his life (Birzer 1999). He relied heavily on his Métis status and multi-lingual abilities to negotiate treaty deals between his tribe and the United States government (Anson 1970). Richardville was able to utilize these abilities and his social status to become increasingly successful within the tribe, as well as within the larger context of the 19th century fur trade.

These multi-cultural interactions of the fur trade created a unique cultural environment that
has come to be known as the middle ground (White 1991). In addition to a physical place where several different cultures came together and met to exchange goods and ideas, the middle ground was also a metaphorical and social place. In the middle ground, people of different cultures interacted with one another to create unique relationships that blended cultures without forced change and conflict (White 1991). Together, Native Americans and Europeans mutually created the middle ground because neither group could obtain what they wanted without cooperation (White 1991). However, to say that the middle ground was created mutually by Native Americans and Europeans out of the necessity of trade, does not mean that interactions within the middle ground were simple or straightforward. Native Americans had to negotiate trade and interactions amongst themselves, other Native American groups, as well as several European groups, which was quite complicated. Additionally, conflict between European groups erupted independently of Native American groups, which created an added complication and Native Americans had to choose sides carefully. Native American groups would often align themselves with certain European nations when it benefitted them to do so but sometimes chose opposite sides in other conflicts, or they tried to abstain from the conflict all together. Furthermore, after conflicts between European groups erupted, a new group would rise to power and Native Americans would again have to adjust their approach in order to adapt to a new sociopolitical system.

*Decline of the Fur Trade*

While the fur trade was beneficial for Native Americans, the colonization, assimilation, loss of land, resource depletion, conflict and disease that accompanied the trade was detrimental to them. For example, the Mohawk-Mahican war in the 1620s and the Beaver wars that followed in the seventeenth century were the direct result of resource depletion in key areas (Axelrod
Additionally, European diseases were so impactful, it is estimated that one third to one half of all Native American tribes in the fur trade country were killed by small pox alone (Axelrod 1993; Bryce 1968[1904]). These diseases were so contagious that they frequently reached Native American tribes far ahead of the Europeans themselves, due to down-the-line trade and inter-tribal contact (Rafert 1996). Epidemics became increasingly common and indigenous populations began to decline quickly.

Ultimately, the fur trade economy was driven by the presence of fur bearing animals and while they were plentiful at first, their populations began to decline as animals were over hunted in the fur trade. More valuable fur bearing animals (like the beaver and lynx for example) were quickly depleted and less valuable furs (muskrat and marten) were then sought after, but these were soon in short supply as well (Ray 1998). As early as the seventeenth century, fur exports to Europe resulted in the decline of fur bearing animals and areas on the St. Lawrence where fur bearing animals had been plentiful in the time of Cartier were already being depleted by the time Champlain arrived. As a result of the combination of these factors, the fur trade came to a close in the early part of the nineteenth century (Axelrod 2011; Glenn 1990).

**The Miami Indians**

The first French account of a Native American group referred to as the Miami is from Father Gabriel Dreuillettes, who was told that the tribe was residing at the tip of Green Bay, Wisconsin, referring to them as the people of the peninsula (Anson 1970:4; Berthrong 1974; Kinietz 1965). Like many other Native American groups, the origins of the Miami tribe predates written records in North America and most records of early encounters with the Miami are brief and incomplete, simply noting where and when Europeans encountered them. Radisson and Groseilliers recorded an encounter with the Miami northwest of Green Bay, Wisconsin on the
Fox River in 1654 where they were taking refuge (Rafert 1996). Their next recorded presence was not until 1669, at a formal Miami village where the St. Joseph River flows into the southern end of Lake Michigan and Perrot recorded a visit to a Native American village on the Fox River portage in 1671, where he noted that Miami were present (Schweikart and Birzer 2003). Shortly thereafter, additional accounts place the Miami at the St. Joseph River (which was also known as the River of the Miami, due to their large numbers in this location) in southern Michigan as early as 1679 and just a few years later the Miami tribe is known to have inhabited the headwaters of the Maumee River and Starved Rock (Anson 1970; Brown 1975; Callender 1978b; Kinietz 1965). Lastly, in 1687 the Sieur de La Durantaye observed the tribe in the straights between Lakes Huron and Erie.

Conflict with neighboring Native American groups caused the Miami to avoid certain areas, while trade with the French encouraged them to gravitate toward portages and other high traffic areas that would facilitate trade (Berthrong 1974; Ericsson 1990; Rafert 1996). By the Middle Historic period, the Miami were formally inhabiting their historical homeland in the Ohio and Wabash valleys, including parts of southeastern Wisconsin, northeastern Illinois, northwestern Indiana, southern Michigan and western Ohio (Anson 1970; Barce 1922; Berthrong 1974; Ericsson 1990; Jeske and Stillwell 1995; Kubiak 1970; Pritzker 2000; Quimby 1960; Tanner 1987). This piece of land was highly valued due to its location and the access it granted to waterways.

Because the Miami controlled such an important portage, their tribe became influential in the region and prospered through the operation of a trading post at the portage (Anson 1964). However, as the British began their exploration of the interior of the continent they too became interested in this area. As a result of cultural interactions in the various locations that factions of
the Miami tribe inhabited, the Miami became divided when it came to their allegiance to European powers. For example, the Miami located in the Wabash, Maumee and Tippecanoe valleys, were for the most part, pro-French, while others at Laramie Creek were pro-British, or at least anti-French (Blasingham 1955). The relations in the Early Historic period were certainly not static but instead fluctuated constantly, and when they did, the Miami were actively trading with both European groups and fought against the least threatening. For example, the Miami allied with the French to fight against the British during the French and Indian War, but then allied themselves with the British during the Revolutionary war, as well as the War of 1812 to fight against the Americans (Berthrong 1974).

Also, among their Native American neighbors in the Great Lakes, the Miami formed the Miami Confederacy, which consisted of the various Miami bands, as well as the western Iroquois, Kickapoo and several other tribes that resided in the western Great Lakes and Ohio Valley (Anson 1970). As with all things Miami in the historic period, these alliances were fluid, flexible and changed constantly because conflicts in the western Great Lakes developed and changed quickly. In these and other conflicts, the Miami often had to choose between the lesser of two evils, though neither side of these conflicts had the best interests of the Miami in mind. After centuries of the fur trade and colonization, they understood each European nation had a different approach and that some approaches were better for the Miami than others.

*Miami Life*

Historic accounts refer generally to one Miami tribe but at European contact there were originally six separate, yet dynamic, kin-based groups that made up the Miami tribe including the Atchakangouen (or Atchatchakangouen), Kilatika, Mengakonkia, Pepicokia, Piankeshaw and the Wea (Barce 1922; Bauxar 1987; Berthrong 1972; Kinietz 1965). However, by the time of
sustained European contact, these six groups coalesced into just three factions (the Miami, the Wea and the Piankeshaw) and each group retained their own distinct tribal identity (Callender 1978b). Each of these groups consisted of a series of clans including the turtle, crane, eagle, wolf, buzzard, turkey, panther, raccoon, duck, bear, acorn, fish, fox, panther, elk, loon and deer clans (Anson 1970:17). Clan membership was determined by their matrilineal lineage, where a person belonged to their mother’s brother clan. Marriage was exogamous to their clan and like clan membership, lineage was traced through the mother’s brother. Clans were then grouped into one of two moieties based on earth or sky affiliation of their clan (Callender 1978a).

Each Miami band contained two chiefs that included a civil (principal or peace) chief, as well as a war chief (Callender 1978a). Within this system the principal chief of the band was generally an authority on an everyday basis and was charged with administrative duties and were expected to avoid participating in warfare or showing aggression and were instead expected to mediate conflicts and prevent death (Callender 1978a). The war chief on the other hand, had authority during times of war, and serving a general police function for the tribe. The practice of appointing a larger overarching civil or principal chief of the collective Miami was not known to exist until around 1750 and when this position was filled, the selection would be made from one of the existing civil or war chiefs by a tribal council (Pritzker 2000). These chieftain titles were generally hereditary, filled by the current chief’s sister’s son, but still had to be approved by the tribal council. The Miami did not require a person to be a male to be a chief and women were known to have served in these roles as well—including Richardville’s mother Tecumwah (Callender 1978a).

By the time Europeans encountered the Miami, they were established agriculturalists and semi-sedentary, primarily farming corn along with beans, squash, melons, pumpkins and gourds.
These cultigens were complimented by gathering wild fruits, nuts and berries, as well as hunting deer, elk, bison, bear and beaver and fishing (Callender 1978a; Kinietz 1965; Kubiak 1970; Pritzker 2000; Quimby 1960; Rafert 1996; Tanner 1987). Women generally tended gardens while men hunted, though the division of labor among the Miami was not strictly based on sex, but rather determined by personal ability and were shared among the members of the group. By the middle historic period, the Miami were known to reside in large, formal villages in the summer months that contained a number of clans, including villages near Vincennes, Lafayette and Fort Wayne, Indiana (Barce 1922; Callender 1978a; Kinietz 1965; Tanner 1987).

Miami villages usually consisted of a series of wigwams made of saplings that were covered in bark or rush mats and were thought to consist of thousands of people each, though exact population numbers are not known (Kinietz 1965; Rafert 1996). After the summer, the large Miami villages would disperse into smaller winter camps (Callender 1978a). By the eighteenth century wigwams were generally abandoned and the Miami were known to live in log structures (Callender 1978b).

In adolescence, all Miami underwent a vision quest. In preparation, they would fast and while on the quest it was thought that a spirit would take pity and appear to them in the form of an animal in order to fulfill their quest (Callendar 1978b). Afterwards, boys painted their faces black, girls vermillion and the third gender white, after which they were considered to be full adults. Boys would also have to participate in a war party. In addition to women and men, the Miami also recognized a third gender, referred to as white faces (Callender 1978b). These individuals were males who were directed by a female spirit during their vision quest to assume the dress and occupation of women. Though these individuals occupied a separate gender and maintained alternative gender roles, they were highly respected within the Miami society.
Miami marriage was primarily monogamous and exogamous to clan membership (Callender 1978a). In order to propose marriage, a young man visited the girl he preferred at night and holding a burning piece of bark, he woke her and when she smiled and asked him to leave she accepted his proposal (Callender 1978b). Over the next few days the young man would stay with the girl, seeing her parents in the morning, begin leaving possessions at her house and would hunt for the household, providing food. If a man was unsure the proposal would be accepted, formal family negotiations took place and were accompanied by gifts to persuade the girl and her family (Callender 1978b). While monogamy was the most common form of marriage, polygamy did exist, where a man would marry one woman along with her sisters. Divorce for the Miami culture could be initiated easily by both men and women (though it was most often initiated by women) and required only that the woman remove the husband’s belongings from the house (Kinietz 1965; Rafert 1996). These flexible and fluid marriage practices are likely a contributing factor to the Miami adapting so favorably to marriage in the fur trade. However, prior to the eighteenth century, marriage between the Miami and Europeans was limited and it was not until the middle of the eighteenth century that the Miami marriage practice shifted and commonly incorporated Europeans.

At contact when trade goods first became available, the Miami discarded only some of their more traditional material culture in favor of European trade goods. Ceramic vessels and chipped stone tools for example, were quickly replaced by more durable metal kettles, knives and axes, but much of the Miami way of life remained intact during the early years of interaction, with European goods merely fitting into the Miami lifestyle. As interaction with the French and British intensified and the Miami became engrossed in the fur trade, they continued to adopt additional metal tools, firearms, cloth, other domestic items and their dependence on
European goods would slowly increase (Rafter 1996). In addition to the adoption of goods, European influence would eventually cause them to change aspects of their traditional lives as well. For example, it became common practice for women to marry fur traders, as was seen in many tribes at this time. This shift in marriage practices tied the Miami more securely to Europeans (specifically the French) and the fur trade, but also produced Métis offspring who would become a unique subculture among the Miami that symbolized the assimilation and culture change taking place among the tribe.

**Chief Richardville**

John B. Richardville (sometimes spelled Richerville), also known as Peshewa (the Lynx or Wildcat) was born in 1761 in the Miami village of Kekionga located in present-day Fort Wayne, Indiana (Birzer 2008; Leonard 1990; Robertson 1913). Richardville’s mother, Tacumwah (Maria Louisa Richardville), was Miami Chief Pacanne’s sister, while his father, Antoine Joseph Drouet de Richardville was a French fur trader of noble descent from Canada (Anson 1970; Carter 1987; Chaput 1978; Edmunds 1996; Garraty and Carnes 1999; Rafert 1996; Walston 1997). Richardville was raised by his mother Tacumwah in the early years of his life among the Miami tribe at Kekionga and was heavily influenced by her activity in the tribe. Due to her position in the tribe as the sister of the chief, she held an elevated status of a female chieftain, and as a result she experienced much more autonomy than other Miami women of this time period (Birzer 1999; Schweikart and Birzer 2003). While Miami women were allowed to perform activities and take on responsibilities that were usually denied EuroAmerican women, Tacumwah’s freedoms exceeded even those standards, and in addition to having typical roles and responsibilities of a Miami woman, she is also known to have been outspoken in tribal council meetings and was in charge of the trading post at the Long Portage (Brice 1868; Carter 1987;
Chaput 1978; Schweikart and Birzer 2003). Young Richardville was likely influenced by his mother in this capacity and probably learned a great deal from her while she ran the Portage.

More than a decade after Richardville’s birth, Tecumwah divorced Joseph Richardville in 1774 and although she met some resistance from him in the process, she was successful in her divorce and soon remarried another French trader, Charles Beaubien (Birzer 1999; Chaput 1978; Marrero 2005; Schweikart and Birzer 2003). Young Richardville travelled to Canada and lived with his father where he attended school in Three Rivers, receiving a full, formal Western education. As a result, he became fluent and literate in both English and French. Richardville had the experience of living a privileged lifestyle while he resided with his father (Anson 1970; Carter 1987; Edmunds 1996; Poinsatte 1976). Receiving a Western education prepared Richardville like no other Miami before him and he benefitted greatly from his Western and Miami educations. While Richardville spoke Miami among his tribal people, he spoke English and French to outsiders and found that being literate and fluent in two Western languages was advantageous, because it not only gave him the ability to communicate directly with EuroAmericans and comprehend them without an interpreter, it was also unexpected on behalf of the EuroAmericans, giving him an edge in his interactions with Westerners. In addition to language and communication skills, his Western education also provided him with a sense of European business practices, which became useful when he served as a mediator between the Miami tribe and the United States government during numerous treaty negotiations (Rinehart 2012).

When Richardville completed his education, he returned to live with the Miami tribe as a young man and soon became an active member of the tribe. Upon his return, he and his mother successfully operated the trading enterprise centered on the Long Portage, which is also known
as the Glorious Gate or Golden Gate to the Miami (Birzer 1999; Jeske and Stillwell 1995). In addition to revenues earned from running a trading post on the site, it is reported that Richardville also earned as much as one hundred dollars per day in tolls at the portage (Barce 1922; Glenn 1990). Though the Miami tribe was fairly small in numbers when compared to neighboring native groups, they had an unusually large amount of power due to control of the land surrounding the Long Portage (Leonard 1990). The high volume of traffic through the Long Portage included both Native Americans and Europeans, which created a unique cultural environment that exposed Richardville to the development of a new distinct group referred to as Métis (Marrero 2005).

In addition to his responsibilities at the portage, Richardville became an active member of the tribe and as he demonstrated his abilities, he was given increased levels of responsibilities. Richardville took on the role of chief at the age of 55 after Pacanne’s death in 1814. Richardville would hold that position until his death in 1841 (Anson 1970; Barce 1922; Carter 1987; Leonard 1990). While the Miami tradition generally called for the position of chief to be passed to the nephew of the current chief this tradition was not always followed and although Richardville was the chief’s nephew, he still had to secure his position as the next chief. In order to do so, at the age of 25 in 1785, he made a daring rescue, saving a white man who had been taken prisoner from being burned at the stake (Brice 1868; Carter 1987; Leonard 1990).

Richardville and his mother Tacumwah gathered near where the Miami were going to burn the prisoner and once the prisoner was bound and the fire lit, Tacumwah reportedly gave him a knife and told him to assert his claim to chieftainship by rescuing the prisoner (Bodurtha 1914). Such a rescue demonstrated his bravery to the rest of the tribe, demonstrated he was against violence (as civil chiefs were expected to be) and ensured that he would be named chief. Not
coincidentally, his uncle Pacanne also secured his position as chief of the tribe by exhibiting bravery in a similar rescue, further demonstrating to the tribe that Richardville was a suitable candidate to serve as the chief, following in his uncle’s footsteps. There was some scrutiny surrounding this incident, as it was likely facilitated by his mother, Tacumwah and exaggerated in order to secure his position as Chief (Chaput 1978). Richardville’s rescue therefore not only mirrored his uncle’s actions, but also demonstrated desired behavior of a tribal chief among the Miami.

Richardville did not become a war chief like Little Turtle (though they remained close allies and had similar approaches to Miami matters) and he instead became an equally effective civil chief. Rather than possessing military strength and knowledge, Richardville’s strengths lie in his knowledge of European business practices and European languages, which allowed him to negotiate treaties. As the principal chief of the tribe, he served as a merchant operating a trading post and was also known to be generous and hospitable to tribal members in need (Rinehart 2012).

By the age of 25, he had secured his position to the post and by the age of 29 he was acting as deputy chief at Kekionga while Pacanne was away. Richardville’s first major recorded act on the behalf of the Miami took place at the signing of the Treaty of Greenville in 1795 following the Battle of Fallen Timbers. After the battle, Richardville helped negotiate the treaty and demonstrated to the United States officials that the Miami tribe was still a force to be reckoned with, while also demonstrating to the Miami that he was a capable and valuable asset to the tribe (Carter 1987; Wirtner 1990). The Treaty of Greenville set the stage for the many treaties to follow where Richardville would serve as a mediator and the Miami would cede land in exchange for money, trade goods and annuities.
As an adult, Richardville came to exemplify the image of Métis, combining cultural characteristics and dress of both the French and Miami. It was noted that Richardville appeared “more like a Frenchman than an Indian, with blue eyes and features like the pictures of Louis XIV. He was very tall, dressed in the French style, wearing the finest linen and broad cloth (McCulloch n.d. P. 13). He commonly wore a blue cloth coat, waistcoat and red sash combined with broadcloth leggings and buckskin moccasins (Birzer 1999; 2008). Richardville outwardly displayed the amalgamation of cultural characteristics inherent in his Métis persona. According to a historical account from Keating, Richardville “dressed like a trader, and from his appearance, manners and language, we should never have suspected him to be any other than a Canadian fur-dealer” (Keating 1824:107).

Anson (1970) reports that in the early nineteenth century Richardville reverted back to his Miami culture, rejecting the EuroAmerican culture by abandoning European clothing and languages and even went so far as to request an interpreter when speaking to non-Miami people. This claim is difficult to substantiate because little physical evidence exists of Richardville to prove or disprove the claim. However, two portraits of Richardville with good provenance do exist and may provide some evidence to speak to this issue. The first portrait was painted in 1827 by James Otto Lewis and a second by R. B. Craft shortly before Richardville’s death (History Center 2012). Both portraits depict Richardville in fully European clothing wearing a white shirt, neck tie and cloth coat. Richardville is clearly portrayed as a mature adult in the first portrait and as an old man in the latter portrait, indicating these portraits were indeed painted in the nineteenth century, later in his life. Richardville also built a Greek Revival house in Fort Wayne where he chose to live until his death in 1841. These pieces of evidence demonstrate that the idea that Richardville abandoned European cultural norms after 1818 is simply not true. However,
this is a great example of how identities can get distorted and those inaccuracies get perpetuated as information is repeated. It also calls into question what we think we know about Richardville and provides an opportunity to see if archaeological evidence coincides with or refutes accounts of Richardville.

As chief of the Miami tribe, Richardville was also known to have raised a large family. Around 1800 Richardville married Natoequah and had five children including two sons (Jean B. Jr. and Joseph) as well as three daughters (Maria Louisa (LaBlonde), Catherine (Cates) and Susan) (Chaput 1978). All of his children were educated and became affluent members of the community. His sons were sent to attend the Choctaw academy in Kentucky and became merchants on the frontier (Anson 1970). Despite their following in their father’s footsteps, his sons never got the chance to become chief because the Miami were divided by the removal process, which greatly weakened the tribe. Additionally, they faced strong competitors for the position of chief, like Frances LaFontaine (who became the chief following Richardville’s death). Richardville’s daughters were involved in the fur trade on the frontier as well and all married Miami-Métis traders. Catherine married Francis LaFontaine, while Maria Louisa married James Godfroy and Susan married George Ossem (Birzer 2008). LaFontaine was related to Richardville through marriage to his daughter, so the significance of relation through the female line among the Miami should not be overlooked.

Prior to becoming chief, it is known that Richardville was not only astute, but also a ferocious businessman. While others rarely got the better of him, if they did, he honored whatever deal had been agreed upon and one interesting anecdote offered by Brice is a testament of that. Among the Miami there was a practice of striking possessions from others that one desired, which consisted of calling the person out in public demanding a particular item, after
which point the item had been won and the person must cede the item. Brice (1868) accounts of one such occasion where Richardville saw Henry Hamilton riding a stunning horse and called him out saying “I strike you on that Horse, Mr. Hamilton” (Brice 1868:21). Hamilton did not enjoy losing his horse to Richardville because of this tradition, but he did not forget it. Sometime later Hamilton and Richardville were on Richardville’s property near the Wabash when Hamilton suddenly said “Chief, I strike you on this section” (Brice 1868: 21). Richardville saw that Hamilton may have got the better strike in this case simply replied “Well…. I make you a deed on it, but we’ll not strike anymore” (Brice 1868: 21).

From these accounts, it is clear that what we know about Richardville is predominantly from a EuroAmerican perspective and demonstrates how Richardville was perceived in public actions as a trader and chief. The perception of Richardville as an adult is therefore limited to how he portrayed himself in public, who he married, how many children he had and when he died (Anson 1970; Carter 1987; Chaput 1978; Edmunds 1996; Garraty and Carnes 1999; Rafert 1996; Walston 1997). However, as demonstrated here, even these accounts are from EuroAmericans rather than Miami or Métis, which produces a limited picture of Richardville. Such a public perception is not unique to Richardville though and other Native Americans, like Tecumseh, are most often reported from a EuroAmerican perspective (Anson 1970; Koestler-Grack 2003; Sudgen 1997; Tucker 2005).

Richardville’s Role as Chief. Richardville grew up at a unique and tumultuous time in Miami, as well as American, history. During Richardville’s lifetime, America fought for and gained its independence shortly after the British victory over the French in the French and Indian War. Just a few decades after the Treaty of Paris, the United States participated in its first war as a country in order to maintain its independence (War of 1812) and once again demonstrated their
military strength to Great Britain. The eighteenth century was a difficult time for Native American groups on the frontier because they experienced bribery, coercion and violence from a variety of outside sources and also underwent drastic changes as the French, the British and the Americans vied for control of the continent, Native American land and the fur trade enterprise. As a result of these conflicts, the Miami had to negotiate with the French, British and American governments in a fairly short time, each time adjusting their worldview and finding ways to survive within new systems. Due to these and other cultural interactions, Richardville’s time as chief was arduous and grueling as he and the Miami tribe faced constant pressure from encroaching white settlers and the United States government due to Westward Expansion. Despite constant pressures and conflicts, Richardville was openly against unnecessary bloodshed and instead was in favor of goodwill and peace, which is evidenced by his desire to settle conflicts through debates and negotiations. Throughout the negotiation process, he was known to be a patient listener, so much so that his reticence was at times mistaken for indifference. While Richardville was a cunning businessman and reportedly took what he was owed by others, he showed only kindness and charity to others around him and was beloved by his people due to this (Brice 1868).

Due to continual westward expansion and conflict with the United States government, Richardville participated in negotiating 12 treaties over the 45 years between the Treaty of Greenville in 1795 and his death in 1841 (Rafert 1996). Each of the treaties he negotiated ceded tribal lands in exchange for money, land, as well as annuities for the Miami tribe to help pay off tribal debt (Rinehart 2012). The Piankeshaw and Wea were some of the first to wholly cede their tribal lands in 1805 and 1820, respectively (Jeske 1995). Although some Miami were able to hold out and keep their land longer than others, in 1840 Richardville signed one final treaty that
ceded the remaining portions of the Big Miami Reserve and called for the formal removal of the Miami from Indiana (Leonard 1990; Wirtner 1990). However, Richardville was able to negotiate a delayed removal from Indiana, which took place over the course of five years, with the provision that suitable land was first acquired and approved prior to full Miami removal (Leonard 1990). Additionally, Richardville persuaded the government to pay off Miami debt, secure additional annuities for the Miami and secure private land for himself and several Miami Métis families, which allowed them, along with about half of the tribe to remain in Indiana on private lands (Carter 1987; Rinehart 2012). Between 1818 and 1840 Richardville was granted just over 28,000 acres or about 44 square miles of private, personal land in Indiana, was granted approximately $32,000 and was reportedly the richest Indian in North America, as well as the wealthiest person in the state of Indiana when he died on 13 August 1841 in his home on the St. Mary’s in Fort Wayne (Anson 1970; Poinsatte 1976; Walston 1997). His assets were so immense and diverse that it was not until 1852 that his will and estate were completely sorted out and settled (Leonard 1990). It cannot be said why Richardville agreed to removal in 1840 but Anson (1964) has posited that ailing in his later years Richardville wanted to finish the negotiations himself and did not trust others to do it, or that Richardville wanted to protect his remaining tribal members and stop their exploitation by white settlers. Through Richardville’s education and experience with the French, British and finally Americans, it is likely that he understood the collective ownership of land by Native American tribes would not be allowed and that private land ownership would endure.

Richardville’s wealth and influence in the Miami tribe remains controversial to this day and arguments can easily be made in either direction, painting him as the villain that gave away Miami land to receive a fortune, or as a hero and liberator of the Miami. On the one hand,
Richardville is responsible for ceding the remaining tracts of Miami land and agreeing to Miami removal from Indiana. Over the course of nearly fifty years, Richardville negotiated a number of treaties and each time he did so, he personally benefitted from each treaty, receiving land grants, as well as financial grants that awarded him money (Walston 1997). However, these monetary gifts were a standard practice at the time and several other Métis individuals also worked as negotiators and were paid well for their work with money, land and houses. Richardville did amass a personal fortune at the expense of the Miami tribe as a whole, much more than other chiefs and Métis, but there is another perspective that can be taken here. Richardville did benefit personally while the Miami lost their land, however, during his negotiations he was able to secure one-time and recurring annuity payments for the tribe as whole to assist with tribal debt. Through his negotiation skills, Richardville also retained the most valuable tracts of Miami land in Indiana and resisted Miami removal for ten years after the official Indian Removal Act was passed in 1830. Additionally, when Richardville eventually agreed to Miami removal from Indiana, he negotiated a five-year timeframe, which delayed their full removal and included a provision for finding suitable land in Kansas before the move, though he died before this was carried out. Lastly, Richardville was able to negotiate the gift of private tracts of land and exemption from removal to other Miami Métis, who were able to house nearly half of the tribe on their land, saving them from removal (Anson 1964).

So, while Richardville can be viewed as a selfish and self-serving individual in one light, in another light he can be viewed as an individual who understood the value EuroAmericans placed on private land ownership and saw private land ownership as the only means for some of the Miami to avoid removal and remain in Indiana. The Battle of Fallen Timbers also taught him that the United States had become much stronger than the Miami and if he did not pacify the
U.S. in some way, the Miami would lose everything. While it is difficult to analyze Richardville’s motives and take a stance on them from a presentist perspective, it seems that even though Richardville ceded Miami land, he cared about his fellow Miami and only broke up Miami land to award it to Miami tribal members who were also Métis, which allowed them to privately own the land. It is also likely that Richardville saw that the Cherokee, Choctaw and other Native American tribes in the southeast who tried to retain their communal tribal lands were forcibly removed and suffered greatly for it through the Trail of Tears and wanted to avoid a similar situation.

Unlike Richardville, Natoequah is essentially absent in historic accounts. This is partly due to her position in society, but also due to her gender, as well as her ethnicity. Unlike Richardville, she was not Chief of the tribe and did not serve in a leadership role in the tribe, so she was not the focus of attention of tribespeople or others. Instead, she was the wife of a Chief and is mentioned in relation to Richardville and the role she played in his life, including her marriage to Richardville or bearing their children. Additionally, she was a woman and a Miami, both of which caused her to perhaps go unnoticed by EuroAmerican men (who kept a majority of historic accounts) or perhaps they did not think her activities were worth reporting. Even a basic Google search brings up only four search results in which she appears compared to 2,200 search results returned for “Jean Baptiste Richardville”. So very little is known about her and while this is discouraging, it also provides an opportunity to once again see if the archaeological record can provide information where the historic record falls short.

Miami Removal

Like all Native American groups in the eighteenth century, Miami lands were constantly threatened as an independent America began to expand westward. In Indiana alone, there were
only 65,000 settlers when the state was ratified in 1816, but this population exploded to 343,000 settlers in 1830 (Rinehart 2012). In addition to an influx of people into the area, the landscape was dramatically altered to accommodate settlers; natural grasslands were converted to farmland and approximately 926,000 acres of land were devoted to the construction of the Erie Canal in northern Indiana and western Ohio (Rinehart 2012). The steady population growth and changing physical landscape placed immense pressure on Native American populations and territories, resulting in increased hostilities between Natives and whites and one of the few ways to reduce this conflict on the frontier was treaty negotiations.

Though Miami removal was delayed, the Army officially removed them in 1846, five years after Richardville’s death (Anson 1964; Callender 1978b; Pritzker 2000). Miami tribal members were loaded onto canal boats, then steamboats, and transported west with 323 Miami arriving on their reservation in Kansas on 9 November 1846 (Anson 1964). While the Miami removal is less well-known than the Cherokee’s Trail of Tears, it was no less devastating to their tribe. The trip west to Kansas was not well funded, so food shortages, illness and death were a common occurrence. Also, the Miami tribes were accustomed to living in areas surrounding river valleys and were people of the water, so their move to the plains of Kansas was shocking (Rinehart 2012). After Richardville’s death, his son-in-law Francis LaFontaine took over as chief of the tribe and while he was exempt from removal due to his Métis status, he accompanied the Miami to Kansas and was able to see the reservation for himself. Lafontaine’s tenure as chief was brief, however, as he died on the return trip from the Kansas reservation in 1847 (Anson 1964).

The removal of the Miami from Indiana created a large rift within the tribe, creating a Western Miami faction and several Eastern Miami factions, which still exists to this day. The
western Miami moved from Kansas to Oklahoma in the 1870s where they joined a confederacy along with the Wea, Piankeshaw and the Peoria. Currently the Western Miami are the only federally recognized Miami tribe in the United States. Because the Eastern Miami were able to avoid removal due to their Métis status, they were viewed as fully acculturated and too “white” to be officially recognized as part of the Miami Native American tribe by the United States government and as a result, they officially lost their tribal status in 1897 (Callender 1978b; Rinehart 2012). The Eastern Miami have continued to appeal for tribal recognition, but have been continually denied, including their most recent attempt in 1990 (Rinehart 2012).
Chapter 4: The Houses of Chief Richardville

The purpose of this chapter is to introduce the Chief Richardville House and LaFontaine House and discuss them within their cultural-historical context of the eighteenth and nineteenth century fur trade in the Great Lakes. Such a discussion is necessary in order to understand the importance and significance of these sites, as well as Richardville’s presence and actions at each of the house sites. The houses themselves will be examined in this chapter because they represent cognizant consumer choices that reflect Richardville’s self-ascribed identity. Each house will be introduced and the history of each structure discussed. Specific architectural elements of each house will also be examined and the significance and meaning of these elements will be discussed within their cultural-historical context in order to evaluate Richardville’s motivation for building these structures in the Greek Revival style. Such an analysis will highlight the architectural characteristics of each structure and include a discussion of the historical context, as well as the social milieu in which they arose, and which will touch on the cultural ideals they embodied at the time. Richardville was meticulous in his design of the houses and consciously selected specific decorative attributes that made these structures not only the first of their kind in the region, but also unique showpieces among contemporary Greek Revival structures. The ultimate goal of an architectural analysis is to inform a discussion of the construction of Richardville’s identities at these two sites. It is hypothesized here that Richardville made cognizant architectural choices pertaining to the extravagant design and decoration of each structure in order to reinforce his position within the local elite, EuroAmerican social hierarchy of the eighteenth century by presenting different social identities at each site.

Archaeological excavations that were undertaken at each site will be discussed in this chapter, as will their findings, with specific attention paid to the archaeological features and
architectural elements that were unearthed during the excavations. These features and architectural elements relate to the construction of each house and will therefore provide information pertaining to the construction and history of each structure, as well as changes that each structure underwent throughout its existence. A brief and general presentation and discussion of the archaeological findings of each of the sites will also be included in this chapter while a more detailed discussion and analysis of the findings from the Chief Richardville House will take place in Chapter 6, along with comparisons to the findings at the LaFontaine House.

**The Chief Richardville House**

The Chief Richardville House (Figure 4.1) is located in southwestern Fort Wayne, Indiana (Figure 4.2) and was constructed in 1827. It is located on the western side of the St. Mary’s River, strategically overlooking the nearby portage route, or what the Miami called the Golden Gate (Jeske 1995). This house was the earliest example of Greek Revival architecture in Indiana, as well as the grandest of any Native American treaty house recorded (Jeske 1992). The structure is an I-House of brick construction with a central stairway that is side-gabled, with two full stories in the main portion of the house and one and a half stories in the rear of the house (National Register of Historic Places 1997; National Historic Landmark Nomination 2012). In total, the house currently contains 4,634 square feet, with 1,586 square feet in its first level, 1,188 square feet in its second level and approximately 1,860 square feet in its unfinished basement. When it was initially constructed it contained approximately 4,344 square feet because the porch was enclosed in 1915 and an indoor bathroom was added to the first level of the structure, adding approximately 290 square feet to the structure.

The Chief Richardville House was initially funded through a six hundred dollar grant awarded to Richardville during the signing of the Treaty of Mississinewas in 1826, which
specified that Richardville (among others [8]) receive $600 for treaty house construction. Richardville then supplemented the grant with an additional sixteen hundred dollars of his own money in order to build a grand, modern European-style structure rather than a single-story, two-room treaty house that was common at the time (Bodurtha 1914; Kappler 1904; Leonard 1990). The Chief Richardville House is now the oldest Native American structure in the Midwest, the oldest structure in northeastern Indiana and one of few extant treaty houses east of the Mississippi River (Jeske and Stillwell 1995; National Register of Historic Places 1997; National Historic Landmark Nomination 2012).

History of the Chief Richardville Structure

After its construction in 1827, Richardville and his family lived in the Chief Richardville House in Fort Wayne. However, while Richardville is known to have lived in this house until his death in 1841, it is believed that Natoequah lived in a traditional or log home adjacent to the house somewhere on the property rather than in the house itself (Jeske 1992, 1995). Remains of this supplemental structure have not been located on the property, though the property did serve as a gravel quarry during the middle of the twentieth century, so most of the property has been quarried, save a small, one-acre parcel that the house is situated on. As a result, most
outbuildings and associated features on the property were likely destroyed or are covered by a parking lot. If time, or more importantly money and professional expertise were available, a geophysical survey of the property would be necessary to detect subsurface post molds, fire pits and other subsurface anomalies associated with such a structure had it been present on the property. However, this work was unfortunately outside the scope of this project.

In addition to serving as the residence of Richardville and his family, the house was also known to be a place for lavish entertainment. Richardville is known to have hosted extravagant banquets for his friends, acquaintances, Indian agents and U.S. Officials, with guests that included Abel Pepper (an Indian agent for northern Indiana), Allen Hamilton (an Indian agent assigned to the Miami), Samuel Hanna (Allen Country postmaster and local developer) and William Rockhill (McCammon-Hansen 2013). These fanciful gatherings included live music, dancing, card games and even horse racing on a track located on the property (Birzer 2008; Brice 1868; Edmunds 1996). Richardville quickly gained quite the reputation for throwing opulent parties and the locals in the area knew that the best food was served at the Chief’s House, as his house came to be known locally. Along with providing extravagant entertainment, the house itself was sumptuously outfitted. Susan McCulloch noted that the interior of the dwelling “was quite ‘Frenchy’ with bright red carpets and Watteau figures on the mantle” (N.D.: 13).

From historical documents (Figures 4.3 and 4.4), it is clear that Richardville ordered specific architectural and interior design features for this structure personally. Handwritten plans for the Chief Richardville House exist, stating: “The within plan of a house for Jean B Richardville has been submitted to us and we have given our obligations of this date for its erection & completion” signed by Richardville, on August 30, 1827 (J.B. Richardville with A.G.
Ballacoe and S.T. Hasnia, plan of a house, 30 August 1827, Allen County Fort Wayne Historical Society, Fort Wayne, Indiana).

The plans are quite detailed and include drawings of the layout of both floors and includes the location of stairs, windows, chimneys and doorways (Figure 4.3) (J.B. Richardville with A.G. Ballacoe and S.T. Hasnia, plan of a house, 30 August 1827, Allen County Fort Wayne Historical Society, Fort Wayne, Indiana). Additionally, the notes also state that the foundation be three feet high, the first story nine feet high and the second story eight feet high, and that “all sash, door and window frames must be finished with a coat of lead and oil as it goes into the wall
and troughs or gutters painted white, roof red.” Richardville even specified “small grated windows in front and 1 back in the foundation below the floor,” and the panel work, window shutters and woodwork painted wherever painting is “usual and necessary.” The plans for the house also state that the house should be made of red brick, include a red shake roof, as well as green shutters. Richardville allotted one year for the house to be completed and set up a payment schedule where a down payment of two hundred dollars was provided, another two hundred paid when the house was “covered”, one hundred dollars when the carpenters’ work was finished and the remaining balance paid when he received the keys to the finished house (Figure 4.3) (J.B. Richardville with A.G. Ballacoe and S.T. Hasnia, plan of a house, 30 August 1827, Allen County Fort Wayne Historical Society, Fort Wayne, Indiana).

Figure 4.4 Signature on plans of Chief Richardville's House

Richardville passed away in his home in Fort Wayne in 1841, after which ownership of the house passed to his eldest daughter, La Blonde, until her death in 1847, when she died, the house then passed to her son George Ossem (Leonard 1990). The house changed ownership many times since Richardville’s passing but stayed in the ownership of his descendants until
1894. After that time the property was bought and sold several times, underwent many changes and generally fell into disrepair over the years. In the middle of the twentieth century the property was owned by the Spy Run Gravel Company who heavily mined the property causing extensive disturbance to the property. From existing plans of the structure, it is known that the house was originally brick-built with a front entry porch, though the porch was torn down and replaced at some point with a modern entry porch and the exterior stuccoed in the early twentieth century (Figure 4.5).

![Figure 4.5: Chief Richardville House with stucco exterior and modern entry porch (photograph courtesy of R. Jeske, 1995)](image)

It was not until 1991 that the Allen County-Fort Wayne Historical Society purchased the property and began restoring the structure to its original grandeur through the Wabash River Heritage Corridor grant. The stucco was removed from the original brick facade, while the windows, shutters, doors, roof and gutters were restored and the masonry of the structure was
repaired (DNR n.d.). The Allen County and Fort Wayne Historical society hired Cole Matott Architects to produce formal architectural drawings of each floor and facade of the structure, which are shown in Figures 4.6 and 4.7.

Figure 4.6 House Elevations of the Chief Richardville House

![First and Second Floor Plans](image-url)
The house was designated as a local historic landmark by the Fort Wayne Historic Preservation and Protection Ordinance in 1966, added to the National Register of Historic Places in 1997 and was granted National Landmark Status by the National Park Service in 2012. The purchase and renovation of the structure along with the recent nominations have created renewed local interest in Chief Richardville, his role in the Miami tribe and Indiana history.

Architectural Elements of the Chief Richardville House

The Greek Revival style was a popular architectural style for public buildings in the United States from approximately 1825 to 1860 and was transferred to domestic buildings shortly thereafter, from approximately 1830 to 1860. As with many cultural trends, the earliest Greek Revival structures were seen on the east coast of the United States and the trend slowly traveled westward to the frontier, becoming common in Indiana from 1840 to 1860 (DNR, n.d.). The Chief Richardville House was constructed in Fort Wayne in 1827, making it an early example of Greek Revival residential architecture, which is considered by some to be the first
united, national style of architecture seen in America (Eggener 2004; Hamlin 1964; Morrison 1952). The style rose to prominence in the generation following the Revolutionary War and likely gained momentum due to the parallels Americans saw between themselves, the Greeks and their new democracy.

While some credit parallels are seen between a new America and Greece (i.e. newly gained independence and a democratic republic) there was likely little political motivation for the architectural trend because the style was by no means unique to America. The Greek Revival style was instead an international architectural style where classical forms were embraced and used in modern and progressive contexts (Maynard 2002). No matter the driving factors behind the popularity of Greek Revival architecture in North America and around the world, the style rose to prominence in the middle of the nineteenth century and was characterized by the application of flamboyant characteristics from ancient Greek architecture to modern houses and buildings.

In addition to influences from the ancient Greeks, the Greek Revival style is also influenced by the Georgian and Adams (Federal) architectural styles that came before it in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in North America and Europe. As a result, the Greek Revival trend seen in North America witnessed the blending of classical Greek styles with modern European and American building. Common Greek Revival characteristics include symmetry in the facade with a central entry and fanlights or transom lights above the entry, along with low-pitched, side-gabled roofs, underlain with cornice lines with a wide trim (McAlester and McAlester 2009; Morrison 1952). Some of these features are also seen in Georgian and Adams styles (like the cornice lines and accompanying bands) though they are simpler in the Greek Revival tradition, consisting of straight, plain white bands, while those of the Adams and
Georgian styles contained more detailed tooth-like dentils in the cornice lines. The Greek Revival style of architecture is also known for containing a pronounced central entrance to the structure, flanked by either transom lights or sidelights, along with partial- or full-height porches containing round or square columns or pillars (McAlester and McAlester 2009). As can be seen in Figure 4.8 below, the Chief Richardville House contains most of these elements.

![Figure 4.8 Common Greek Revival Architectural Characteristics (McAlester and McAlester 1984:178)](image)

While the modern Chief Richardville House does not contain an entry porch presently, archaeological excavations at the house revealed the original fieldstone porch foundation measuring 55cm deep and 220cm wide, along with the base of a pillar that likely supported the porch (Figure 4.9). These findings suggest that it did once contain an entry porch that measured approximately two and a half feet wide and three feet deep (Jeske 1995). The differences between these two architectural styles are slight, but the presence of cornice lines rather than dentils, as well as an entry porch make it a Greek Revival structure, as opposed to an Adams style structure.
The facade of the Chief Richardville House exhibits perfect balance and symmetry that is expected in the Greek Revival architectural style. The structure contains four identical sets of six over six double hung windows with shutters on either side of the central entry, along with one matching set of six over six double hung windows in the center of the structure above the entry. However, the original windows had been replaced earlier in the early twentieth century, only after the structure was purchased in 1991 were the windows restored to the original six over six style. A wide band of trim emphasizes the cornice lines that underlay the low-pitched roof of the structure and mirror the horizontal lintels above the windows. The structure also contains two chimneys, one on either side of the house, which service the numerous fireplaces within the house (Figure 4.10).
The symmetry of the structure is not limited to its exterior, but also extends to the interior of the house as well.

*The Chief Richardville House in Cultural Context*

The Chief Richardville House is interesting to examine within its cultural context because the Greek Revival architectural style is relatively new at this time the house is built and because the house was personally designed by the chief of the Miami tribe. Although eight other chiefs were also awarded money to build a treaty house in the same treaty as Richardville, none did so in such high style. Instead, these other chiefs constructed single-story, one room log cabins that were typical of the nineteenth century frontier. Like the construction of his house, many personal choices Richardville made during his lifetime were unique, amalgams of his cultural influences, including the way he dressed and the language he used. These choices are interesting in themselves because Richardville was Métis but become more intriguing when Richardville is viewed in the role of the Civil Chief of the Miami tribe, which is a very public figure. Rather than living in a village among his people in traditional Miami housing, he instead chose to live
separately, on his privately owned property overlooking the portage in a fully European structure. Furthermore, Richardville gained the money to build the structure (as well as the land it is built upon) from the United States government and used the structure as a place for entertaining people from the elite, white upper class, with whom he surrounded himself.

Some speculations can be made pertaining to his motivations to build in the Greek Revival style. One motivation could be that Richardville had an aversion to the Adam and Georgian architectural styles due to their association with America’s colonial period and English influence. By choosing to build in the Greek Revival style, Richardville perhaps instead chose to portray and represent the ideals of the new America, or perhaps he was just partial to the new, modern and fanciful trends in American architecture rather than those of the English colonial period. Another motivation could have been an active rejection of his Miami cultural identity in favor of a more modern Métis, or even an assimilated American identity. Given Richardville’s past, however, it is much more likely that his actions are the result of how he was raised, his life experiences as a young man and his admiration for architecture, rather than a rejection of his Miami heritage. Because Richardville had the experience of living with one foot in both cultures, it is no surprise that later in life he exhibited characteristics and tendencies from both, developing unique personal and social identities. Richardville’s ability to construct a house in the Modern Greek Revival style that was luxuriously decorated demonstrated not only his elite financial status, but also his cutting edge intellectual prowess and knowledge of European and American culture, which secured his status in the upper-class American society of the frontier. The construction and ownership of such a house became a public symbol and representation of his identities, displayed to the Miami and Americans that visited the structure; identities that were
accepted and validated by attendees each time he hosted one of his famous parties and performed or presented his identities.

While Richardville’s motivations for choosing to build in the Greek Revival style will never be known for certain, the decision that Richardville made to construct a formal European structure rather than a traditional Miami or Métis structure, or even a typical treaty house of the day was a major statement on his part. By building and living in an extravagant European style structure, Richardville publicly lived like a European and used the house as a statement that he belonged in the white, European and American world. Moreover, it was an elite, wealthy world in which he belonged. Similar public statements pertaining to his identity were also mirrored in Richardville’s daily dress and appearance, as he is known to have worn a combination of traditional Miami and European clothing, epitomizing the Métis image of the nineteenth century frontier (Anson 1970 and Edmunds 1996). This personal style was a physical representation of who Richardville had become based on his personal experiences, living part of his life as a Miami Indian with his mother in their Miami tribe and part of his life as an elite European with his father in Canada. The distinctive experience of living in both worlds provided Richardville with both European and Miami cultural traits, making him equally a member of both groups, though not a full member of either group. As a result, he more closely ascribed to the Métis lifestyle, wearing a combination of Miami and European clothing and residing in a fully European structure.

Expectations

It is expected that the earliest materials recovered from the site will likely be fewer in quantity when compared to later materials in the assemblage due to the short time that Richardville occupied the structure after it was built (1827-1841). These early materials
(particularly glass and ceramic artifacts) are expected to represent a range of activities exceeding those of a common domestic residence because the Chief Richardville House was built as a prestige residence and a place for interaction with, as well as the entertainment of various state or government officials and other elite, upper class EuroAmericans (Anson 1970; Birzer 2008). Therefore, it is expected that a high proportion of tableware and serving vessels are present in the levels associated with the earliest occupation of the structure and that these items are more highly decorated and ornate. Richardville was a very wealthy individual, reported to be the wealthiest person in Indiana when it became a state in 1816, so it is expected that the earliest materials associated with Richardville and his use of the structure as an elite residence would be of a higher quality. Later materials found in upper stratigraphic layers associated with Richardville’s descendants are expected be more numerous due to a longer, continuous habitation of the house, but also of a lower quality and contain traditional domestic, utilitarian materials, due to the transition in the use of the house to a traditional frontier domestic residence after Richardville’s death. The artifact classes of ceramics and glass associated with later occupations by his descendants are expected to exhibit less variation in ware type and color, be more plainly decorated (if decorated at all) and primarily contain utilitarian items representative of a typical family household of the nineteenth century. Materials from each distinct occupation are also expected to represent the identity of the individuals present in the house at the time. Therefore, the earlier materials are expected to be representative of an elite EuroAmerican male, as Richardville was the dominant figure at the house and Natoequah is thought to have been absent from the structure, residing separately, somewhere nearby on the property. Because the excavation units were clustered adjacent to the structure, it is likely that Natoequah is completely absent from the archaeological materials recovered from the house, since she was not living in
the structure and known to not be connected to it. Later materials from the Chief Richardville House are expected to be more fully representative of an entire Métis family because LaBlonde and her husband are known to have both inhabited in the structure with their children and represent a full range of domestic activities.

However, the nomenclature for artifact types are determined by their makers (e.g. prehistoric, Native American, historic or EuroAmerican) rather than their users. However, many Native Americans commonly used EuroAmerican goods in the fur trade era, yet when identified archaeologically they are still considered historic or EuroAmerican in nature and discussed more in terms of their makers rather than their users. In many cases describing artifacts as *EuroAmerican* or *Native American* poses little conflict, however, in the context of Métis assemblages, like the one recovered from the Chief Richardville House, neither term is particularly appropriate and in fact, both are problematic. In the context of this dissertation, typical EuroAmerican historic artifacts (glass, ceramics, metal, etc.) will be referred to as such, though it is known that while they may have been created by EuroAmericans they were in fact used by Richardville, who was in fact, a Métis. The prehistoric artifacts recovered (lithics and ceramics) remain a little less clear however, so care will need to be taken when discussing these artifacts.

*Archaeological Excavations*

Archaeological excavations were conducted at the Chief Richardville House by students and staff of the Indiana University Purdue University Fort Wayne (IPFW) field school, under the direction of Dr. Robert Jeske, in 1992 and 1995. The larger goal of these investigations was to determine whether subsurface historic deposits remained intact and to document the extent of subsurface disturbances at the site. Throughout the course of these investigations, it became clear
that historic deposits were indeed intact at the site with relatively little mixing occurring, leaving the deepest and oldest deposits undisturbed and separate from those of later occupations (Jeske and Stillwell 1995). During the two field seasons a total of sixteen test excavation units were excavated (15 two by two meter units along with one, one by two meter unit) (Figure 4.11).

![Figure 4.11: Locations of archaeological excavation units (Jeske 1995).](image)

A steel pipe datum was placed at the northeast corner of the property and the coordinates of 500N, 500E were then assigned to the southeast corner of the property from which as site grid was established. All excavation units at the site were then measured from this 500N, 500E datum point at the southeast corner of the property. Units 1-8 and 10-16 were two by two meter units while Unit 9 was a one by two meter unit. All units were hand excavated by shovel or trowel in 10 cm levels unless transitions or changes in the natural stratigraphy were noted.
The units yielded six cultural features and 42,951 artifacts. All units were hand excavated using shovels and trowels in arbitrary 10 cm levels within natural levels (e.g. Root zone, A horizon, bb horizon) and screened through 6.35 mm mesh. Visual soil anomalies and stains were isolated in the unit and excavated separately from units and given appropriate feature or area designations. All features were bisected, with one half was excavated in arbitrary 10 cm levels in order to expose the profile of the feature (which was mapped) and the second half of the feature excavated in natural levels based on stratigraphy, with samples taken for flotation. Photographs were taken at the surface of each level in each unit and profile walls of the entire unit walls. In addition, photographs were taken of the surface, profile and excavated basin of each feature.

Archaeological excavations conducted at the site revealed that some significant disturbances were present, but that the majority of the archaeological deposits at the site immediately surrounding the structure remained intact. The southern end of the property was once the location of a parking lot filled with condensed gravel deposits (Figure 4.12) and the north side of the site was also moderately disturbed by modern sewer and water construction (Figure 4.13).

Figure 4.12: Gravel deposits shown in profile (photograph courtesy of R. Jeske, 1992)
The western portion of the site remained relatively undisturbed by both historic and modern activities, while the eastern side of the house did exhibit some disturbance, which was related to construction episodes of the house. Although any amount of site disturbance is not ideal, the disturbance on the eastern portion of the site has provided some additional useful information about the site and post-depositional processes that took place. While archaeological materials recovered from the Chief Richardville House (as well as the house itself) will be the foundation for the discussion of identity creation and maintenance by Richardville and Natoequah, this discussion will take place later in Chapter 7 of this dissertation. The full, detailed analysis of material culture recovered from this site will also be presented and discussed in Chapter 6 of this dissertation. The paragraphs below will briefly summarize the cultural features identified, artifacts recovered and the fieldwork itself, in order to present basic findings and discuss architectural elements of the house that were uncovered during excavations.
Prior to the 1995 excavations, the extant porch was removed from the structure and three test excavation units (10, 11 and 12) were placed in that location (Figure 4.14 and 4.15).

![Figure 4.14: Porch removed from the house (photograph courtesy of R. Jeske, 1995)](image)

At the time of excavation, it was known that the current entry porch was not original and was added sometime after the original porch had been demolished. From the scant historic evidence available, the construction of the modern porch was placed in the mid-twentieth century. The removal of the porch provided an opportunity to excavate in an area where site collection and
metal detecting had been limited during the life of the structure and produced some interesting artifacts and features that shed light on construction episodes of the structure.

A total of six cultural Features were identified during excavation. Feature 1 was identified in the northeast corner of Unit 5 in 1992. This feature was rectangular in shape, found at a depth of 15 cm below the modern ground surface that extended down to 30 cm below the modern ground surface. After excavation, it was determined to be a post that was burned in place due to the concentration of charcoal and burnt soil present. Although it cannot be determined what this post was a part of or firm dates established for it, it was thought by the field director that they date relatively late in the historic period and were not contemporaneous with Richardville’s occupation of the structure (Jeske 1995). Feature 2 (Figure 4.9) was a round pillar 40 cm in diameter that was identified in the southeastern corner of Unit 12 in the first level of excavation at 4 cm below the modern ground surface. An accompanying flagstone foundation was also uncovered in subsequent levels that extended down to 33 cm below the modern ground surface and expanded into neighboring units. The pillar and associated flagstone foundation were likely part of the original entry porch of the house.

Features 3 and 6 were identified in level two of the southern half of Unit 11 as dark soil stains (10YR 3/2 and 10YR 2/1, respectively). Feature 3 began 18 cm below the modern ground surface and extended down to 33 cm below the modern ground surface, while Feature 6 began at 18 cm below the modern ground surface and extended down to 36 cm below the modern ground surface. Both features contained coal and had amorphous shapes that kept changing as the features were excavated suggesting that they were the result of rodent activity at the site. Feature 5 was identified in level three of Unit 12 at 32 cm below the modern ground surface as a rectangular dark stain (10 YR 3/3) that extended to 57 cm below the modern ground surface at its
deepest point. The feature contained coal and general historic debris, while the soil around it contained prehistoric flakes. The feature was identified just north of a modern pipe and was interpreted by the field director to be associated with modern construction. The only feature contemporaneous with and significant to the structure is Feature 2, as it represents the original entry porch of the house.

During the two seasons of excavation a total of 29.7 cubic meters of soil was excavated from the sixteen units yielding 42,949 artifacts (118,668.9g) and resulting in a site density of 1,446 artifacts per cubic meter (Table 4.1). Initial analysis of the 1992 materials was conducted by Larry N. Stillwell at IPFW, though the final analysis was conducted by myself at UWM.

Table 4.1: Unit Densities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Levels Excavated</th>
<th>Total Depth (cm)</th>
<th>Volume (cubic meters)</th>
<th>Artifacts</th>
<th>Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>153.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1220</td>
<td>717.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1364</td>
<td>802.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1585</td>
<td>720.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>1255.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1127</td>
<td>626.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1282</td>
<td>754.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>1301.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1231</td>
<td>615.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49*</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4814</td>
<td>2831.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3498</td>
<td>1749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2954</td>
<td>1181.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1544</td>
<td>671.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3844</td>
<td>2023.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>12113</td>
<td>4658.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As reflected in Table 4.2 below, building materials was the most numerous (25,376) followed by ceramics (4,285), ecofacts (3,911), metal (3,755), glass (3,630), lithic materials (635), modern miscellaneous (453) and personal items (301). A consistent count of natural stone was not kept, but the total weight of natural stone collected at the site is 4,230.9g.

Table 4.2: Artifact category totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Materials</td>
<td>25,376</td>
<td>67108.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>4,285</td>
<td>7405.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecofacts</td>
<td>3911</td>
<td>20010.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>3630</td>
<td>7919.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithics</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>3755</td>
<td>10358.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Miscellaneous</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>328.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Stone</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>4230.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Items</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>42949</strong></td>
<td><strong>118667.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unit 1

Four levels were excavated in Unit 1 and on average the unit was excavated to about 53 cm below ground surface. The northern portion of the unit was excavated to 59 cmbd, the southern portion of the unit was excavated only to 47 cmbd and the unit as a whole gradually sloped from south to north, down from 47 cmbd to 59 cmbd. As with the site as a whole, Unit 1 contained mostly building materials (487) followed by glass (239), miscellaneous artifacts (188), metal (109), ceramics (86) and lithics (2). The first level of excavation was the sod layer (Level 0), was
excavated down about ten cm and contained very few artifacts including three brick fragments, three brown container glass fragments, one steel band and two pieces of bone. Level one was excavated from about 12 cmbd to about 30 cmbd and contained more artifacts than the sod layer, mostly brick (239), although it also contained some ceramics, glass, metal and miscellaneous artifacts. Generic whiteware ceramics was the most prevalent ceramic in level one (26) followed by flow blue (5), yellow ware (5) and salt glazed stoneware (1). Clear container glass was most numerous in the glass category (67), followed by clear flat glass (18), aqua flat glass (6), brown container glass (6), aqua container glass (5) and frosted container glass (1). The metal category contained a wider range of artifacts, though they were generally less numerous than those in the glass and building materials categories. There were six square nails, five pieces of unidentifiable miscellaneous metal, four round nails, three unidentifiable nail fragments, a single piece of barrel strapping, one fire poker handle and one percussion cap. The only personal item recovered from this level includes one clay pipe fragment, while ecofacts found in this level include fourteen pieces of bone and modern miscellaneous artifacts include three pieces of linoleum and ten pieces of plastic.

Level two of Unit 1 was excavated from about 28 cmbd to about 35 cmbd and contained mostly modern miscellaneous artifacts including linoleum (87) and plastic (2). Building materials recovered from this level include 86 pieces of brick and five pieces of tar paper, while glass artifacts included clear decorative glass (48), nine clear container glass, two pieces of aqua container glass and one piece each of amber container glass, brown container glass, frosted container glass and green container glass. Ceramics recovered from level two include one piece of porcelain, three pieces of flow blue, three pieces of yellow ware and five pieces of whiteware. Metal artifacts recovered from level two included nine square nail fragments, five unidentified
miscellaneous metal pieces, one metal jar lid, one paper clip, one round nail and one piece of wire. Bone (18) and a single clay pipe stem were also recovered from this level.

Level three was excavated from about 35 cmbd down to 47 cmbd and building materials were again most numerous with 65 brick fragments and one roofing shingle, while the glass category also contained a high number of artifacts with 44 pieces of brown container glass, six pieces of clear container glass, five pieces of aqua flat glass and one piece of milk glass and aqua container glass. Level three ceramics include eleven pieces of whiteware, two pieces of earthenware and one piece each of porcelain and yellow ware. The metal category consisted of 20 pieces of unidentifiable miscellaneous metal, 11 unidentifiable nail fragments, ten square nails, five pieces of foil, two round nails and one piece of copper. Ecofacts found include 26 pieces of bone and two pieces of wood, while modern miscellaneous artifacts recovered include six pieces of linoleum, five pieces of plastic and twelve pieces of tar paper. Only one lithic flake was recovered from this level.

The last level excavated in this unit was level four and extended from 47 cmbd to 59 cmbd in the north and east portions of the unit. Overall, fewer artifacts were recovered from this level though building materials were still the most numerous with 26 pieces of brick and one piece of tile. Ceramics were the next numerous category with 17 pieces of whiteware and one single piece of black transferprint, decorated porcelain, green transferprint, porcelain and salt glazed stoneware. Thirteen pieces of glass were also recovered from this level (three aqua, three brown, five clear and two clear flat glass), as was one lithic flake and 12 metal artifacts (two metal rings, three round nails, one spoon bowl, six square nails and 19.5 grams of unidentifiable miscellaneous metal). Only eleven ecofacts were recovered including six pieces of bone, four pieces of wood and one peach pit, while one eyeglass bow cover constitutes the only modern
miscellaneous artifact recovered from this level. Thirty-two additional brick fragments, one
electrical outlet cover, one iron stake, six round nails, four bone fragments and one penny were
also recovered though their provenience is unknown. Excavation ceased at the base of Level four
and all four walls of the unit were drawn in profile.

*Unit 2*

Four levels were excavated in Unit 2 to a total depth of approximately 40 cmbd and the
unit contained one cultural feature (Feature 1). Level 0 was excavated to approximately 12 cmbd
and contained brick (12), whiteware (5), aqua container glass (1) brown container glass (2), aqua
flat glass (1), one round nail, one screw, four square nails, three wire fragments, two pieces of
bone and two pieces of plastic. Level 1 was excavated to approximately 20 cmbd, though the
southwest corner was excavated to 37 cmbd. This level contained the highest density of artifacts
in the unit (101 artifacts) most of which were building materials (44 brick pieces and six
shingles) and metal (12 square nails and four pieces of unidentifiable miscellaneous metal),
though this level did contain some ceramics (seven pieces of whiteware and one piece of flow
blue) and glass (five pieces of clear container glass, four pieces of aqua container glass, three
pieces of brown container glass and three pieces of clear flat glass). Additionally, two lithic
flakes were recovered, as well as eight pieces of bone, one belt fragment and one piece of plastic.

Level two was excavated to approximately 30 cmbd and contained an artifact density
close to that of level one (94 artifacts), though there was a decrease in variety of artifacts
represented. The most numerous artifact in the level was unidentifiable miscellaneous metal (46)
followed by square nails (22), brick fragments (14), bone (3), aqua container glass (3), clear flat
glass (2) and clear container glass, frosted container glass and aqua flat glass, each of which
there was a single artifact. One metal bracket was also recovered from level two. Level 3 was
excavated to level out the unit floor. Level 2 was excavated to about 30 cmbd, though each corner and the center of the unit were at different depths. By the end of Level 3 the center of the unit more closely matched the depth of the corners of the unit and the feature that was identified (Feature 1) was better defined. As a result, level three contained just one square nail. One piece of unidentifiable miscellaneous metal was marked as being from Level 4, though this level was not excavated, so this artifact was likely recovered while flattening the floor. Twelve additional square nails were recovered from Unit 2, though their exact provenience was not known. Excavation of the unit ended at the base of level three (though Feature 1 was excavated separately and will be described separately) and the south and west walls were profiled.

Unit 3

A total of four levels were excavated in level three to a depth of 47 cmbd and 1,220 artifacts were recovered from the unit. Level 0 was excavated to about 15 cmbd and contained few artifacts including whiteware (3), earthenware (1), yellow ware (1), aqua container glass (1), unidentifiable miscellaneous metal (1) and plastic (1). The density of artifacts increased greatly in Level 1, which was excavated to 27 cmbd. Building materials contained the highest number of artifacts (134 brick and one piece of coal), while ecofacts contained just 71 bone and there were metal artifacts (31 round nails, eight unidentifiable miscellaneous metal, seven square nails, two bottle caps, two rivets, two washers, two pieces of wire, one coffee can, one piece of foil, one spike head and one staple). Ceramics recovered from Level 1 include 28 earthenware, 24 whiteware, 10 salt glazed earthenware, six salt glazed stoneware, four pieces of creamware, two flow blue, one blue decorated edgware, one decal transferprint and one rockingham. Glass artifacts recovered include 21 pieces of clear container glass, three aqua flat glass, two aqua container glass, one milk glass and one clear flat glass. Level two contained mainly ceramics
including 325 whiteware, 26 flow blue, 21 black transferprint, 20 yellowware, 12 porcelain, four annular banded ware, three stoneware, two decorated porcelain, one brown transferprint and one piece of prehistoric, shell-tempered pottery. Metal artifacts recovered from level two include four round nails, two square nails and one piece of unidentifiable miscellaneous metal. Five pieces of bone were also recovered from level two.

Level three contained a similar density of artifacts, although here building materials were present (310 brick) and there were far fewer ceramics present (15 whiteware, 11 flow blue, four earthenware, three salt glazed earthenware, three salt glazed stoneware, two black transferprint, two pink decorated ware, one annular banded ware and one porcelain). Nineteen glass artifacts were recovered from Level 3, including seven clear container glass, five aqua container glass, four aqua flat glass, two brown container glass and one green container glass, as were seven lithic flakes, one round nail, 11 pieces of bone, six pieces of wood, two pieces of plastic, one clay bead and one unidentified stone. Unit excavation ended at the base of level three at 47 cmbd and all four walls were profiled.

Unit 4

Five levels were excavated in this unit yielding a total of 1,364 artifacts. As with most other units excavated, the first level (Level 0) of Unit 4 was excavated to approximately 8 cmbd and contained the fewest artifacts (29) which included a single brick fragment, one piece of black transferprint, two flow blue, one piece of yellow ware, 19 pieces of whiteware, one fragment of brown and clear container glass, as well as a single piece of wire and two pieces of bone. Level 1 was excavated to 20 cmbd and contained 436 artifacts, with the most numerous category being building materials (164 brick), followed by ecofacts (one charcoal, 103 bone, two peach pits and one piece of shell) and modern miscellaneous (17 plastic, one necklace link, one pencil) and
personal items (three buttons, one clinker, one dime, one nickel, one marble, and one pipe stem). The glass category contained clear container glass (22), aqua flat glass (16), aqua container glass (11), clear flat glass (8), milk glass (3), brown container glass (2) and green container glass (1), while ceramics contained 41 pieces of whiteware, three yellowware, three salt glazed earthenware, two earthenware and just one of blue transferprint, flow blue, prehistoric grit-tempered pottery and porcelain. Metal artifacts recovered from level one include 10 square nails, five round nails, two pieces of wire, two pieces of unidentifiable miscellaneous metal and one ball, bottle cap and paint can fragment.

Level 2 was excavated to 30 cmbd and was quite similar to Level 1 in that brick was by far the most numerous artifact recovered (178) and other artifacts were found in much lower frequencies. A wide variety of ceramics were recovered including black transferprint (3), blue decorated edgeware (1), blue transferprint (1), earthenware (8), flow blue (6), mocha yellow ware (1), porcelain (4), salt glazed earthenware (2), whiteware (2) and yellow ware (5). Glass artifacts recovered include aqua container glass (15), brown container glass (1), clear container glass (19), green container glass (1) and aqua and clear flat glass (16 and 1, respectively). Two lithic flakes were recovered from this level, as well as seven metal artifacts (one lightbulb base, four round nails, one screw and one piece of unidentified miscellaneous metal), thirty-one ecofacts (30 bone and one shell) and one personal artifact (button). The artifact frequency decreased dramatically in levels three and four, yielding only 68 and 195, respectively.

Level 3 was excavated to 40 cmbd and contained brick (30), charcoal (1), black transferprint (3), whiteware (10), yellow ware (1), aqua container glass (6), clear container glass (2), barrel strapping (1), round nails (3) and bone (11). Level 4 was excavated to 44 cmbd and contained brick (96), coal (6), whiteware (12), aqua, clear and green container glass (5, 37 and 1,
respectively), as well as aqua flat glass (8), burnt metal (1), round nails (9), square nails (6), wire (1), bone (7), walnut shell fragments (4) and a single pipestem and button. An additional 251 pieces of brick, 75 pieces of whiteware, four pieces of unidentified miscellaneous metal and a single piece of salt glazed earthenware were recovered but their provenience is unknown. Excavation ceased at the bottom of level four at approximately 44 cmbd, however the floor of the unit was uneven so the southern portion of the unit was closer to 45 cmbd while the northern portion of the unit was closer to 40 cmbd. The north, south and west walls were drawn in profile. 

Unit 5 

The artifact density of Unit 5 was similar to that of Unit 4. A total of 1,585 artifacts were recovered from its five levels. Level 0 was excavated to approximately 12 cmbd and produced a total of 26 artifacts including three brick fragments, one piece of coal, one earthenware, six whiteware, five pieces of clear container glass, two pieces of green container glass, four pieces of aqua flat glass, two pieces of clear flat glass and two pieces of plastic. Artifact frequencies increased dramatically in Level 1, which produced 759 artifacts and was excavated down to 26 cmbd. The glass category contained the most artifacts including aqua flat glass (150), clear container glass (36), aqua container glass (33), green container glass (3), brown container glass (1), followed by building materials (155 brick) and ceramics (120 whiteware, six salt glazed stoneware, five porcelain and a single piece of annular banded ware, blue transferprint, earthenware and hand painted ware). Level 1 also contained 126 metal artifacts (83 square nails, 15 round nails, 23 pieces of unidentifiable miscellaneous metal, two pieces of wire, one piece of barrel strapping, one lightbulb base and one metal clip) and 103 ecofacts (one piece of coal, 101 pieces of bone and one piece of burnt soil). Additionally, five pieces of plastic, three barrettes, three clay pipe fragments, six pieces of lithic material (one biface fragment, four flakes and one
piece of shatter) were also recovered from this level.

Level 2 was excavated to 36 cmbd and only contained 225 artifacts. Building materials was the most numerous category (115 brick), followed by ceramics (19 whiteware), five flow blue, one black transferprint, one handpainted ware, one purple transferprint) and glass (12 aqua flat glass, four clear flat glass, two aqua container glass, one brown container glass and one clear container glass). Fewer metal artifacts were recovered from Level 2, including a single round nail, 19 square nails and four pieces of unidentifiable miscellaneous metal while the category of ecofacts contained 33 bone and two pieces of charcoal and the only personal item recovered included one button. Two lithic flakes were also recovered from this level.

Level 3 was excavated to 46 cmbd and produced 326 artifacts, though the majority of these artifacts (249) were brick fragments. Other artifacts recovered from this level include black transferprint ceramics (2), salt glazed earthenware (1), whiteware (3), aqua container glass (4), clear container glass (1), aqua flat glass (12), clear flat glass (2), four lithic flakes, one metal rod, 14 square nails, 30 pieces of bone, one button, one marble and one pipe bowl. Level 4 was excavated to a total depth of 56 cmbd and contained 230 artifacts. Brick again was the most numerous (177), followed by square nails (16), bone (13), unidentifiable miscellaneous metal (6), coal (4), aqua container glass (4), aqua flat glass (3), lithic flakes (2), whiteware (2), black transferprint (1), earthenware (1) and round nails (1). An additional 19 artifacts were recovered though their provenience is unknown including two decorated porcelain pieces, one flow blue ceramic, two porcelain pieces, nine whiteware, three yellow ware and two annular banded yellow ware. Excavation ceased at the base of Level 4 at approximately 56 cmbd and all four walls were drawn in profile.

Unit 6
Three levels were excavated in Unit 6 to a depth of 32 cmbd and produced 1,632 total artifacts. The first level, Level 0 was excavated to approximately 11 cmbd and contained four pieces of brick, three pieces of frosted decorative glass, two pieces of amethyst container glass and a single piece of aqua container glass, aqua flat glass and whiteware. Artifact densities increase dramatically in the following levels. Level 1 was excavated to approximately 20 cmbd and produced 1251 total artifacts. This level contained a large amount of brick (576), as well as a high number of ceramic artifacts including whiteware (236), flow blue (31), black transferprint (25), brown transferprint (6), porcelain (4), earthenware (3), salt glazed stoneware (2) and edge decorated ware and hand painted whiteware (one each). Glass artifacts recovered from this level include aqua flat glass (140), clear container glass (68), aqua container glass (27), clear flat glass (11), brown container glass (7), amethyst container glass (3), green container glass (3), cobalt container glass (2) and milk glass (2), while metal artifacts include 16 pieces of unidentified miscellaneous metal, 11 square nails, 10 round nails, nine pieces of wire, two metal lid fragments, two staples, two washers, one bottle cap, one plumbing pipe piece and one spoon. Ecofacts recovered include bone (35), personal items include buttons (4), clay pipe fragments (6) and one stone bead while one plastic comb fragment constitute the modern miscellaneous items recovered. The only chipped stone artifact recovered from this level was a single lithic blade.

Level 2 was excavated to 32 cmbd and contained a slightly lower artifact frequency, yielding only 366 total artifacts. The most numerous category was again ceramics (134 whiteware, 20 black transferprint, 16 flow blue, two brown transferprint, two creamware, one annular banded ware, one blue transferprint, one hand painted aware and one piece of porcelain), followed by glass (62 clear container glass, 40 clear flat glass, two aqua container glass, one brown container glass and one aqua flat glass) and miscellaneous artifacts (56 bone, one piece of
plastic). Eighteen metal artifacts were recovered (12 pieces of unidentifiable miscellaneous metal and six square nails) as were two lithic artifacts (one core remnant and one flake). Ecofacts were scarce in this level, with only five pieces of coal recovered. Excavation ceased at the base of Level 2 (32 cmbd), though three plastic fragments were labeled as being recovered from Level 3. These artifacts were likely found at the base of Level 2 when the floor was cleaned. The south and east walls of Unit 6 were profiled.

**Unit 7**

The first level (Level 0) was excavated down to approximately 8 cmbd though the floor was fairly uneven. Few artifacts recovered from Level 0 including brick (2), clear container glass (2), clear flat glass (1), lithic flakes (3), a single biface fragment, one rubber ball and one piece of plastic. Level 1 was excavated to approximately 24 cmbd and had a higher density of artifacts (929), with ceramics being the most numerous. There were 313 pieces of whiteware recovered along with 59 pieces of flow blue, 16 porcelain, four salt glazed stoneware, three glazed ware and earthenware, two annular banded ware, black transferprint, blue edge decorated ware and hand painted ware. Brick building materials were the next most numerous (227) followed by glass with 47 clear container glass, 46 aqua flat glass, 34 brown container glass, four aqua container glass and clear flat glass, two amethyst and green container glass. This level also produced 45 square nails, 23 round nails, 13 pieces of unidentifiable miscellaneous metal, two chain fragments, one knife and one D-ring and one lightbulb base. Ecofacts recovered from this level include 48 pieces of bone and two pieces of shell, while modern miscellaneous artifacts include three pieces of plastic and one plastic comb fragment. Personal items recovered from this level include two buttons and one penny and a high number of lithic artifacts were recovered, including 14 flakes and a single end scraper.
Level 2 was excavated to approximately 35 cmbd and contained 163 artifacts. Ceramics were the most numerous including 45 whiteware, 13 flow blue, two porcelain and one multicolor transferprint and blue decorated edge ware, while building materials were the next numerous with 33 brick pieces, two pieces of coal and a single piece of wood. A total of 34 flakes and one biface fragment were also recovered from this level, as were five square nails, 16 pieces of bone, five pieces of aqua container glass, two pieces of brown and clear container glass. Artifact densities continued to decrease in Level 3, which was excavated to 45 cmbd and contained only 24 artifacts including 11 lithic flakes, three pieces of brick, five whiteware, two pieces of bone and three pipe stem fragments. Excavation stopped at the base of Level 3 and the east and north walls were profiled.

Unit 8

Three levels were excavated in Unit 8 to a total depth of 43cmbd. Level 0 was excavated down to approximately 10 cmbd and contained just 19 artifacts including 10 brick, three clear flat glass, two clear container glass, one aqua container glass, two pieces of unidentifiable miscellaneous metal and a single piece of plastic. Level 1 was excavated to 23 cmbd and contained 313 artifacts. Fifty-seven pieces of brick were recovered along with 24 pieces of whiteware, three pieces of porcelain, two pieces of earthenware and a single piece of decorated ware. Glass artifacts consisted of 18 clear container glass, 14 clear flat glass, 13 brown container glass, six aqua container glass and a single piece of amethyst container glass, milk glass and aqua flat glass. Metal artifacts were more numerous and contained square nails (80), round nails (22), unidentifiable miscellaneous metal (3), staples (2), one suspender fastener and one hose attachment. Additionally, 46 pieces of bone, eight marbles, eight pieces of plastic and a single piece of natural stone were recovered.
Level 2 had a significantly higher artifact density (948 artifacts) with ecofacts being most numerous, primarily due to a high concentration of bone in the unit (371). Metal artifacts from Level 2 include 110 square nails, 35 pieces of unidentifiable miscellaneous metal, 28 round nails and a single fastener, one lightbulb base, one metal ring, one spike, one spring and one washer. Brick was the only building material present in the unit, with 152 pieces. Glass artifacts was the next most numerous category containing 78 pieces of clear container glass, 51 pieces of aqua flat glass, 18 pieces of aqua container glass, five pieces of green container glass, three pieces of brown container glass, two pieces of clear flat glass and a single piece of amethyst container glass and milk glass. Ceramic artifacts include 61 pieces of whiteware, four salt glazed stoneware, three pieces of porcelain, two black transferprint, two yellowware and one piece of brown transferprint. Personal artifacts recovered include nine buttons, one clay pipe fragment, one cosmetic tin. Lastly, a single lithic flake and one modern, plastic comb were recovered from this level. Two additional artifacts were recovered (one hinge and one piece of unidentifiable miscellaneous metal) though their exact provenience is unknown. Excavation ceased at the base of Level 2 at 43 cmbd and the east, west and south walls of the unit were drawn in profile.

Unit 9

Unit 9 was a one by two meter unit that was excavated to a depth of 30 cmbd. A total of 781 artifacts were recovered from the unit and a majority of those artifacts came from Level 2. The first level of excavation (Level 00) produced 31 artifacts including 14 brick, five coal, two pieces of aqua container glass, four pieces of aqua flat glass, one piece of barrel strapping and five bone fragments. Two hundred and six artifacts were recovered from Level 1 and metal artifacts were by far the most numerous including 42 square nails, 15 round nails, 16 pieces of unidentifiable miscellaneous metal, seven bottle cap fragments, two pieces of wire and a single
Ceramic artifacts recovered include 40 pieces of whiteware and a single piece of black transferprint, earthenware and salt glazed stoneware. Building materials recovered include brick (32), while glass recovered from the unit includes aqua flat glass (23), clear flat glass (4), clear container glass (6), aqua container glass (4), brown container glass (2) and amethyst container glass (1). Additionally, two pieces of plastic, four pieces of wood, one piece of bone and one button were recovered from this level.

Level 2 was excavated down 30 cmbd and contained the bulk of the material from the unit. Building materials made up most of the material from this level with 182 pieces of brick. The Ceramics consisted mainly of whiteware (100), flow blue (4), black transferprint (3), yellow ware (3), blue transferprint (1), purple transferprint (1), salt glazed earthenware (1) and salt glazed stoneware (1). Glass artifacts recovered from this level include 54 pieces of aqua flat glass, three pieces of clear flat glass, 19 aqua container glass, 16 clear container glass, two green and brown container glass, one piece of cobalt container glass and one piece of mirror glass. One lithic flake was found along with one buckle, two sprockets, one staple, two pieces of unidentifiable miscellaneous metal and 17 pieces of wire. Ecofacts include bone (49) and wood (4), while modern miscellaneous artifacts include linoleum (62) and plastic (10). The only personal artifact recovered from this level is one pipe bowl fragment. Excavation ceased at the bottom of Level 2 at 30 cmbd and the north and east walls were recorded and drawn in profile.

Unit 10

Unit 10 was placed at the front of the house, on the northeast side of the structure. A porch stood at this location but was removed prior to the field school and as a result, Unit 10 had a piling or footing from this porch it its northwest quadrant. Seven levels were excavated in Unit 10 to a total depth of approximately 50 cmbd. Level 0 contained only 16 artifacts including five
bricks, one piece of miscellaneous building material, mortar and wood, as well as a single piece of red ware, one piece of clear container glass, three round nails, one piece of unidentifiable miscellaneous metal, one window screen clamp and one bone fragment. While few artifacts were recovered from this level, artifact densities increased greatly in the subsequent levels. Level 1 contained 244 artifacts, most of which were building materials that consisted of brick (41), mortar (74), window caulking (21) and stucco (3). The level also contained many ecofacts including wood (35) and coal (34.9g), along with unidentifiable miscellaneous metal (21), round nails (8), square nails (2), screws (2), one piece of foil and one spring. Ceramics were limited in this level and only included two pieces of earthenware and one piece of whiteware. Glass artifacts included aqua flat glass (17) while modern miscellaneous artifacts recovered include plastic (5) and a cigarette filter. Bone (5), natural stone (23.5g) and coins were also found in this level. Level 2 contained mostly building materials again, made up of brick (19), mortar (6), miscellaneous building material (2) and a single piece of drain tile and flagstone. Ceramics recovered include rockingham (1), unglazed ceramic (2) and yellow ware (1), while glass consisted of clear chimney lamp glass (10), aqua flat glass (4), clear flat glass (2), clear container glass (3), amber container glass (1) and green container glass (1). Metal artifacts found include ten round nails, 13 square nails, 14 pieces of unidentifiable miscellaneous metal and one staple. Ecofacts include bone (2) and coal (0.6g), while plastic (2) were the only modern miscellaneous artifacts recovered.

Level 3 was by far the densest level and made up most of metal artifacts including 153 pieces of unidentifiable miscellaneous metal, 25 square nails, four round nails, two ammunition casings and a single spoon. Building materials consisted of brick (58), miscellaneous building material (35) and drain tile (8). Few ceramics were found including ten pieces of rockingham,
one whiteware, one flow blue and one ironstone. Glass artifacts found include clear container glass (5), clear chimney lamp glass (3), aqua flat glass (13), aqua container glass (2) and amethyst container glass (2). Ecofacts found include wood (3), charcoal (2), bone (4), shell (1) and coal (116.7g). Two lithic flakes were recovered, as were one glass bead and one piece of plastic. In Level 4 artifact frequencies declined slightly, with only 150 artifacts recovered. Building materials were again most numerous with 24 brick and 71 mortar, while glass was sparse (one clear chimney lamp glass, three clear container glass and one aqua flat glass), as were lithics (three flakes) ecofacts (three coal and five bone) and natural stone (23.7g). Metal artifacts included 31 square nails, seven round nails and one ammunition casing. Level 5 contained fewer artifacts still with five pieces of brick, 10 mortar, one piece of miscellaneous building materials, two clear container glass fragments, four flakes, one square nail, two pieces of unidentifiable miscellaneous metal, five clinkers and 33 pieces of natural stone. Level 6 was the final level excavated in this unit and contained four pieces of mortar, four pieces of unidentifiable miscellaneous metal and three natural stones. The center of this unit contained a large disturbance from a trench associated with the plumbing of the house and remained unexcavated. The south and the east walls were drawn in profile from this unit.

Unit 11

Six levels were excavated in Unit 11 which produced 4,814 artifacts and three cultural features. Level 00 was the first level excavated and extended down to just 3-4 cmbd. This level contained six of brick, 23 mortar, 195.0g of coal, six pieces of wood, one aqua container glass, two aqua flat glass, one clear flat glass, one fork and one soda can tab. Level 1 extended from approximately 3 cmbd to 16 cmbd. Level 1 contained 2,364 artifacts, which accounts for 80% of the artifacts recovered from this whole unit. Level 1 contained a great deal of brick (475) and
mortar (1,424), as well as wood (155), coal (55), window caulking (14), charcoal (5), shingles (3) and paint chips (1). Ceramics recovered from this level consisted mainly of whiteware (23), along with some flow blue (5), terracotta (2), yellow ware (1), black transferprint (1), red ware (1), rockingham (1), miscellaneous decorated ware (1) and salt glazed earthenware (1). Glass found in this level consisted of amethyst container glass (1), aqua container glass (13), brown container glass (2), clear chimney lamp glass (14), clear container glass (22) frosted container glass (3), green container glass (1), aqua flat glass (64) and clear flat glass (14). Metal artifacts found include unidentifiable miscellaneous metal (235), square nails (64), round nails (32), ammunition casings (3), barrel strapping (2), buckles (2), caps (1), chain and hook (1), clamps (2), foil (1), keys (1), screws (2), shotgun shell (1), staples (1), washers (2) and wire (4). Twelve lithic flakes and one piece of chert were recovered from this level, as were 20 pennies, 27 pieces of plastic, 14 bone fragments, one clay bead, one glass bead, three buttons, two cigarette filters, three pieces of paper, 141.6 grams of natural stone, one plastic comb fragment, one porcelain doll bust and two pieces of polystyrene.

Level 2 was not evenly excavated throughout the unit. The northwest corner was excavated from 18 to 26 cmbd and the center of the unit was excavated from 15 to 26 cmbd while the northeast, southeast and southwest corners remained at 16, 18 and 13 cmbd respectively. Level 2 contained a lower concentration of artifacts than Level 1, most of which were metal artifacts that included unidentifiable miscellaneous metal (128), round nails (31) and square nails (16). Building materials recovered consisted of brick (90) and mortar (8). Eleven pieces of whiteware were recovered, as were 39 pieces of aqua flat glass, 13 clear container glass, ten clear chimney lamp glass and one piece each of clear flat glass, aqua container glass and brown container glass. Two lithic flakes were recovered along with one button, one medallion, 12 pieces of bone, 62
pieces of wood, four pieces of charcoal, 376.3 grams of coal and 13 pieces of plastic. In Level 2 Feature 2 was identified and consisted of flagstones, which were the original entry steps to the original porch to the structure.

Level 3 was excavated from 26 cmbd to approximately 36 cmbd though the northeast and southeast corners stayed at 16 cmbd and the southwest corner stayed at 13 cmbd. At this point the southwest portion of the unit consisted of Feature 2 and contained flagstones, which were not excavated. Feature 3 was also identified in the northeast corner of the unit in this level. Though it was excavated separately it was determined that this feature was the result of rodent activity. The artifact density continued to decrease as the levels increased, so only 68 artifacts were recovered in this level. Most of the artifacts found in this level were building materials including brick (9), cement (12), limestone (162.8 grams), and mortar (13).

Little glass was found (two aqua flat glass and four aqua container glass) and few ceramics were recovered (one piece of whiteware). Metal artifacts consisted only of eight pieces of unidentifiable metal while miscellaneous artifacts consisted of a single clay bead, two pennies and 9.3 grams of natural stone. Four lithic flakes, four pieces of coal and eight pieces of wood were also found in this level. Level 2/3 was an intermittent level that was not excavated throughout the entire unit and was instead restricted to the southeast corner of the unit to bring the entire unit down to the same level. An area approximately 25 cm (east-west) by 100 cm (north-south) was a wall separating Units 10 and 11 (the very southeastern corner of the unit) was left in place between levels two and three and taken down to level the floor in this unit from 16 cmbd to 36 cmbd. Artifacts recovered include six brick, one wood, three grams of coal and one piece of porcelain ceramics. Because the southern portion of Unit 11 contained flagstones and the eastern portion of the unit was excavated as a feature (Feature 3), only the northwest
portion of the unit was excavated from 36 cmbd to 44 cmbd in Level 4. This level contained 74 artifacts including 48 pieces of wood, 12 pieces of mortar, three pieces of brick, four grams of coal, one piece of brown container glass, two pieces of unidentifiable miscellaneous metal, three pieces of bone and five natural stones.

Level 5 was excavated down to 55 cmbd and contained even less material including brick (1), wood (1), coal (1.3 grams), whiteware (1), clear chimney lamp glass (1), clear decorative glass (2), one lithic flake, unidentifiable miscellaneous metal (1), one unidentifiable nail, one first aid cream tube and natural stone (25). Additional artifacts were recovered from the unit, though their exact provenience is unknown including nine pieces of clear container glass, three pieces of cobalt container glass, two pieces of aqua flat glass, four round nails and one square nail. Excavation ceased at approximately 55 cmbd.

Unit 12

Six levels were excavated in this unit to a maximum depth of 50 cmbd. Level 0 consisted of just the sod layer, was 2-3 cm thick and produced brick (27), caulking (7), coal (54), miscellaneous building materials (41), roofing shingles (5), clear container glass (1), round nails (3), screws (2), unidentifiable miscellaneous metal (2), wire (1), one button, one coin and two pieces of natural stone. Level 1 was excavated to an average depth of 12 cmbd and contained a significantly higher concentration of artifacts (1070). Building materials made up the largest percentage of artifacts recovered from this level and included 307 miscellaneous building materials, 159 brick, 83.7g of limestone, 43 masonry, 12 roofing shingles and one piece of caulking. Additionally, 257 pieces of wood, 57 coal, 56 mortar and one piece of tar paper were also recovered. The southeastern corner of the unit contained a dark stain that appeared around 8 cmbd that was designated Area B. Ceramics recovered from Level 1 were limited to just two
pieces of whiteware, while glass included amethyst glass (1), aqua container glass (5), blue container glass (1), brown container glass (1), clear container glass (15), green container glass (3), aqua flat glass (23) and clear flat glass (5). Seven lithic flakes and one biface fragment were recovered, as were three ammunition casings, one nut, eight round nails, six square nails, 28 unidentifiable miscellaneous metal pieces and 17 unidentified nails. Personal items from this level include two glass beads, two shell buttons, one glass button, one metal button, 23 pennies and one cufflink. Additionally, one piece of FCR, one toothpaste tube, one pencil lead, 14 pieces of plastic and three natural stones were also recovered from this level.

Level 2 was excavated down to 24 cmbd and contained 928 artifacts. Building materials again made up a majority of the artifacts recovered including 217 brick, seven flagstones, 16 limestone, 23 masonry, 180 miscellaneous building materials, 20 mortar, nine roofing shingles and one roofing tile. Ceramics recovered include three whiteware and one stoneware, while glass included two aqua container glass, one brown container glass, 27 clear container glass, five green container glass, 80 aqua flat glass and one piece of clear flat glass. Seventeen lithic flakes and two pieces of lithic shatter were recovered, as were two ammunition casings, one piece of foil, one lead musket ball, one metal ring, two round nails, 53 unidentifiable miscellaneous metal and 14 unidentifiable nails. Ecofacts recovered include 23 pieces of wood, 19 charcoal, 47 coal, while personal items include four glass buttons, one shell button and five pennies. Additionally, seven pieces of plastic, 20 natural stones, one rubber stopper and 17 pieces of polystyrene were also recovered. Area B in the southeastern corner of the unit was excavated down to 10 cmbd and designated Feature 2 then left alone to be excavated separately.

Level 3 was excavated to an average depth of 30 cmbd and contained significantly fewer artifacts, only 89. Building materials were again the most numerous (13 brick and 36 pieces of
miscellaneous building materials) and the categories of metal (one key, one round nail, 12 unidentifiable miscellaneous metal), glass (one clear container glass, four aqua flat glass), lithics (seven flakes, one projectile point) and personal items (one button, one coin), ecofacts (five charcoal, 249.1 grams of coal and two FCR), modern miscellaneous (1 plastic) and natural stone (3) made up less than half of the artifacts recovered from this level. Another feature (Feature 5) was identified in the western portion of the unit. Feature 5 was a rectangular stain identified 40 to 150 cm north of the unit’s datum that extended 70 cm from the western wall. Level 4 was excavated to 39 cmbd and contained even fewer artifacts including two brick, 23 coal, four masonry, five miscellaneous building materials, one wood, two flakes and 16 pieces of unidentifiable miscellaneous metal.

Level 5 was the final level excavated in this unit which extended down to 50 cmbd and contained 44 artifacts including brick (5), coal (36.9g), mortar (12), clear chimney lamp glass (1), clear container glass (1), lithic flakes (3), unidentifiable miscellaneous metal (15), bone (6) and a single penny. In Level 5 it was discovered that a modern pipe ran through the northern portion of the unit diagonally (from the southwest to the northeast). The pipe entered the unit approximately 110 cm north of the unit datum and was approximately 15 cm in diameter. The profile of the west and north walls were drawn, as was the profile of the southwest corner of the unit. An additional twelve pieces of brick, eight coal, 15 miscellaneous building material, two mortar, one aqua container glass, one flake, one round nail, 20 unidentifiable miscellaneous metal and one glass button were recovered, though their provenience is unknown.

Unit 13

Seven levels were excavated in Unit 13 to an average depth of 63 cmbd, producing a total of 2,954 artifacts. Level 00 was the sod layer and was approximately 10cm thick, extending
down to 17 cmbd and contained no artifacts. Level 1 extended down to approximately 20 cmbd and contained 1,521 artifacts. Building materials constituted a majority of the assemblage from this level including 877 brick, 161 mortar and 18 miscellaneous building material). Ceramics from Level 1 included whiteware (67), flow blue (22), rockingham (2), pink decorated ware (2), porcelain (1) and red ware (1), while glass included aqua container glass (26), brown container glass (15), clear container glass (23), frosted container glass (6), clear decorative glass (2), aqua flat glass (11) and clear flat glass (7). Metal artifacts also made up a substantial portion of the artifacts recovered from this level and include one piece of barrel strapping, one bolt, one lead bullet, 47 miscellaneous building materials, five found nails, 25 square nails, one tack and one wire. Ecofacts recovered include 170 bone, three wood, as well as charcoal (14.6g), coal (33.4g), shell (1), FCR (1) and limestone (645.7g). Lastly, four pieces of plastic, one clay pipestem and one natural stone were recovered. Additionally, three biface fragments and 14 lithic flakes were found in this level.

Level 2 was excavated to an average depth of 28 cmbd and contained a slightly lower artifact density, containing only 1,144 artifacts. Like most other levels, building materials made up most of the assemblage and included 685 brick, 84 miscellaneous building materials and 11 mortar. Ceramics recovered consisted mostly of whiteware (54), followed by flow blue (16), rockingham (7), pink decorated ware (1) and red ware (1), while the glass assemblage contained 16 aqua container glass, 28 brown container glass, 26 clear container glass, 14 aqua flat glass and a single piece of clear flat glass. The number of metal artifacts found in this level decreased greatly and only 30 unidentifiable miscellaneous metal, 14 square nails and three tacks were recovered. Lithic artifacts found include 36 flakes, as was one corner notched projectile point base, while ecofacts include 106 pieces of bone, one shell and 9.1 grams of coal. Other items
found in this level include two buttons, six pieces of FCR, one nickel and 51.5 grams of natural stone.

Level 3 was excavated to an average depth of 38 cmbd and contained a much lower artifact concentration than previous levels (227) including brick (82), coal (1.0g), mortar (39), wood (1), flow blue ceramics (2), whiteware (6), brown container glass (3), clear container glass (6), aqua flat glass (1), clear flat glass (3), lithic flakes (47), Unidentifiable miscellaneous metal (2), round nails (2), FCR (13) and bone (20). Artifact frequencies continued to decline in subsequent levels with Level 4 containing nine brick, 31 flakes, one piece of unidentifiable miscellaneous metal, one bone and two FCR, while Level 5 contained five brick, one mortar 4.4 grams of coal and four flakes. Level six contained seven flakes, while one additional flake was found in the scrapings from the southern wall of the unit. Excavation ceased at the base of Level 6 at 63 cmbd and the south and west walls of the unit were drawn in profile.

**Unit 14**

Seven levels were excavated to a total depth of 58 cmbd and produced a total of 1,544 artifacts. Level 00 was excavated to approximately 10 cmbd and contained only three pieces of aqua flat glass and two pieces of plastic though the subsequent levels were much more dense. Level 1 was excavated to an average depth of 20 cmbd and contained 580 artifacts including brick (154), charcoal (2), coal (45.3g), miscellaneous building materials (56), mortar (5), wood (17), black transferprint ceramics (4), edge decorated ceramics (1), flow blue (6), porcelain (2), rockingham (1), whiteware (35), aqua container glass (30), brown container glass (1), clear chimney lamp glass (2), clear container glass (10), aqua flat glass (12), one biface fragment, flakes (21), a single buckle, one clasp, one metal clip, round nails (16), scissors (1), square nails (27), unidentifiable miscellaneous metal (68), one metal washer, one wire, 73 bone, one button,
one clay pigeon, 19 FCR, one lead bullet, three natural stone, one pencil lead, two pennies, one nickel and one piece of plastic.

The density of artifacts continued to increase in level two, which produced 721 artifacts and was excavated to 26 cmbd. Building materials recovered from this level include 303 brick, one burnt unidentified artifact, three pieces of caulking, seven pieces of cement, 15 miscellaneous building materials and five mortar. Ceramics included black transferprint (3), edge decorated ware (1), flow blue (15), porcelain (2), rockingham (1), whiteware (26) and glass artifacts included container glass that was aqua (28), brown (1), and clear (1) along with flat glass that was aqua (16) and clear (3). Thirty-one lithic flakes were found in this level, along with one nut and bolt, one gun trigger, one metal rod, six round nails, one spike, 12 square nails, nine pieces of unidentifiable miscellaneous metal, 194 bone, 18 charcoal, eight pieces of coal, three pieces of wood, one button, one lead bullet, one piece of plastic and 26.5 grams of natural stone.

Level 3 was excavated to an average depth of 35 cmbd and contained fewer artifacts, only 171 total artifacts. Building materials included 31 brick and 11 miscellaneous building material, while ceramics artifacts included two flow blue, two rockingham and 15 whiteware and glass artifacts included container glass that was aqua (14), brown (1) and clear (1), as well as one piece of aqua flat glass. Lithic artifacts increased in this level and contained one biface fragment, three end scrapers, 31 flakes and one Madison projectile point. Metal artifacts included one round nail, two screws, one square nail, four unidentifiable miscellaneous metal pieces and one piece of wire and ecofacts included ten coal, nine pieces of wood, 27 pieces of bone and one piece of FCR. The only modern artifact recovered was one piece of plastic. Artifact frequencies decreased dramatically in subsequent levels. Level 4 was excavated to 42 cmbd and included three pieces
of brick, two coal, 12 mortar, one wood, one flow blue, one whiteware, 24 flakes, three square nails and two pieces of bone. Level 5 was excavated to approximately 50 cmbd and contained only two pieces of mortar, eight lithic flakes, one screw, two square nails and one piece of bone. Level 6 was the final level excavated to a depth of 58 cmbd and contained two pieces of brick and two lithic flakes. Once excavation was complete the west and south unit walls were drawn in profile.

Unit 15

Unit 15 was one of densest units excavated at the Chief Richardville House, containing 3,844 artifacts in its six levels. Level 00 was excavated to an average depth of 7 cmbd and contained five pieces of brick, nine shingles, three pieces of flow blue, one whiteware, one piece of clear container glass, one lithic flake and two pieces of plastic. Level 1 was excavated to an average depth of 15 cmbd and consisted of mainly building materials including brick (354), miscellaneous building materials (115) and mortar (205). Ceramics recovered include two black transferprint, three decorated ware, one earthenware, 43 flow blue, one porcelain, two red ware, one stoneware, 112 whiteware and one yellow ware, while glass included one amethyst container glass, six aqua container glass, one brown container glass, 29 clear container glass, two clear decorative glass, one milk glass, 33 aqua flat glass and 11 clear flat glass. Metal artifacts found in this level include one annunciation casing, one piece of lead, one magnet, one nut, two round nails, two screws, two silverware handles, 13 square nails, 17 pieces of unidentifiable miscellaneous metal and one wire, while ecofacts include 26 bone, twelve coal, one FCR and three walnut shells. One button, eight pieces of plastic, one plastic comb fragment and four lithic flakes were also recovered from this level.

Level 2 was excavated to approximately 25 cmbd and was the densest level in the unit,
containing 1,989 artifacts. Most of the material recovered were building materials including brick (932), cement (13), miscellaneous building materials (60) and slate (2), while ceramics included black transferprint (2), decorated ware (3), flow blue (146), porcelain (2), red ware (1), refined earthenware (1), rockingham (1), stoneware (2), whiteware (287) and yellow ware (1). Glass artifacts recovered from Level 2 include container glass that is aqua (15), brown (2), clear (66), frosted (2), green (1) as well as clear decorative glass (4), milk glass (1) and aqua flat glass (101). Lithic artifacts include two biface fragments, ten flakes and one probable Late Archaic humpback projectile point and metal artifacts include two pieces of aluminum, one bolt, two bottle caps, two metal rings, one piece of decorated metal, one fence nail, two lantern brackets, 14 round nails, 37 square nails, one tack, 30 pieces of unidentifiable miscellaneous metal, three pieces of wire and one wrench. Personal items recovered from Level 2 include three glass beads, two buttons, two clinkers, one clothing eyelet, one suspender fastener, one cufflink, one pipe bowl and two pipe stems, while ecofacts included 165 bone, one piece of FCR, 19 charcoal and 34 coal. Lastly, seven grams of natural stone and two pieces of plastic were recovered.

Level 3 was excavated to an average depth of 32 cmbd and contained 666 artifacts. Building materials once again made up the bulk of these artifacts including brick (273), miscellaneous building materials (70), and mortar (7). Ceramics made up a large portion of the artifacts recovered from this level and included 12 black transferprint, 71 flow blue, one red ware and 79 pieces of whiteware. Glass artifacts include one aqua container glass, one brown container glass, 29 clear container glass and ten pieces of aqua flat glass. Lithic artifacts found include one biface fragment, 24 flakes and one modified flake. Metal artifacts include one fence nail, seven square nails and nine pieces of unidentifiable miscellaneous metal, while ecofacts include 51 bone, 12 FCR, 4.7 grams of coal and two pieces of burnt limestone. Three pieces of
natural stone and one piece of plastic were also recovered from this level. Two additional levels were excavated in this unit though artifact frequencies decreased dramatically. Level 4 was excavated to 40 cmbd and contained 81 artifacts including brick (29), coal (1.4g), miscellaneous building material (1), mortar (1), black transferprint ceramic (1), whiteware (8), clear container glass (1), clear decorated glass (1), frosted container glass (2), aqua flat glass (2), lithic flakes (22), round nail (1), square nail (1), one metal wheel, bone (3) and FCR (7). Level 5 was excavated to 48 cmbd and contained one piece of brick, one miscellaneous building material, one whiteware, 56 flakes and three pieces of bone. Eight additional pieces of bone were retrieved from the west profile wall, while one piece of brick and two pieces of whiteware had no known provenience. Once excavation was complete the west and south walls of the unit were drawn in profile.

Unit 16

Seven levels were excavated in this unit to an average depth of 65 cmbd. This unit was by far the densest unit excavated at the site and contained 121,116 artifacts. Level 00 was excavated to approximately 10 cmbd and contained brick (191), miscellaneous building materials (19), one roofing shingle, wood (2), flow blue ceramics (2), ironstone ceramics (3), whiteware ceramics (3), clear container glass (1), clear flat glass (1), round nails (4), one square nail, plastic (2) and one piece of rubber. Level 1 was excavated to an average depth of 20 cmbd and contained mostly building materials including brick (2660), cement (16), masonry (1) miscellaneous building materials (538), mortar (642), roofing shingles (6) and wood (7). Ceramic artifacts recovered from Level 1 include one blue decorated ware, two blue transferprints, 186 flow blue, two gray transferprint, 15 ironstone, three porcelain, six red ware, one rockingham, 128 whiteware and two yellow ware, while glass artifacts contained container glass in amber (1), amethyst
decorative glass (6), aqua (15), brown (2), clear (36) and green (3), as well as clear chimney lamp glass (11), clear decorative glass (4), aqua flat glass (172) and clear flat glass (38). Five lithic flakes were recovered along with one firing cap, one metal hook, one pair of pliers, one roofing nail, 22 round nails, 1 pair of scissors, two screws, one spoon, 57 square nails, two staples, two tacks and 14 unidentifiable miscellaneous metal. Ecofacts recovered from this level include 39.5 grams of coal and 29 pieces of bone, while personal items included two buttons, one clinker, three mirror fragments and one pipe bowl. Eight pieces of natural stone, 14 pieces of plastic, three plastic comb fragments, one plastic food spear, ten pieces of slate and one whetstone were also recovered.

Level 2 was excavated to an average depth of 22 cmbd and consisted of mainly building materials including brick (2322), cement (11), masonry (25) and mortar (91). Ceramics recovered from this level include flow blue (30), gray transferprint (3), ironstone (6), porcelain (1), red ware (1), rockingham (6), whiteware (128) and yellow ware (2), while glass included amethyst decorative glass (2), amber decorative glass (2), aqua container glass (22), black container glass (1), blue container glass (1), clear chimney lamp glass (35), clear container glass (13), clear decorative glass (13), green container glass (1), aqua flat glass (181) and clear flat glass (15). Two lithic flakes were recovered, as were one fence nail, ten round nails, 59 square nails, one tack, 57 unidentifiable miscellaneous metal, one wire, 20 pieces of bone, one button, 87 clinkers, 20.7 grams of FCR, one marble, 144 natural stones, one pipestem, two pieces of plastic and one walnut shell, 3.8 grams of coal and 11 pieces of wood.

Level 3 was excavated to approximately 36 cmbd and contained 3,447 artifacts. As with the other levels building materials made up the majority of artifacts recovered from this level including 1,979 brick, 534 cement, 235 flagstone and mortar, 334 miscellaneous building
material and 38 mortar. Ceramics recovered from this level include 64 flow blue, four gray transferprint and 28 whiteware, while glass recovered from this level consisted of one amber container glass, ten aqua container glass, one brown container glass, 15 clear chimney lamp glass, two pieces of clear container glass, 55 aqua flat glass and 22 clear flat glass. One piece of lithic shatter and 14 flakes were recovered, along with one metal hinge, one pair of scissors, 20 square nails, two staples, 35 pieces of unidentifiable miscellaneous metal, 26 pieces of bone, one button, two pieces of charcoal, one clinker, ten natural stones, one pipe bowl, one piece of plastic, six charcoal, 3.2 grams of coal, four pieces of wood and one walnut shell. Artifact densities decreased dramatically following level three.

Level 4 was excavated to approximately 45 cmbd and contained 382 artifacts. Much like the previous levels building materials constituted the majority of the artifacts recovered from this level and included brick (69) and miscellaneous building materials (265). Ceramics recovered included eight flow blue and seven whiteware, glass included one clear chimney lamp glass, two clear container glass and seven aqua flat glass and lithic materials recovered included 14 flakes and one hammerstone. Metal artifacts included one square nail and two pieces of unidentifiable miscellaneous metal and ecofacts consisted of charcoal (21.5g), coal (6.0g) and FCR (1). One clay pipestem, 45.0 grams of clinkers and three natural stone were also recovered. Level 5 was excavated to a depth of 55 cmbd and contained 19 artifacts including three bricks, three miscellaneous building materials, one mortar, four pieces of wood and eight lithic flakes. Level 6 was excavated to 65 cmbd and contained 16 artifacts including two bricks, seven miscellaneous building materials, five pieces of mortar, one piece of wood and one lithic flake. An additional 19 pieces of brick and four pieces of whiteware ceramics were recovered though their provenience is unknown. Once excavation ceased the south, north and east walls of the unit
were drawn in profile.

Feature 1

One feature was identified in the 1992 season in Unit 2. The feature was identified in Level 2 of the unit and defined and designated a feature at the base of Level 2 at about 20 cmbd. Feature 1 was a dark, square stain surrounded by another circular stain (Figure 4.16). This feature was interpreted to be a square post that was replaced by a circular post and associated with later activity at the house. Artifacts recovered from the feature include three pieces of unidentifiable miscellaneous metal.

![Figure 4.16 Feature 1 plan view (photograph courtesy of R. Jeske, 1992)](image)

Feature 2

Feature 2 was identified north of the structure in Units 11 and 12 beneath the porch that was removed from the house. In Unit 11, Feature 2 was identified in Level 1 as flagstones of an original porch to the house at approximately 8 cmbd (Figure 4.17).
The feature extended west into Unit 12 and was also identified around 8 cmbd (Figure 4.18). In addition to a flagstone foundation, a dark (10YR 3/1) circular stain was identified and interpreted to be the base of a pillar or column that belonged to the original entry porch. Given that this feature was found in this location and the fact that the house was originally constructed in the Greek Revival style, it is safe to assume that the house originally contained a matching porch that was also in the Greek Revival style.
A feature trench was excavated around the flagstones in Unit 11, which contained brick (50), coal (134.8 g), mortar (116), wood (67), whiteware (3), aqua flat glass (15), one clear container glass, one ammunition casing, one metal cylinder, one round nail, seven square nails, one tack, 53 pieces of unidentifiable miscellaneous metal, one penny, two leather laces, four paint chips, one pendant, one button, 57 natural stones and 11 pieces of plastic. Level 1 of the feature contained drain tile (1), flow blue ceramics (4), earthenware (2), salt glazed earthenware (1), terra-cotta (6), whiteware (16) and one button. Level 2 contained 15 brick, three cement, 761.3 g of coal, 12 masonry stones, six miscellaneous building material, one piece of bone, one piece of wood, two pieces of clear flat glass, five pieces of aqua flat glass, six pieces of flow blue, one red ware, one salt glazed earthenware, 82 terra-cotta, 20 whiteware, one yellow ware, five lithic flakes, two round nails, one glass bead, two clay pigeons, one clay pipe fragment, 13 natural stones, four pennies, three pieces of plastic and one rubber ball. No artifacts were recovered from Level 3. In Unit 12 artifacts were recovered while cleaning the feature and were labeled as Level 1/2/3 and included two brick, 24.6 g of coal, 16 miscellaneous building material, two wood, two aqua flat glass, one lithic flake, one square nail, two unidentifiable miscellaneous metal and one buffalo head nickel. Excavation ceased at Level 3 though one piece of brick was recovered and labeled as being from Level 4. This was likely recovered at the base of level three as the feature was being cleaned. An additional piece of flow blue ceramic and one lithic flake were recovered though their provenience is unknown. The east, west and north walls were drawn in profile.

Feature 3

Feature 3 was identified in the northeastern portion of Unit 11 and the northwestern portion of Unit 10 in Level 1 and defined around 18 cmbd. This feature was a dark (10YR3/1)
amorphous stain that was excavated in three levels (Figure 4.19). The bulk of the feature lay in Unit 10 and was excavated in six levels, while only three levels were excavated in Unit 11.

![Image](image.jpg)

*Figure 4.19 Feature 3 in Unit 10 (photograph courtesy of R. Jeske, 1995)*

Level 1 extended from 18 cmbd to 28 cmbd and contained brick (28), coal (102.4g), cement (3), drain tile (2), flagstone (8), wood (1), miscellaneous building materials (3), paint chips (24), wood (1), whiteware (5), terra-cotta (1), ironstone (1), chimney lamp glass (2), clear container glass (3), aqua flat glass (3), square nails (8), ammunition casing (1), car insurance plate (1), makeup compact (1), unidentifiable miscellaneous metal (65), round nails (3), cork (2) and natural stone (10). Level 2 contained 143 brick, 15 cement, two charcoal, 580.9 grams of coal, five miscellaneous building material, 157 mortar, 34 pieces of wood, one flow blue ceramic, one ironstone, one red ware, seven rockingham, one unglazed ceramic, nine whiteware, 29 aqua flat glass, seven clear container glass, one brown container glass, one aqua container glass, one piece of chert, eight lithic flakes, three ammunition casings, seven pieces of unidentifiable miscellaneous metal, five round nails, 14 square nails, six natural stones, three FCR and two pieces of plastic. Level 3 contained two pieces of brick, 16 charcoal, 3.4 grams of cinders, 1.2 grams of coal, one flagstone, two pieces of mortar, seven pieces of miscellaneous building materials, one whiteware, one clear chimney lamp glass, one aqua container glass, three
clear flat glass, one square nail, three unidentifiable miscellaneous metal, one button and 67 natural stones. Level 4 contained three brick, two rockingham, three unidentifiable miscellaneous metal and 37.6 grams of natural stone. Level 5 contained two pieces of mortar and one piece of rockingham ceramics and Level 6 contained one piece of FCR.

Artifacts recovered from the feature bulk wall include 39 brick, 32 charcoal, 126.9 grams of coal, 56 miscellaneous building materials, one piece of unglazed ceramic, four whiteware, three aqua container glass, five brown container glass, seven clear container glass, one frosted container glass, five round nails, 54 pieces of unidentifiable miscellaneous metal, one button and one piece of bone. The feature basin cut contained 81 pieces of unidentifiable miscellaneous metal. Additional artifacts recovered with unknown provenience include 203.3 grams of coal, two drain tile, 17 mortar, one piece of red ware ceramic, three rockingham, seven whiteware, one piece of brown container glass, one ammunition casing, one firming cap, one round nail, two square nails, 64 pieces of unidentifiable miscellaneous metal, one clothing eyelet, one piece of beaded jewelry and one plastic comb fragment. After excavation it was determined that this feature was the result of rodent activity. The north wall of the feature was drawn in profile.

**Feature 4**

No paperwork exists for Feature 4 but artifacts are labeled as being recovered from Feature 4. Level 2 of Feature 4 contained three pieces of bone while Level 4 contained 14 pieces of charcoal, one piece of coal, three pieces of bone and 49 pieces of natural stone.

**Feature 5**

Feature 5 was identified as a dark (10YR3/3) stain in the western portion of Unit 12 in Level 3 at 32 cmbd. The feature was rectangular in shape and extended down to 62 cmbd. Level 1 of the feature contained brick (44), cement (9), charcoal (67), coal (43), mortar (15), slate (24),
wood (44), earthenware (1), yellow ware (1), aqua container glass (1), clear container glass (3),
clear flat glass (4), one lithic blade, five lithic flakes, unidentifiable miscellaneous metal (124)
and natural stone (113). Level 2 contained coal (1), mortar (8), terracotta (3), aqua flat glass (2),
one lithic flake and two natural stones.

Other artifacts that were recovered with no provenience recorded include 44 brick, four
coal, 30 miscellaneous building material, 71 wood, two whiteware ceramics, two clear container
glass, eight aqua flat glass, nine clear flat glass, one lithic flake, one round nail, 257
unidentifiable miscellaneous metal, two pieces of fabric, six pieces of plastic and one toy jack.
Due to the mixture of materials found in this feature and the existence of a modern pipe this
feature is likely associated with construction episodes that took place at the structure and not
associated with the original occupants of the house (Figure 4.20). The south wall of the feature
was drawn in profile.

Figure 4.20: Feature 5 in Unit 12 and modern pipe (photograph courtesy of R. Jeske, 1995)

Feature 6

Feature 6 was identified in Unit 11 in Level 2 at 15 cmbd as a dark (10YR3/2) stain.
Artifacts recovered from the feature include brick (4), coal (28.5g), miscellaneous building
material (43), paint chips (6), whiteware ceramics (1), brown container glass (1), aqua flat glass
(7), one metal staple, two unidentifiable nails, unidentifiable miscellaneous metal (4), bone (8) and one penny. The feature was mixed throughout and determined to be the result of rodent activity at the site rather than a cultural feature. The west and north walls of the feature were drawn in profile.

The LaFontaine House

The LaFontaine House (12HU1013) is a second treaty house that was possibly built by Richardville. Whether he or his son-in-law built it is in dispute, but the property belonged to Richardville (Chief Jean Baptiste de Richardville NRHP nomination form). This structure is located in a more rural area than the Fort Wayne house, near Huntington, Indiana, where the Little River and Wabash River join (Figure 4.21). After construction of the Chief Richardville House in Fort Wayne, Richardville reportedly moved his trading operations down to the Forks of the Wabash in 1833 or 1834, though he continued to formally reside at the Chief Richardville House in Fort Wayne (Anson 1964).

Figure 4.21: LaFontaine House Location in Huntington, IN

Unlike the Chief Richardville House in Fort Wayne, the construction of the LaFontaine House was not formally documented, so a firm construction date for the house still remains
unknown (Edmunds 1996; Leonard 1990). The first mention of any structure at this location was in 1832, when a treaty was negotiated on the site (Zoll et al. 2000). Silverman (1971) places the construction date in 1833 in a Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) report of the structure created for the National Park Service. However, documentary evidence is not provided in the HABS report to support this date of construction.

Francis LaFontaine helped Richardville operate the trading post that existed on the property, took over operations of the post and residence of the structure probably before, but definitely after, Richardville’s death. The house officially passed to Richardville’s daughter Catherine, who was married to Francis LaFontaine and they reportedly lived at the house together (Zoll 2000). After Richardville’s death, the function of the house therefore shifted from one that only included business and trade, to one that also included a full family domestic residence. After Catherine’s death in 1866, her daughter Archangel inherited by house and the structure was occupied by Richardville’s descendants until 1943, when it was sold to Leo Zahn. Zahn then sold it to Luke Sheer in that same year (Anson 1964; Gernand 1990; Zoll et al. 2000).

The house measures approximately fifty-five by forty-two feet and is L-shaped, with a basement underlying the northern portion of the house, along with an attic and full second story above the southern portion of the house. It is approximately 2,010 square feet in size and contains ten rooms, as well as two porches (Historic American Buildings Survey [HABS] n.d.). The current kitchen was added to the northwest corner of the house in 1923, making the original structure approximately 1,834 square feet, which was a large structure for the time. Louvered shutters and gutters were also added to the house after the property was purchased by Mr. Sheer. Other changes include the restoration of the chimney to its original location at the front of the structure, as well as the installation of modern plumbing and a modern bathroom beneath the
stairs (Silverman 1971). The property remained empty from the 1960s until 1977, when the Huntington Junior Historical Society renovated the house. In 1978 it became the site for local fourth grade school tours and shortly thereafter, the Sam Rophchan Foundation in Fort Wayne awarded the Junior Historical Society a grant of $25,000 towards the purchase of the house. Along with the formation and assistance of the Historic Forks of the Wabash Inc. in 1987, the grant allowed for the purchase of the house, followed by the associated treaty grounds in 1990 (Gernand 1990). Though the house was not purchased until 1987, it was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1985.

*Francis LaFontaine*

Francis LaFontaine (Topeah) was born in 1810 to a Miami mother and a Métis father, also named Francis LaFontaine, who was descended from a Frenchman named Peter LaFontaine (Anson 1964). Though Francis (the younger) eventually married Richardville’s daughter Catherine and became chief of the tribe, the LaFontaine’s connection to Richardville’s family began quite early when Peter LaFontaine managed Charles Beaubien’s storehouse at Kekionga, followed by his son Francis (the older) (Anson 1964). Because Beaubien was Tacumwah’s second husband, it is likely that Richardville knew the LaFontaine’s quite well and established relationships with both of them at an early age. The older Francis died in 1831 or 1832, so between the birth of the younger Francis in 1810 and the death of the older Francis, it can be quite confusing to determine which Francis historical documents refer to (Anson 1964).

After the death of Richardville, the younger LaFontaine was appointed as the next principle chief of the Miami tribe and he fought just as ardently as Richardville against federal removal of the Miami from Indiana. While Richardville did sign the final treaty for Miami removal in 1840, it was not slated to take place for at least five years. Much like Richardville,
LaFontaine was a skilled negotiator and versed in American business practices and was able to delay Miami removal a bit longer. Between his appointment to chief in 1841 and the official removal in 1846, LaFontaine continually appealed to the United States in an attempt to delay Miami removal, arguing that the appointed reservation land in Kansas was not appropriate or sufficient for the Miami and he petitioned the government on behalf of many Miami families for the exemption from removal. LaFontaine also conveniently avoided council meetings at which details pertaining to removal would be decided and even made a trip to Washington at his own expense for one last attempt and plea to delay Miami removal (Anson 1964). Despite his best efforts, formal removal began in October 1846 and was complete by November of that same year.

Although LaFontaine was not as powerful a leader as Richardville, he was still a charismatic leader who was valued and respected by his tribe. In order to show his dedication to the tribe and ensure the reservation was suitable, LaFontaine accompanied the Miami to Kansas during their removal (Rafert 1996). While the removal of the Miami meant that the tribe was divided into two distinct and separate groups in 1846, LaFontaine remained the last uniting force among the tribe and all remained loyal to him, even those who traveled to Kansas (Anson 1964). Unfortunately, LaFontaine died in 1847 on his return trip from the Miami reservation in Kansas and the tribe lost its only unifying figure; the two factions of the tribe became estranged and have maintained a separation that is evident to this very day.

*Architectural Elements of the LaFontaine House*

The house is much more modest than Richardville’s Fort Wayne home. The LaFontaine House does contain Greek Revival architectural elements: a classic low-pitched roof, symmetry in the facade of the structure in its six-over-six hung windows that are equally distributed and
contains an embellished entranceway with sidelights and transom lights, as well as an entablature (Figure 4.22). Overall this house is much smaller than the Chief Richardville House and the structure itself is stick-built rather than brick-built. In addition to the building materials and size, this house lacks the more elaborate details of lintels above the windows, as well as cornice lines with trim flanking the roofline, which are features that are commonly seen in Greek Revival architecture.

Figure 4.22: The LaFontaine House (photograph taken by author, October 2013)

While the entrance to the LaFontaine House contains an entablature as well as sidelights and transom lights, it is not known to have ever contained a front entry porch, as the Chief Richardville House did. Additionally, the entrance to the house is situated on the east side of the south facade of the structure rather than being centered, which changes the appearance of the facade, breaking up the symmetry, as well as the arrangement of the interior of the house (Figure 4.23). Rather than a central staircase with rooms to either side as seen in the Chief Richardville House, this structure contains a set of stairs in the southeast corner of the house, just beyond the entrance and the foyer that proceed up towards the back of the house.
To the left (west) of foyer on the main floor lay the living room, which leads into a formal dining room, followed by the original kitchen and eventually the modern kitchen. The second floor (Figure 4.24) contains a master bedroom in the southwest corner of the house, along with one smaller bedroom in the southeast corner and two servants’ rooms (one in the middle of the house on the west side and the second in the northwest corner of the house). The LaFontaine House also contains two other staircases in the rear, northwest corner of the house with one leading from the kitchen down to the basement and the other leading from the kitchen up to the back servant room.
Unlike the Chief Richardville House, the LaFontaine House contains only one chimney on the west side of the house, which services the two fireplaces in the structure, one in the master bedroom and the other in the living room. In addition to the main house, other outbuildings were known to be present on the forks of the Wabash property including the operational trading post itself (Rafert 1996; Zoll et al. 2000). However, while this house is smaller in size and more subdued in its Greek Revival features and construction materials, it was still a grand structure in this area at the time. Its construction marks an early date for a Greek Revival structure on the frontier and was likely the most prominent structure in the area. While it was not as grand as the Fort Wayne house, it still symbolized the elevated wealth and status of Richardville and later, of LaFontaine.
Because Richardville’s use of the Chief Richardville House and the LaFontaine House vary from one another, it is proposed that the material culture recovered from each site that is contemporaneous with the original occupation or use of the structure will also differ. The LaFontaine House will likely contain a higher percentage of trade goods (since there was an operational trading post present on the property), as well as fewer and less ornate domestic goods (ceramics, glass and items of personal adornment) and represent a full range of domestic activities, including artifacts that associated with women and children.

Archaeological Excavations

Two seasons of fieldwork were carried out at the original location of the LaFontaine House in 1989 and 1999 by Historic Forks of the Wabash, Inc. and Ball State University to determine whether subsurface archaeological deposits remained intact and if found, assess their condition. Over time, the house and property were exposed to multiple cultural disturbances including the installation of septic systems, wells and modern reconstructions of wigwams and a log house (Cochran 1990). Additionally, nearby highway projects associated with the widening of SR 24 to the south of the house and the construction of a highway bypass to Huntington (HWY 37) to the east of the house also impacted the property. Despite the disturbances associated with habitation of the structure for a century and a half, modern construction on the property and associated mixing of soils that has taken place at the site, archaeological excavations found that the stratigraphy of underlying soils remained intact, as did some subsurface deposits. However, following the excavations at the site, the road construction surrounding the house required that the entire structure be moved south, to the opposite side of SR 24, where it stands today near the Historic Forks of the Wabash Museum (Zoll et al. 2000). In 1999 additional systematic testing and excavations were conducted on the original house site in order to document the extant
archaeological deposits and assess site disturbance, which would then inform future work in the area. All units were hand excavated with trowels and shovels in arbitrary 10 cm levels and all excavated materials passed through 6.35mm mesh. Features were mapped in plan view, then bisected, excavated in arbitrary 10cm levels, then mapped in profile. Fill from each feature was saved for flotation. The results of these two field seasons will be discussed below.

1989 Excavations. In total, 11 test units were excavated at the site, which produced 11 archaeological features and over 20,000 artifacts. A total of ten, two by two meter test units were excavated around the house, while an eleventh unit was excavated north of the house in order to evaluate local folklore, which said that an exposed limestone block was once the cornerstone of a council house. Units 1 and 2 were located side by side at the south end of the house at the front door and Unit 3 was located just north and east around the corner of the structure. Artifacts recovered from these units are presented in Table 4.3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Materials</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Lithics</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Biface</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortar/Cement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>Flake</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Glazing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Projectile</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Transferprint</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Transferprint</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bottle Cap</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorated Porcelain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Can Fragments</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgeware</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Chain Fragments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand Painted Wares</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hook</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Knife Fragments</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple Transferprint</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Nut</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Ware</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Pin</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spongeware</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Pocket Knife</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Pull Tab</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrefined Earthenware</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Round Nail</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Screw</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Ware</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Shutter Hinge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecofacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Snap Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td></td>
<td>186</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Square Nail</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal/Slag</td>
<td></td>
<td>274</td>
<td>Tack</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Unidentifiable Miscellaneous Metal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Washer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqua Container Glass</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modern Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Container Glass</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Clay Pigeon</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Container Glass</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Record</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Container Glass</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat Glass</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Personal Items</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frosted Container Glass</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Button</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Container Glass</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Clay Pipe Fragment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lightbulb Glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Marble</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk Glass</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Thimble (Brass)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2298</td>
<td>2525</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excavation of these three units revealed concrete foundations belonging to the structure and a dark brown stain was found in Unit 3 underlying the concrete foundation that contained prehistoric artifacts. However, the origin of this feature could not be determined.
Unit 4 was placed on the east side of the structure near an outside doorway on the corner of the porch. Excavation of this unit revealed the original porch foundation and provided additional information pertaining the history of the structure. Artifact totals recovered from this unit can be seen in Table 4.4 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Building Materials</strong></th>
<th><strong>Count</strong></th>
<th><strong>Weight</strong></th>
<th><strong>Glass</strong></th>
<th><strong>Count</strong></th>
<th><strong>Weight</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>Lightbulb Glass</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortar/Cement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Milk Glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Glazing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lithics</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ceramics</strong></th>
<th><strong>Count</strong></th>
<th><strong>Weight</strong></th>
<th><strong>Glass</strong></th>
<th><strong>Count</strong></th>
<th><strong>Weight</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annular Banded Ware</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Flake</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Transferprint</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Projectile Point</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorated Porcelain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgeware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand Painted Wares</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bolt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bottle Cap</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple Transferprint</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Can Fragments</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Ware</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Clock Gear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spongeware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Door Handle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Knife Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrefined Earthenware</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Pipe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Round Nail</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Ware</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Screw</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ecofacts</strong></th>
<th><strong>Count</strong></th>
<th><strong>Weight</strong></th>
<th><strong>Glass</strong></th>
<th><strong>Count</strong></th>
<th><strong>Weight</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Staple</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Unidentifiable Miscellaneous Metal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal/Slag</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>Washer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wire</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Glass</strong></th>
<th><strong>Count</strong></th>
<th><strong>Weight</strong></th>
<th><strong>Modern Miscellaneous</strong></th>
<th><strong>Count</strong></th>
<th><strong>Weight</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amethyst Decorative Glass</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unit 5 was placed on the north side of the porch to determine if pathways connecting the porch and the building could still be detected. Excavators found that just beneath the soil lay a slab of concrete that was covering an old, filled-in well. Cursory excavation of the top of the well fill suggest an early twentieth century origin. Unit 10 was located adjacent to Unit 5 and contained the same concrete slab identified in Unit 5. Artifact totals from these units can be seen in Table 4.5 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Materials</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Lithics</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortar/Cement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Flake</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Glazing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Projectile Point</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annular Banded Ware</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Transferprint</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bolt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Transferprint</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Can Fragments</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorated Porcelain</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Chain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand Painted Wares</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Door Hinge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Foil</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple Transferprint</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Ware</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Knife Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spongeware</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Nut</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pin</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrefined Earthenware</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Pocket Knife</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Pull Tab</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Ware</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Round Nail</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ecofacts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td><strong>Weight</strong></td>
<td><strong>Screw</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1235</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Square Nail</td>
<td>1420</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal/Slag</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>Staple</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Tack</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glass</strong></td>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td><strong>Weight</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unidentifiable Miscellaneous Metal</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amethyst Decorative Glass</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Washer</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqua Container Glass</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Wire</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Container Glass</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modern Miscellaneous</td>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td><strong>Weight</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Container Glass</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Container Glass</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Personal Items</td>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td><strong>Weight</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat Glass</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bone Comb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frosted Container Glass</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Button</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Container Glass</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Clay Pipe Fragment</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lightbulb Glass</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Gun Flint</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk Glass</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hawk Bell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lithics</strong></td>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td><strong>Weight</strong></td>
<td><strong>Marble</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biface</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sleigh Bell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bipolar Artifact</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5630</td>
<td>3788</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Units 6 and 7 were combined and excavated as a one by eight meter trench on the north side of the house and yielded a compact gravel deposit (interpreted to be a driveway) underlain by a dark brown layer containing an increased proportion of prehistoric materials to historic materials. Artifacts recovered from these units can be seen in Table 4.6 below.
Table 4.6: 1989 LaFontaine Units 6 & 7 artifact totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Materials</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Lithics</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortar/Cement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Flake</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Glazing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Projectile Point</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramics</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annular Banded Ware</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Transferprint</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bolt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Transferprint</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Can Fragments</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorated Porcelain</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Chain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand Painted Wares</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Door Hinge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Foil</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple Transferprint</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Ware</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Knife Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spongeware</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Nut</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pin</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrefined Earthenware</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Pocket Knife</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Pull Tab</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Ware</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Round Nail</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ecofacts</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1235</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Square Nail</td>
<td>1420</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal/Slag</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>Staple</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Tack</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glass</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Unidentifiable Miscellaneous Metal</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amethyst Decorative Glass</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Washer</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqua Container Glass</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Wire</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Container Glass</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modern Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Container Glass</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Container Glass</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Personal Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat Glass</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bone Comb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frosted Container Glass</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Button</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Container Glass</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Clay Pipe Fragment</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lightbulb Glass</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Gun Flint</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk Glass</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hawk Bell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithics</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marble</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biface</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sleigh Bell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bipolar Artifact</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5630</strong></td>
<td><strong>3788</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unit 8 was placed on to the northwest corner of the house near an addition, but also in the proximity of the original entrance to the house in order to determine if walkways were present. Excavation produced a number of artifacts (Table 4.7) and revealed the presence of a cracked limestone layer in this unit (as well as Unit 9) interpreted to be such a walkway. Due to time constraints the limestone was not excavated.

Table 4.7: 1989 LaFontaine Unit 8 artifact total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Materials</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Glass</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>Frosted Container Glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortar/Cement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Milk Glass</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Glazing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annular Banded Ware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Flake</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Transferprint</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgeware</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Can Fragments</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Clock Gear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple Transferprint</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Foil</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spongeware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Lead Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Metal Cap</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrefined Earthenware</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Round Nail</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Screw</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Ware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Safety pin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecofacts</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Square Nail</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unit 9 was located southwest of the structure and placed to determine the nature of the slope in the yard. The limestone layer seen in Unit 8 extended into Unit 9 and excavation of the limestone revealed a feature that appeared to be prehistoric in nature. However, excavation did not reveal the purpose of the feature. Artifacts recovered from Unit 9 are in Table 4.8 below.

Table 4.8: LaFontaine Unit 9 artifact totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Materials</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Glass</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1412</td>
<td>Clear Container Glass</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortar/Cement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Flat Glass</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Glazing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Green Container Glass</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Milk Glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annular Banded Ware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Lithics</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Transferprint</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Biface</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Transferprint</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bipolar Artifact</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgeware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand Painted Wares</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Flake</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Projectile Point</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple Transferprint</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Metal Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Ware</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Can Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fishing Weight</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrefined Earthenware</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Round Nail</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td>Screw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecofacts</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Square Nail</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>Tin Can</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Unidentifiable Metal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal/Slag</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>Washer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Modern Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amethyst Decorative Glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Items</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqua Container Glass</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Button</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Container Glass</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clay Pipe Fragment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Container Glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marble</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1224</td>
<td>2086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lastly, Unit 11 was excavated to evaluate local legend that a piece of limestone visible in the ground of the property was a cornerstone to a council house located on the property. Excavations determined that the stones were associated with a hearth and fireplace foundation, in conjunction with an outbuilding on the property. After some consideration it was determined that this location likely served as a summer kitchen while the adjacent feature in Unit 6/7 is thought to have been an associated midden (Cochran 1990). Artifact totals from this unit can be seen in Table 4.9 below.
Valuable data was obtained from these excavations in the form of material culture and in the form of stratigraphic data. Only a small portion of the artifacts recovered firmly date to the original occupation and use of the house by Richardville and LaFontaine before 1850. The earliest artifacts recovered are representative of the trading activities that reportedly took place at the site and include a hawk bell, sleigh bells, a Brandon gunflint, glass trade beads, a military

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Materials</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Glass</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Brown Container Glass</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortar/Cement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>Clear Container Glass</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Glazing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Flat Glass</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ceramics</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Green Container Glass</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Transferprint</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Lightbulb Glass</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Transferprint</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Milk Glass</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand Painted Wares</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>Lithics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Biface</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spongeware</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrefined Earthenware</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Flake</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Ware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Can Fragments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ecofacts</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Round Nail</td>
<td>340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>Screw</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Square Nail</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal/Slag</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Staple</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Unidentifiable</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glass</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous Metal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqua Container Glass</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Button</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Container Glass</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Marble</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>740</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9: LaFontaine 1989 Unit 11 artifact totals
button and a metal thimble (Cochran 1990). Most of the other artifacts recovered from this season of excavation postdate 1850 including all of the domestic materials (ceramics, glass, coins, marbles and clay pipes). These findings indicate that the use of this structure transitioned from a trading locale to a domestic structure sometime in the 1850 (Cochran 1990). Another trend identified in the ceramic assemblage was a general decline in wealth through time with less expensive and ornate ceramics purchased as the Richardville/ LaFontaine descendants occupied the house. The archaeological excavations also revealed that although disturbances have occurred at the site over the years, prehistoric and historic subsurface archaeological deposits remained relatively undisturbed and intact at the site at the time of excavation. An examination of the 11 features identified during this season’s fieldwork suggests that trash disposal was conducted between the house and summer kitchen, where a midden was identified, as well as outside of the doorways.

1999 Excavations. In 1999 Ball State University and Historic Forks of the Wabash, Inc. returned the original LaFontaine House site in July and August to systematically test and excavate the site. The goal of this work was to determine the presence, extent and condition of subsurface deposits at the site after the house had been moved. In total six, two by two meter test units were excavated at the site, resulting in the recovery of over 30,000 artifacts.

Unit 1 contained several prehistoric artifacts and historic artifacts, primarily building materials and kitchen materials. The presence of building materials was thought to represent repair to a structure or the razing of it (Zoll et al. 2000). Unit 1 also contained the only feature that was identified in the 1999 field season, in the southeast corner of the unit directly below the sod layer. It was photographed and mapped in plan view then bisected, its material screened and the feature profile mapped and photographed. No feature fill was taken for flotation because at
the time of excavation it was determined that the feature was a recent fire pit. Artifact totals from Unit 1 can be seen below in Table 4.10.

Table 4.10: LaFontaine 1999 Unit 1 artifact totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Materials</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Glass</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>178.9</td>
<td>Lightbulb Glass</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ceramics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Transferprint</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Red Container Glass</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Transferprint</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>Lithics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorated Ware</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Flake</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironstone</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mocha Yellow Ware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bolt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Cone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terracotta</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Container Lid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Foil</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ecofacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fork</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Rivet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>Roofing Nail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal/Slag</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>Round Nail</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2694.7</td>
<td>Screw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Unidentifiable</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Wire</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glass</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modern Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber Container Glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Container Glass</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Vinyl</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqua Flat Glass</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>Personal Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Flat Glass</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bead</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frosted Container Glass</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Clay Pipe Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Container Glass</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sewing Needle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>536</td>
<td>3000.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unit 2 was placed northwest of the original house. After inspection it was determined that this was an area for coal stove dumping near a summer kitchen due to the presence of slag and ash in the unit, as well as a high percentage of bone and kitchen artifacts followed by lithic materials and building materials. Artifact totals from Unit 2 can be seen below in Table 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Materials</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Lithics</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1175.2</td>
<td>Biface</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortar/Cement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>295.9</td>
<td>Flake</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaster</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Graver</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tile</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>168.9</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramics</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Ammunition Casing</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Transferprint</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bolt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bottle Cap</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorated Ware</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bullet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow Blue</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Clip</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand Painted Ware</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Foil</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironstone</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Latch</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mocha Yellow Ware</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Metal Rod</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polychrome Whiteware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Nut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Transferprint</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Rivet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Ware</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Round Nail</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Screw</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Spoon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Ware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Square Nail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecofacts</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Staple</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Tack</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal/Slag</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1344.8</td>
<td>Unidentifiable</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1049.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4179.3</td>
<td>Miscellaneous Metal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>189.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unit 3 was placed over the location of a suspected summer kitchen, north of the original house with the goal of sampling and further defining the midden that was present. The midden deposit was dense and extended 26 cm to 66 cm below the modern ground surface and contained bone and kitchen artifacts as well as building materials. In addition to the midden, pipes were also discovered in the unit running north to south and while their function remains unknown, it is thought that they are associated with the original structure. Artifact totals from Unit 3 can be seen below in Table 4.12.

Table 12: LaFontaine 1999 Unit 3 artifact totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Materials</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17234.4</td>
<td>Bottle Cap</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortar/Cement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>143.2</td>
<td>Bottle Opener</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaster</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Buckle</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roofing Shingle</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Cabinet Hardware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>169.2</td>
<td>Cast Iron</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tile</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8164.3</td>
<td><strong>Clamp</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ceramics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Clock Parts</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annular Banded Ware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Container</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Transferprint</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Container Lid</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Transferprint</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Copper Pin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Door Handle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorated Ware</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fastener</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow Blue</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Foil</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Transferprint</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Gear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handpainted Ware</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Grommet</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironstone</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hammer Head</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mocha Yellow Ware</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hatchet Blade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polychrome Transferprint</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Lightbulb Base</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple Transferprint</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Nut</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Transferprint</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ring</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Ware</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Rivet</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spongeware</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Roofing Nail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Round Nail</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terracotta</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Screw</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Staple</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Ware</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Tack</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecofacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unidentifiable Miscellaneous Metal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3235.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>Unidentifiable Nail</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3458.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal/Slag</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1190.8</td>
<td>Washer</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>Watch Back</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Watch Gear</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Wire</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glass</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wrench</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber Container Glass</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modern Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amethyst Container Glass</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Clay Pigeon</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqua Chimney Lamp Glass</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Paperclip</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqua Container Glass</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqua Flat Glass</td>
<td>1185</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Container Glass</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Container Glass</td>
<td>1142</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Chimney Lamp Glass</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Flat Glass</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frosted Container Glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>520.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Container Glass</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lightbulb Glass</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirror Glass</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pink Container Glass</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Container Glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay Pipe Fragment</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cufflink</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair Clip</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hairpin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingerie Fastener</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marble</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain Doll Part</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosary Fragment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewing Needle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewing Spool</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6966</td>
<td>34812.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unit 4 was thought to be placed in front of the original structure but was placed before the location of the original foundation was identified. As it turns out this unit was actually placed inside the structure and was in a heavily disturbed area (most likely due to modern storm sewer construction). The unit was abandoned after the excavation of two levels that were heavily disturbed.
disturbed. This unit was dominated by kitchen artifacts along with building materials and given the location and disturbance in the unit they have likely been redeposited in this location. Artifact totals from Unit 4 can be seen below in Table 4.13.

Table 4.13: LaFontaine 1999 Unit 4 artifact totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Materials</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Glass</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4276.9</td>
<td>Pink Container Glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortar/Cement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40.36</td>
<td>Yellow Container Glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaster</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>Lithics</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roofing Shingle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Transferprint</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ammunition Casing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow Blue</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bolt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mocha Yellow Ware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fastener Hook</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Transferprint</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Round Nail</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Screw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecofacts</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Staple</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Tack</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Unidentifiable</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal/Slag</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>Unidentifiable Nail</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Washer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Wire</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Modern Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber Container Glass</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Clay Pigeon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqua Container Glass</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ceramic Insulator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqua Flat Glass</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Container Glass</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural Stone</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Chimney Lamp Glass</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Flat Glass</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Green Container Glass 1 -  Personal Items Count Weight
Milk 1 -  Button 3 -
                        Coin 1 -
Total                      346 4570.2

Unit 5 was placed near the back porch of the original house. Pipe fragments were recovered from this unit, as was glass, ceramics and building materials. A high amount of lithic materials and miscellaneous artifacts were also recovered from Unit 5. Artifact totals from Unit 5 can be seen below in Table 4.14.

Table 4.14: LaFontaine 1999 Unit 5 artifact totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Materials</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Lithics</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2109.6</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Flake</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortar/Cement</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaster</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>Ammunition Casing</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roofing Shingle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bolt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Bottle Cap</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annular Banded Ware</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bracket</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Transferprint</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Buckle</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Transferprint</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Caster Wheel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Chain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorated Ware</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Clasp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow Blue</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fence Staple</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray Transferprint</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Flange</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Transferprint</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Foil</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handpainted Ware</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fork</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironstone</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Gear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mocha Yellow Ware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Grommet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polychrome Transferprint</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hammer Head</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hardware Plate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple Transferprint</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hinge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Transferprint</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Latch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Ware</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Nut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spongeware</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>O-Ring</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Rivet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terracotta</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Roofing Nail</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Round Nail</td>
<td>328</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Ware</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Screw</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecofacts</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Square Nail</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Tack</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal/Slag</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>987.7</td>
<td>Unidentifiable Miscellaneous Metal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>519.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>Unidentifiable Nail</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>129.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fossil</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Washer Clamp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wire</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modern Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Clay Pigeon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber Container Glass</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Plastic Figurine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqua Chimney Lamp Glass</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Pencil</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqua Container Glass</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqua Flat Glass</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Safety Pin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Container Glass</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural Stone</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Container Glass</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural Stone</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Chimney Lamp Glass</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Personal Items</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Flat Glass</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Button</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frosted Container Glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ceramic Toy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Container Glass</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Clay Pipe Fragment</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirror Glass</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Coin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pink Container Glass</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Harmonica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Container Glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Marble</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithics</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Rosary Fragment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Unit 6 was placed north of the original house location and west of Unit 3 with the goal of defining the midden found in Unit 3 to the east. Given the time constraints of this project only the north half of Unit 6 was excavated, which contained a limestone scatter in the second level that ran southeast to northwest in the unit. This scatter is thought to have been either a badly disturbed foundation, part of a limestone bed, or associated with the summer kitchen identified in the 1989 excavation. Given that kitchen artifacts and bone dominated the assemblage in this unit, the latter is quite likely (Zoll et al. 2000). Artifact totals from Unit 6 can be seen below in Table 4.15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Materials</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Lithics</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>601.6</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2467.6</td>
<td>Flake</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaster</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>583.2</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roofing Shingle</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Bolt</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annular Banded Ware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bottle Cap</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Transferprint</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bracket</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Transferprint</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Chain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorated Ware</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Contain Lid</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handpainted Ware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Door Knob</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironstone</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fence Staple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mocha Yellow Ware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fishing Hook</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple Transferprint</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Foil</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Ware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Grommet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hinge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hook</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Ware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hook &amp; Eye Set</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ecofacts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td><strong>Weight</strong></td>
<td><strong>Knife Blade</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Latch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Lead Weight</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal/Slag</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>255.4</td>
<td>Nut</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>O-Ring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Rivet</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glass</strong></td>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td><strong>Weight</strong></td>
<td><strong>Roofing Nail</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber Container Glass</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Round Nail</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqua Chimney Lamp Glass</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Screw</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqua Container Glass</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Spike</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqua Flat Glass</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Stake</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Container Glass</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Unidentifiable Miscellaneous Metal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Container Glass</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Unidentifiable Nail</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>761.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Chimney Lamp Glass</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Washer</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Flat Glass</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Wire</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Container Glass</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modern Miscellaneous</td>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td><strong>Weight</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Clay Pigeon</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Items</strong></td>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td><strong>Weight</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mesh</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Button</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay Pipe Fragment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Polystyrene</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Rubber</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marble</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>1231</strong></td>
<td><strong>5928.4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Much like the 1989 fieldwork conducted at the site, the work conducted in 1999 confirmed that the stratigraphy at the site exhibited mixing from historic disturbances as well as modern utility work that has taken place at the site. Additionally, the trenching that was required to repair the original foundation of the structure, as well as the removal of the house from its
original location, further contributed to this disturbance. The Mean Ceramic Date was calculated for the site (based on data recovered in the 1999 excavations) as well as each individual level in every unit excavated in 1999. The calculated Mean Ceramic Date confirmed that mixing between the layers was evident throughout the site but that the site did still retain some integrity, particularly in the deepest levels associated with the earliest occupation of the site. The information presented here is a cursory summary of what was recovered at the LaFontaine House. A more detailed and robust discussion of findings at the LaFontaine House will be conducted in Chapter 6 when findings at the two sites are compared.
Chapter 5: Methods

Archaeological Materials

The artifact assemblages from the Chief Richardville House that were examined for this dissertation were housed at UWM and Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne (IPFW), however all data analysis was conducted at UWM. All artifacts were sorted, counted, weighed and their horizontal as well as vertical proveniences recorded. The artifacts were then placed into one of nine categories including glass, ceramics, personal items, metal, building materials, lithics, ecofacts, modern miscellaneous items and natural stone. Artifacts within these broad categories were then further sorted based on specific criteria in each category for analysis. Given the material present in the various categories, some artifacts lent themselves to a more detailed analysis (glass, ceramics, personal items) while artifacts in other categories (metal, building materials, ecofacts, modern miscellaneous and natural stone) did not allow for such detail.

As a result, artifacts in categories like metal (e.g. Nails, screws, unidentifiable miscellaneous metal), building materials (e.g. mortar/cement, brick and plaster), natural stone, ecofacts (e.g. coal/slag, FCR, wood) and modern miscellaneous artifacts (e.g. plastic, polystyrene and linoleum) were merely counted, weighed and recorded, while more detailed analysis was possible with glass, ceramics and personal items. The only exception is nails, which were also sorted by shape (round or square), then counted and weighed. Beyond identification and recordation, the analysis of metal and building materials in this dissertation was limited to intrasite comparisons of horizontal and vertical distribution of the materials in the units (which facilitated a discussion of use areas at the site), as well as intersite comparisons to that of the LaFontaine House site.
More detailed analyses were possible with other artifact categories including ceramics, glass and personal items. In the category of ceramics ware type, manufacture date and cost of the materials were identified in order to speak to consumer choices, behavior and relative wealth at the site through time. Because this type of analysis (or something approaching it) was also possible with glass and personal items, the detailed discussion in this dissertation will be limited to the analysis of glass, ceramic and personal items, while general discussions of the distribution of metals, building materials and ecofacts will take place.

Statistical analyses were not conducted with the Chief Richardville and the LaFontaine assemblages because the two assemblages do not represent a sample of a population (which is required for statistical testing) and instead represent their own full population. Measures of richness and diversity were therefore conducted for ceramics, personal items and container glass from each structure and compared to one another, which allowed for discussion of similarities and differences between the two assemblages. The results from the Chief Richardville House will then be compared to the LaFontaine House based on artifact information gained from reports generated from two seasons of excavations at the LaFontaine House (Cochran 1990; Zoll et al. 2000).

*Ceramics.* All ceramic material was further sorted by paste, categorized by ware type or decoration, then counted, weighed and their horizontal and vertical provenience recorded. As would be expected at a historic site of this age, whiteware made up a substantial portion of the ceramic assemblage and unfortunately little of the whiteware contained any diagnostic information and provided very little information pertaining to date or function (beyond basic domestic use). However, a number of other ceramic wares and patterns were present and provided more information including stoneware, ironstone, creamware, polychrome, porcelain,
yellow ware, mocha yellow ware, edge decorated wares, red ware, annular banded ware, flow blue, and a variety of transferprints (blue, black, gray, purple, red and green), hand painted wares and decorated wares. The horizontal and vertical provenience of these artifacts was recorded, as were their frequencies in order to examine the trends of ceramic use at the site through time. When present, maker’s marks and specific decorative patterns were identified, documented and dated. One of the goals of the analysis conducted for this dissertation was to create a chronology for the Chief Richardville House, which required an examination of the maker’s marks, as well as decorative patterns and ceramic ware types. A mean ceramic date was also produced for the site as a whole, as well as each excavation unit and individual stratigraphic layers within the units in order to examine trends through time and to determine if mixing had taken place at the site. Calculating mean ceramic dates for individual stratigraphic layers made it possible to identify specific levels and artifacts that were associated with Richardville’s occupation of the structure and differentiate them from those associated with later occupation of the structure by his descendants. Additionally, an examination of mean ceramic dates between units assisted in determining whether certain areas of the site were utilized more heavily than others during different occupation periods.

Maker’s marks were identified and utilized when present, however, there were few maker’s marks present in the assemblage and most that were present were partial marks, making it difficult to fully identify and develop a specific date range for some of the ceramics. While maker’s marks are known to allow the best chronologic control in historic sites, ware type and pattern/decoration identification have also effectively been used to this end and are valuable temporal markers. Due to the general lack of maker’s marks on the ceramics in the assemblage, the analysis in this dissertation focused mainly on ware type and pattern/decoration identification.
of the ceramic vessels recovered. In addition to providing chronological information about the site, ware type and pattern/decoration identification will also allow for an interpretation of consumer choices based on price indexes for different wares and patterns.

Analysis of ceramic wares from the Chief Richardville House was conducted in order to examine how ceramic products were consumed through time, comparing Richardville’s consumption of ceramics to that of his descendants. Prior to the analysis it was expected that artifacts associated with the earliest occupation of the site and Richardville himself would exhibit a greater variety, as well as a higher quality, which decreased through time when his descendants occupied the house. Examining the consumer choices exhibited in the ceramic assemblage at the Chief Richardville House was used to discuss the formation and performance of Richardville’s personal and social identities. Prior to this analysis it was posited that Richardville made specific consumer choices at the Chief Richardville House in order to build and publicly portray unique social and personal identities. Lastly, an examination of the ceramic assemblage present at the site was conducted in order to identify activity areas at the site and examine the use of horizontal space at the house. Comparisons were then made to the ceramic assemblages at the LaFontaine House in order to discuss the occupation of the site, the different functions of the sites, as well as varying identities that Richardville may have portrayed at each location. In addition to variation in the ceramic assemblages based on wealth, it was also predicted that the assemblages would represent the different activities that took place at each site. Because the Chief Richardville House was used as a domestic home and place of entertainment, while the LaFontaine site was a business locality that later changed to a domestic structure, the materials from the original occupation of each structure will vary from one another. It was hypothesized that the Chief Richardville House would contain a wider variety of ceramic materials, as well as higher quality
ceramic materials when compared to the LaFontaine House due to the difference in function of the two structures.

Glass. Glass materials were broadly sorted into flat (window) and container or decorative glass, categorized by color, then counted, weighed and recorded. Flat glass from the site consisted of only aqua and clear glass, while the container glass showed more variation in colors. Container glass included amber, amethyst, aqua, blue, brown, clear, frosted, green, milk, pink, red, yellow and clear chimney lamp glass. All diagnostic markings present on container and decorative glass were identified, recorded and dated when possible. The manufacturing and finishing processes of the container glass were also noted in order to establish relative dates for the vessel fragments recovered at the site, as no complete vessels were recovered. Since most embossing and lettering present on the container glass could not be traced to specific manufacturing dates, manufacturing and finishing processes were able to provide more diagnostic information to date the glass vessels recovered at the site. A general analysis of the container glass assemblage allowed for an examination of the activities that took place at the site and how activities, as well as goods consumed at the site may have changed through time. Additionally, creating a chronology via the glass assemblage allowed for the assessment of disturbance and mixing that has taken place at the site over the years. Prior to this analysis it was expected that glass artifacts associated with the earliest occupation of both houses (and therefore Richardville himself) would contain more decorative container glass, as well as a wider variety of colors than that of later occupation of the house by Richardville’s descendants. An increased variability of vessel types and color are likely representative of a wider variety of goods consumed at the site and associated with a wider range of activities, as well as an increased amount of wealth. It was also postulated that materials from the Chief Richardville House would
contain more variability and exhibit more wealth than those from the LaFontaine House due to the difference in activities that took place at each site.

*Personal Items.* Items in this category will be the most useful in discussing identity because they are items purchased, used and displayed by individuals in the past and can therefore be related to identity. Personal items include marbles, beads, clay pipes, buttons, clinkers, coins, jewelry and toys. Of the artifacts recovered from the Chief Richardville House, personal items were of most interest because these artifacts were used by individuals to not only decorate themselves, but also to publicly define themselves and exhibit their personal preferences. These items therefore served as social markers that were significant in social contexts and could aid in the creation of personal and social identities and it was hoped that an examination of personal items would shed light on Richardville’s identities. As with the other material classes, personal items from the Chief Richardville House were compared to those from the LaFontaine House and it was hoped that such a comparison would reflect the different identities presented at the different houses. It was also hoped that an examination of personal items would provide additional information about Natoequah, who is consistently absent from the historical record. However, it must be kept in mind that Natoequah may not have adhered to traditional gender roles, so her identity may be present in the archaeological assemblages, but in unique ways.

*Architectural Elements.* In addition to the material culture recovered from archaeological excavations at the Chief Richardville and LaFontaine houses, the structures themselves were also subject to analysis using the very same theoretical bodies that were used to analyze the other materials. Such an analysis is possible because much like other forms of material culture examined by archaeologists, structures and their architectural elements also represent cognizant consumer choices made by individuals in the past, which can be connected to the discussion of
identity. The structures themselves are therefore also important artifacts with which to examine Richardville’s identity at each of the sites. However, unlike other artifacts whose form, color or style might fluctuate with current popular trends or changes in personal choice or preference, the structures represent a single snapshot of Richardville’s identity based on his preferences at one point in his lifetime when the structures were built. In order to incorporate these structures into a discussion Richardville’s identity, specific architectural elements of each structure were examined within their physical, as well as cultural-historical context.

*Lithic Materials.* While lithic materials generally do not lie within the focus of this dissertation, because they are present at the site they will be discussed. Lithic materials recovered from the Chief Richardville House include cores, bifaces, blades, flakes, projectile points, end scrapers, shatter and hammerstones. Detailed analysis was not conducted on the lithic materials, they were merely identified and types and numbers of lithic artifacts will be examined horizontally across the site, as well as vertically in the units at the site. Findings at the Chief Richardville House were compared to those at the LaFontaine House to determine if differences or similarities existed between the two sites.

*Building Materials.* Artifacts associated with the process of building were placed into this category and include brick, mortar/cement, masonry, miscellaneous building materials, paint chips, roofing shingles, flagstone and caulking. Weights were recorded for all items and in most cases counts were recorded as well. However, there were some instances (mainly mortar/cement) where weight was reported, but not count, so weight will be the variable used to discuss these artifacts throughout the site, as well as compare them to the LaFontaine House. While the examination of building materials might not shed much light on Richardville and his identity, they are good artifacts to examine because they are seen in every level of every unit at the site.
and will therefore be useful when examining stratigraphy and disturbance.

*Metal.* Metal artifacts were sorted by artifact type and include all utilitarian metal artifacts including nails, screws, metal hardware rings, chains, buckles, wire, ammunition casings, foil, staples, washers, barrel strapping, nuts, tacks, scissors, clasps, rivets, bolts and unidentifiable miscellaneous metal. Both counts and weights were recorded for all items in the metal category and the presence of these artifacts will be compared horizontally across the site, as well as vertically through time. Additionally, metal artifacts recovered from the Chief Richardville House will be compared to metal artifacts recovered from the LaFontaine House in order to identify similarities and differences between the two sites. Artifacts in this category will likely not shed much light on Richardville’s identity, but are important to consider because they are useful when considering use areas at the site.

*Modern Miscellaneous Objects.* Items in this category include objects that are modern and not associated with the historic occupation of the structure. Items like plastic, clay pigeons, fabric, linoleum, polystyrene (Styrofoam) and rubber make up this category. Counts and weights of this material will be presented, but additional discussion of these items will not take place because they have no bearing on the historic occupation of the site by Richardville or his descendants.

*Ecofacts.* Ecofacts from the site include bone, shell, FCR, plant remains, wood coal, cinders and burnt soil. These are natural objects that have been used or altered by people at the site and while these artifacts are interesting, they will receive little evaluation in this project and counts/weights of these objects will be examined.

*Natural Stone.* Items in this category are not cultural, they are instead natural, consisting mainly of gravel or stone recovered during excavations and flotation of soil from the site. Counts
and weights of this material will be reported, but no further discussion of this material will take place.

*Geographic Information Systems*

In addition to analyzing the artifacts that were recovered from the Chief Richardville House, a Geographic Information Systems (GIS) was also utilized to examine the spatial relationship between the artifacts at the site. GIS has been a widely utilized tool in archaeology over the last thirty years and continues to demonstrate its utility for examining and revealing significant spatial relations within material culture recovered from archaeological sites. Within the context of this dissertation the vertical and horizontal provenience of all artifacts was examined individually, as well as in relation to each other in order to formulate discussions of site use, as well as site occupation through time. The GIS also assisted in calculating a mean ceramic date for each level of every excavation unit, as well as each excavation unit as a whole. From these calculations the GIS was useful for identifying portions of the site that were mixed and disturbed, as well as portions of the site that retained good stratigraphic control. As a result, artifacts that were directly associated with Richardville and his occupation of the structure could be isolated and viewed in their horizontal and vertical provenience, which fueled a discussion of site use, activity areas and how these changed through time. Comparisons made to the LaFontaine site allowed for an understanding of site use through time.
Chapter 6: Results of Analyses

All artifacts from the Chief Richardville House were sorted and their vertical and horizontal provenience were examined in an attempt to pinpoint artifacts and features associated with Richardville’s occupation of the structure. When possible, these artifacts were considered separately from those associated with later occupations of the house in order to speak to Richardville’s presence at the structure and how he used material culture to create and present his identity at the structure. Certain artifact categories (personal items, ceramics and glass) revealed more information about Richardville and his identity during his occupation of the structure than other materials (building materials, ecofacts, modern miscellaneous artifacts and natural stone), so while all artifacts will be discussed here, emphasis will be placed on those that shed light on Richardville and his activity at the house, as well as the house itself.

The Chief Richardville House

Of all items created and used by Richardville during his lifetime, the Chief Richardville House remains the most important because it is the one item that can be tied securely to him and his activities. While he may have purchased or used artifacts recovered from the site, there is no way to connect him to specific artifacts and confirm that he was indeed responsible for their purchase or use. The house is different however, because hand written building plans for the house exist where Richardville sketched how he wanted the house to look and included specific notations pertaining to building materials to be used. This is significant because much like portable artifacts, structures and architecture are also forms of communication that can be used to convey messages about people (Lasswell 1979). Architectural styles (as well as the structures themselves) then become symbolic and represent the cultural context in which they develop and act as external expressions or physical representations of the sociopolitical power and position of
the individual that owned or created it (Knox 1984). The Chief Richardville House therefore was not merely a house that was lived in, it also had symbolic meaning and represented Richardville’s identity, or at least how he wanted others to perceive him. The Chief Richardville House therefore is a symbol and representation of Richardville and his identities within the context of the nineteenth century fur trade on the frontier.

The house was constructed in the Greek Revival style, which is considered by some (Eggener 2004; Hamlin 1964; Morrison 1952) to be the first united architectural style of the United States, so it is an interesting choice for design because it is representative of the American cultural norms and ideals of the eighteenth and nineteenth century that were dominated by westward expansion and Indian removal. The house is a large, luxurious structure with ten interior rooms and high-end, interior finishes, including French wallpaper and draperies, bright red carpets, a curved staircase with walnut handrail, fireplaces in both parlors and bedrooms and crystal chandeliers in both first-floor parlors (Headings 1998; McCulloch n.d.). The location of the Chief Richardville House on the St. Mary’s River is also symbolic because it overlooks the Long Portage, along with the city of Fort Wayne. Richardville built his home to stay in close proximity to his business at the portage but also to literally look down upon the city and all who resided in it, which is symbolic in and of itself and adds to the high style of the structure.

From historic accounts, it is known that Richardville actively resisted westward expansion, white encroachment on the frontier and the Miami territory and fought vehemently against Miami removal from Indiana while he was Chief, so to design, build and live in a house in the Greek Revival style with extravagant finishes therefore seems somewhat contradictory for Richardville. However, individuals are also able to impose their own interpretation, or
significance on the built environment they create (Knox 1984; Lasswell 1979). So even though the Greek Revival style is symbolic of a fledgling America, Native American removal and westward expansion, it’s likely that Richardville knew how the style would be perceived by others and used it to leave his own mark on the frontier landscape. Richardville therefore used his knowledge of modern architectural styles and his financial means to design, build, live in and entertain other upper-class Americans in the Chief Richardville House. As a result, Richardville successfully used the house to create a unique personal identity, as well as a verified group identity that secured his place among the upper class, elite Americans. The house also became synonymous with Chief Richardville and became symbolic of his individual and group identities.

**Personal Items**

The category of personal items includes items used by individuals including buttons, beads, coins, pipes, sewing implements, marbles, toys and items of personal adornment. Many of the objects in this category are accessories or ornamental items used to embellish personal appearance, while others are items that would have been chosen and used specifically by individuals and will therefore be instrumental in examining and discussing identity at the site. In total, 301 personal items were recovered from the Chief Richardville House and while all units contained at least one personal item, Units 11 and 12 had the highest concentration of personal
items, likely due to the presence of the porch which kept items in this location hidden from collectors (Figure 6.1). Each category of personal item will be discussed individually below.

![Figure 6.1: Personal Items Distribution](image)

**Buttons.** Sixty buttons made from seven different materials were recovered from the Chief Richardville House, presented in Table 6.1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buttons</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1: Buttons from the Chief Richardville House
Units 1 and 2 contained no buttons, while Units 8 and 12 contained the highest concentration of buttons, each containing ten buttons. Aside from these two extremes, all other units at the structure contained some buttons, albeit a fairly low number of buttons (Figure 6.2).

Porcelain buttons were the most numerous type of button recovered at the site (16), most of which came from units north and west of the structure (Figure 6.2). Most porcelain buttons found at the site were four hole, sew through buttons that fit into South’s (1964) Type 23 button (Figure 6.3) and measured between 9.4 mm and 11.6 mm.
A single porcelain button was enclosed in a metal ring and two were two hole sew through buttons (Figure 6.4). Just four porcelain buttons were found in level one, while nine were recovered from level two and a single porcelain button was found in level three.

Unlike porcelain buttons, plastic buttons were clustered in the units on the east side of the site, which contained seven of the eight plastic buttons found at the site (Figure 6.5). Five of the plastic buttons were sew through buttons (three buttons with four holes and two buttons with two holes), while three were toggle buttons, seen below in Figure 6.5. Plastic buttons were recovered from levels one through four, with only a single button found in level four, one in
level three, three in level two and three in level one. Because plastic buttons are modern, the presence of them is a good indication that mixing or disturbance has taken place at the site.

The site produced fourteen metal buttons, including nine sew through buttons and five toggle buttons (Figure 6.6). Just two metal buttons contained decoration (letters H and I in Figure 6.6), otherwise the metal buttons lacked distinguishing characteristics. Seven metal buttons were recovered from units west of the house, four from the east side of the house and just three from units north of the house (Figure 6.2). No metal buttons came from the sod layer (likely due to metal detecting at the site), while nine came from level one, two from levels two and three and a single button was found in level four.
A total of seven glass buttons were recovered from the site including one sew through button and six toggle buttons (Figure 6.7). As can be seen in Figure 6.2, the units west of the house contained the most glass buttons, followed by Unit 12 and Unit 8. All glass buttons were pressed glass buttons and two buttons (letters B and E, Figure 6.7) contain raised decoration, while one contains an impressed decoration (letter C, Figure 6.7). Two glass buttons were recovered from level two of Unit 12, one from level two of Unit 8, three from level one of Unit 6 and one from level two of Unit 15 (Figure 6.2).
Seven shell buttons and five shell button fragments were found at the site, all of which were hand drilled, sew through buttons with either two (6) or four (1) holes (Figure 6.8). While the distribution of shell buttons was fairly equal in northern western and eastern units, Units 8 and 12 contained higher concentrations of shell buttons, each with four buttons (Figure 6.2). A single shell button was found in the sod layer, while level one contained five shell buttons and level two contained six shell buttons. Just three bone buttons were recovered from the site, clustered in units west of the house, all of which were four hole, sew through buttons that were hand drilled.
One wooden button and three bone buttons were also found at the site (Figure 6.2). The wooden button fell into South’s (1964) Type 19 button, while the bone buttons fell into South’s Type 20 button (Figure 6.9). The bone and wood buttons were distributed on opposite sides of the site, with one bone and one wood button found west of the house and two bone buttons found east of the house.

Buttons of different sizes have different functions and according to Lindbergh (1999) buttons with a diameter less than 16 mm were classified as small and used for undergarments, shirts and waistcoats, while buttons larger than 16 mm were classified as medium sized and used on coats, jackets and pants (Lindbergh 1999). All buttons from the Chief Richardville House that could be measured to get an accurate diameter were measured and 43 of them fell into the small
category, while eleven were medium buttons. The higher incidence of small buttons recovered at the Chief Richardville House indicate they came from shirts, waistcoats or under garments rather than coats, outerwear, or larger clothing items.

Bone, wood and porcelain buttons are the oldest buttons found at the site and those most likely to be associated with Richardville and his occupation of the structure. Porcelain buttons were developed and used in the nineteenth century while bone buttons were used in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (Claassen 1994; Rivers 1999; South 1964). Because the bone buttons were hand drilled, these are likely the oldest buttons in the assemblage. However, eight plastic buttons were recovered from the site alongside the bone, shell and wood buttons, which suggests that the bone buttons were produced and used later, or that they are not in their original depositional context.

Beads. A total of ten beads (nine whole beads and one that was in three pieces in Unit 15) were recovered from seven units at the site (Figure 6.10).

Figure 6.10: Bead distribution at the Chief Richardville House.
Beads found at the site include one stone bead, three clay beads and eight glass beads (Figure 6.11). Half of the beads (six) were recovered from units north of the structure, three recovered from Unit 15 west of the house and a single bead from units three, six, ten and thirteen. No beads were recovered from the sod level or deeper than level three at the site and most of the beads recovered were glass. Following methods outlined in Spector (1976) the beads will be described and categorized below.

Figure 6.11: Beads from the Chief Richardville House. Top row from left to right A – G, bottom row left to right H – J.

Two glass beads (Figure 6.11) are wire wound beads, which are created when glass is heated and formed into a cane, then wound around a wire (Good 1977; Jones 2003; Stone 1974; Wilson et al. 2003). These beads are examples of the simplest type of wound bead because they are generally round or spherical in shape, are a single color (in this case white) and the only decoration is that of the longitudinal lines formed when the bead was made (A and B in Figure 6.11). One bead (F in Figure 6.11) is a tubular bead created using the hollow-cane manufacture technique (also called drawn beads) created when a hollow cane of glass is heated, an air bubble introduced into the mass, then stretched between two pontils (Good 1977; Stone 1974). The cane
is then cut into individual beads after it has cooled and produces a tube-shaped glass bead (Spector 1976; Wilson et al. 2003). The tubular bead from the site is black and has no additional surface treatments, characteristics or decoration. A second tubular bead was also found, but rather than being made of glass it was instead is made of clay (D in Figure 6.11). This bead was fired, but not glazed, treated or decorated in any way and retains the original color of the clay. The remaining beads are spherical, molded or mold-pressed beads, where glass is pressed into a mold and formed into beads then allowed to cool (Good 1977; Wilson et al. 2003). One bead (E in Figure 6.11) is yellow, contains no decorations, while two other beads (H and I in Figure 6.11) are white, glazed and mounted to a metal backing. Additionally, a black, multifaceted spherical bead was recovered (J in Figure 6.11) as was a single plain black spherical bead (G in Figure 6.11).

Beads are most commonly associated with women and considered female artifacts, so these artifacts are of particular importance because they are some of the very few artifacts that can be connected with a female presence at the site. Just ten beads were recovered from the site, with the highest concentrations north (6) and west (3) of the structure (Figure 6.10). The presence of beads north of the structure coincides with the presence of women’s artifacts near the entrances of structures, while the presence of beads west of the structure is more consistent with redeposition.

*Items of Personal Adornment.* This subcategory of personal items is a disparate category made up of many different types of artifacts that were united by a common characteristic; all artifacts in this category are items that are used personally, and the primary function of these artifacts is to decorate or adorn a person to embellish their physical appearance. Items that compose this category are not numerous, so their importance cannot be quantified by the volume of artifacts found at the site; instead their importance must be considered in terms of their
presence, the context in which they were found and the value of the items in their historical context.

![Image of Medal of Immaculate Conception](image)

**Figure 6.12:** Front of the Medal of Immaculate Conception from the site (left), compared to a replica medal (right).

One religious pendant was recovered from the site, which is the Medal of the Immaculate Conception, otherwise known as the Miraculous Medal. The medal is small and oval, measuring 1.2 cm wide by 1.7 cm tall (Figure 6.12) and contains a circular bail at the top to attach the medal to a chain, likely used to attach the medal to a rosary or a necklace. The original Miraculous Medal contained an image of the Virgin Mary standing on a globe with a serpent at her feet, while the reverse contained twelve stars surrounding a large “M” below a cross (Deagan 2002). The medal recovered from the Chief Richardville House is similar and while faded, the details of the medal can be made out. One side of the medal is identical to the original Miraculous Medal and contains an image of the Virgin Mary standing on top of a globe with the phrase “O Mary conceived without sin, pray for us to have recourse to thee” surrounding the image in Latin (Deagan 2002:54).
The reverse side of this medal (Figure 6.13) is a bit different from the original medal however, and instead contains an inscription of “Souvenir du Jubile Universel 1851”. The Miraculous Medal was first created in 1832, after the Virgin Mary appeared to Sister Catherine Laboure in 1830, asking her to have a medal made that would grace to anyone who wore it (Deagan 2002; Saint Benedict Center 2008). While the medal recovered from the Chief Richardville House does contain the image of the Virgin Mary on one side, the reverse of this medal is much different and likely dates to 1851, rather than 1830, indicating this medal is a souvenir commemorating the event that took place in 1830. Despite these differences, the person who purchased and wore this medal was likely Catholic in faith, which would fit with Richardville’s descendants, as he was known to have converted to Catholicism and raised his children in the faith.

In addition to the religious medallion, ten other personal adornment artifacts were
recovered that include barrettes, cufflinks, suspender fasteners and jewelry fragments (Figure 6.14).

Figure 6.14: Sample of personal adornment items recovered from the Chief Richardville House.

All of the barrettes and hair pins recovered are plastic, placing their production in the twentieth century. While the remaining items are decorated, aside from their decoration they don not contain any characteristics that allow the items to be dated. Six of these items were recovered from Level 1, while one suspender fastener and one cufflink were found in Level 2 and the jewelry fragment and pendant were recovered from feature contexts in Unit 11 and associated with the original entry porch of the house.

Two makeup compacts were also recovered from the site, one from Unit 8, Level 2, Area A and the other from Unit 10, Feature 3, Level 1, Area AB. The compact recovered from Unit 8 is a complete compact measuring 4 cm in diameter, 1.6 cm high and contains the phrase “Garden
“Garden Court” engraved in a cursive script dating to 1890 (Figure 6.15).

![Garden Court engraving](image)

**Figure 6.15: Garden Court engraving**

Other than this engraving, it is a simple brass compact with no other decoration, clasps, latches, closures or chain. It is a round, bifold compact with a mirror on one side and a reservoir (1 cm deep) that held the cosmetic material and accompanying sponge on the opposing side (Figure 6.16).

![Compact from Unit 8](image)

**Figure 6.16: Compact from Unit 8.**
The other compact was recovered from Feature 3 in Unit 10 (Level 1, Area AB) and while Feature 3 was determined to be a cultural feature, it was noted that the level this compact was recovered from was disturbed by rodent activity. This compact consists only of the top lid of the compact and is much larger, measuring 6.7 cm in diameter. The compact lid is brass, contains the top part of a hinge and contains a Lournay inscription in the center (Figure 6.17).

![Figure 6.17: Lournay compact from Feature 3, Unit 10.](image)

The first use of cosmetics was in ancient civilizations and has continued to this day, though their use has come in and out of popularity and they have experienced a sorted history (Gerson 1989). For example, both men and women were known to have used cosmetics in the Renaissance period without stigma, but in the eighteenth century British Parliament passed a law against the use of cosmetics, so shortly thereafter women that used cosmetics were thought to be degenerates, prostitutes and undesirable (Gerson 1989). However, later in the nineteenth century cosmetics again began to gain acceptance and popularity and cosmetic compacts were exquisite pieces, fashioned from sterling silver with engraving, gilt overlays and even covered in gems (Gerson 1989).

Because Natoequah was known to identify more closely with her Miami background, she would not be a likely candidate to use these products and they instead appear to be associated
with Richardville’s descendants that occupied the house in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Lournay was trademarked by the Colgate-Palmolive Company in New York in 1921 (including metal cosmetic products for rouge and talcum powder), which corresponds with an increase in popularity and acceptance of wearing cosmetics once again (trademarkia.com). Additionally, the plain, undecorated quality of the cosmetics suggest they were used by occupants of lesser means, which corresponds with the presence of Richardville’s descendants at the structure.

*Coins.* Seventy-three coins were recovered from the site and range in date from 1869 to 1961, though the dates of many coins are faded and illegible (Table 6.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coin</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Coin</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nickel</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wheat Penny</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nickel</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wheat Penny</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Quarter</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nickel</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat Penny</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nickel</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat Penny</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat Penny</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>Unk</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat Penny</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dime</td>
<td>Unk</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The bulk of the coins recovered from the Chief Richardville House were pennies, including fourteen wheat pennies and 50 Lincoln head pennies. A single dime was recovered and while its date is not legible, it does feature the image of Franklin D. Roosevelt, which first appeared on dimes in 1946, so a relative date for this dime can be placed in the middle of the twentieth century (after 1946, if not later). One buffalo head nickel was also found at the site (Feature 2 in Unit 12) and while its date is not legible, buffalo head nickels are known to have been produced from 1913 to 1938. The other five nickels from the site are Jefferson head nickels and all but one had a legible date. Jefferson head nickels were first produced in 1938 and are still in production today, so the single coin without a date can be placed in the twentieth century. Just one quarter was recovered from the site, which contains a date of 1958.
As can be seen in Figure 6.18, the only significant concentration of coins occurred in Units 10, 11 and 12, north of the house, which contained 62 coins, again is likely due to the protection offered by the porch from metal detectors. Only six other units contained the remaining coins and the remaining units did not contain any coins.

_Pipe Fragments._ Twenty clay pipe fragments were recovered from ten different units the Chief Richardville House, which can be seen in Figure 6.19.
The units west and east of the house contained the highest concentration of clay pipe fragments, while the units north and south of the house contained the lowest, as can be seen in Figure 6.20.

![Figure 6.20: Clay pipe Fragment distribution at the Chief Richardville House.](image)

Level one contained the most pipe fragments (10), followed by levels two (seven), three (two) and four (one). No pipe fragments were found in the sod layer or deeper than level four at the site. Of the clay pipe fragments recovered, twelve were bowl fragments and eight were pipe stem fragments. A single complete pipe bowl was recovered (Figure 6.19), which matches Type 23 in Hume’s 1970 chronology and places its production in the 1820s - 1860s (Figure 6.21).
All of the other pipe bowls are highly fragmented and lacked decoration, so they are unable to be dated. Within the assemblage only one pipe stem fragment that was decorated, containing bands or stripes and was recovered from level two of Unit 1 (Figure 6.22).

Pipe stem boreholes were measured with drill bits (as outlined by Harrington 1954) for all pipe stems recovered from the site, which are presented in Table 6.3 below. Because the house was constructed in 1827 and falls outside of Harrington’s established chronology for pipe stem bores, it was understood that the measurements may turn out be inconclusive or erroneous.
As it turns out, four pipe stems contained a diameter of 4/64, which according to Harrington’s chronology were produced from 1750 to 1800. Because the land was in use prior to when the Chief Richardville House was built, it is possible that these pipe stems date to the eighteenth century. Another four pipe stem fragments had a diameter of 5/64” indicating they originated from the eighteenth century while two others had a diameter of 3/32” originating in the late seventeenth to early eighteenth century. However, no pipe stem fragments were found below level four, so if these pipe stems do follow Harrington’s chronology and predate the construction of the house, their presence in upper stratigraphic levels of the site may be indicative that mixing, disturbance or redeposition of materials has taken place.

In addition to using Harrington’s chronology, Binford (1962) and South (1962) were also examined and Binford’s regression equation (Y = 1931.85 - 38.26X) was applied to the pipe stems recovered from the site, producing a date of 1748. While this date is close to that produced from using Harrington’s drill bit method, it still predates the occupation of the site, indicating that perhaps these methods aren’t appropriate to use on this assemblage or that mixing and disturbance has taken place at the site. However, according to Binford (1962:20), an “adequate” sample of pipe stems representative of the population being dated is required for this equation to work properly, which is not the case at this site since only ten pipe stems were recovered from the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pipe stem Bore Hole Size (in inches)</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1750-1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1710-1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1680-1710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Toys. Although toys made up a very small portion of the assemblage, a few children’s toys were present at the Chief Richardville House including marbles, a toy jack and doll parts. Toys are an important component of archaeological assemblages because they are one of few categories to represent children’s activities at archaeological sites and may therefore provide information on Richardville’s children.

Marbles were the most numerous toy recovered at the site, with ten glass marbles, one stone marble and one clay marble found in five units at the site (Figure 6.23).

Figure 6.23: Marble distribution map for the Chief Richardville House.
Handmade glass marbles were first produced in the nineteenth century and exhibit two cut marks from where they were cut off of the glass rod from which they were produced, while machine made glass marbles are instead uniformly spherical, do not contain cut marks and were in production in the twentieth century (Samford 2002). Ten glass marbles were recovered from the Chief Richardville House (Figure 6.24) and are clearly machine made, as they do not contain the cut marks characteristic of handmade glass marbles. Instead, all ten marbles are perfectly spherical and are between 1.5 cm and 1.8 cm in diameter, placing their date of production securely in the twentieth century. The only outstanding characteristics of these glass marbles are surface nicks or chips, which are likely from use, excavation procedures or post depositional processes.

Figure 6.24: Glass Marbles from the Chief Richardville House.

One clay marble and one stone marble were also recovered from the structure (Figure 6.25). The clay marble is an earthenware marble that measures 1.4 cm in diameter, is not glazed or decorated and is nearly perfectly spherical, only containing minor surface imperfections. The stone marble is made of limestone, is 1.9 cm in diameter, buff in color and contains no significant surface modifications or imperfections. The glass marbles are not associated with
Richardville’s occupation of the structure due to their later manufacture date, but the clay and stone marbles are earlier and more likely to be associated with Richardville’s occupation of the house. Prior to glass marbles, stone marbles were the most common type of marble in the seventeenth century through the late nineteenth century when porcelain, baked clay and glass marbles became popular (Deagan 2002). While firm manufacture dates for the stone and clay marbles cannot be established, they are more likely to be associated with an earlier occupation of the structure due to their earlier manufacture date.

Figure 6.25: Stone (left) and clay (right) marbles.

Lastly, one metal toy jack was recovered from Feature 5 in Unit 12 (Figure 6.26) and one porcelain doll bust was recovered from level one of Unit 11 (Figure 6.27).

Figure 6.26: Toy jack from the Chief Richardville House.
The toy jack is modern and clearly machine-made, indicating it is more likely to be associated with Richardville’s descendants than his own occupation of the house. The porcelain doll bust is harder to date because it lacks distinguishing characteristics (Figure 6.267) but it was found in level one of excavation with other modern debris, so it is more likely to be associated with a later occupation of the structure.

![Figure 6.27 Porcelain doll bust from the Chief Richardville House.](image)

**Utilitarian Clothing Items.** Five utilitarian clothing items were recovered from three excavation units at the site including one leather belt fragment, two metal clothing eyelets and two leather shoelace fragments (Figure 6.28). One clothing eyelet was recovered from level one of Feature 3 in Unit 11, while the leather shoe laces were recovered from Feature 3 in Unit 11, a single clothing eyelet from level two in Unit 15 and the belt fragment from level one in Unit 2. Unfortunately, these five items are fragmentary and undecorated, providing little additional information. Additionally, the presence of some of these items in upper stratigraphic units suggests that they are recent, or that they are from disturbed contexts.
Ceramics

A total of 4,282 ceramic pieces were recovered from the Chief Richardville House (7,392.4g), which were divided into the broad categories of earthenware, stoneware and porcelain, then further sorted by type. Twenty-seven different ceramic ware types were identified in these three categories. Of the twenty-seven ceramic wares found at the site, only whiteware (66%) and flow blue wares (19%) occurred in significant amounts while the other twenty-five wares identified constitute less than three percent of the ceramic assemblage each and seventeen wares constitute less than one percent of the ceramic assemblage each (Table 6.4).

Table 6.4: Ceramic wares recovered from the Chief Richardville House.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramic Ware</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Ceramic Ware</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annular Banded Ware</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ironstone (White Granite)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Transferprint</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Mocha Yellow Ware</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Spongeware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Multicolor Transferprint</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Transferprint</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pink Decorated Ware</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Transferprint</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Purple Transferprint</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decal Transferprint</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Red Ware</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics Type</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorated Porcelain</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorated Whiteware</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgeware</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthenware</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow Blue</td>
<td>821</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray Transferprint</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Transferprint</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,282</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest number of ceramics were generally found in the units west of the structure, followed by the east of the structure, while the units to the north and south contained the fewest number of ceramics (Figure 6.29).

Figure 6.29: Ceramic Distribution from the Chief Richardville House
Within those basic trends however, Unit 14 and Unit 8 contain significantly fewer ceramics than the surrounding units, while Unit 12 contained more artifacts than the other northern units. However, when the number of ceramics from each unit are considered in comparison to the volume of soil excavated from each unit and density is examined, slightly different trends are seen, which can be seen below in Figure 6.30.

Figure 6.30: Ceramic density at the Chief Richardville House.

Northern and southern units are the least dense (with an average density of just 48 and 24 artifacts per cubic meter excavated, respectively), while eastern and western units are most dense (with an average density of 134 and 240 artifacts per cubic meter excavated, respectively). When eastern and western units are examined more closely, it appears that the units northwest (Units 13 and 14) and northeast (Units 5 and 8) of the structure are less dense, with a density similar to
the units north and south of the structure (< 100 artifacts per cubic meter excavated).

Additionally, the Units to the southwest and southeast have a higher density, constituting the densest units at the site (an average of 312 and 219 artifacts per cubic meter excavated) (Figure 6.30). These general distribution and density trends are likely due to the fact that northern units were covered with a porch for much of the life of the structure and Units 1 and 2 were the furthest from the structure. The remaining units were adjacent to the structure and not covered, which created the right conditions for deposition of ceramics throughout the use and occupation of the structure.

Of the 4,282 ceramics recovered, 4,147 pieces have known vertical provenience. Level 0 contained just 57 ceramic pieces, while levels one and two by far contained the most ceramics and each accounting for 44% of the ceramic assemblage (Figures 6.31 and 6.32).

![Figure 6.31: Level zero ceramic distribution.](image)

![Figure 6.32: Level one ceramic distribution.](image)
Ceramics decreased drastically in Level three (Figure 6.34), followed by Level 4 (Figure 6.35) and Level 5 (Figure 6.36).

Ceramic distribution seen in most levels follow those of the site as a whole discussed above, but there are a few exceptions. Level 0 contained very few ceramics pieces (likely due to keeping the yard surrounding the house clean) and the distribution in Levels 1, 2 and 3 was most similar to that of the site as a whole. Due to the number of ceramics recovered from these three levels (4,021), these levels were likely responsible for establishing the distribution pattern of ceramics for the site as a whole.
The spatial distribution of ceramics in Levels 4 and 5 were different however, with drastically fewer ceramics found, as well as a higher number of ceramics recovered from units that contained few ceramics in previous levels, which may represent a shift in use areas at the site over time (Figures 6.35 and 6.36).

Each ceramic ware type recovered from the site will be discussed below, including a general discussion of each ware, its production dates, efficacy in dating the occupation of the structure and the frequency and distribution of each ware.

**Earthenware**

Earthenware is a large category of relatively soft ceramics that are fired at low temperatures (below 1100 degrees centigrade) resulting in porous bodies that were somewhat
permeable and require glazing to hold liquids without absorption (Greer 2005; Ramsay 1976; Stelle 2001). Earthenware ceramics that were recovered from the Chief Richardville House include whiteware, transferprinted whiteware, flow blue, red ware, yellow ware, creamware, edged ware and some earthenwares that could not be identified any further.

*Whiteware.* Whiteware consists of a white, uniform paste with clear or colorless glaze (Figure 6.37). While whiteware does not have a firm date of introduction, it was developed in England from pearlware and became common in America by the 1830s (Miller 1980; Price 1979; Ramsay 1976; Stelle 2000).

![Figure 6.37: Sample of whiteware ceramics.](image)

Whiteware can be molded, impressed, embossed and decorated in a variety of patterns, however most whiteware produced was plain, without decoration and represents some of the least expensive wares produced. Miller (1980) placed whiteware in the first and lowest level in his economic scaling of ceramics due to the low cost of production and abundance of the ware. Also, because whiteware is still produced today it has a mean production date of 1923 and is therefore not useful for establishing a precise occupation date of sites when found. However, due
to its abundance in the mid-nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the presence of whiteware is often useful for identifying disturbance, mixing and more recent occupation of sites.

Whiteware was by far the most common ware found at the Chief Richardville House, with a total of 2,820 pieces (4,141.3g) recovered, accounting for 66% of the total ceramic assemblage (Table 6.4). Much like the general ceramic distribution pattern at the site, the highest concentrations of whiteware ceramics was in the units southwest (67% of the whiteware) and southeast (18% of the whiteware) of the structure, while the units to the north and south contained the least amount of whiteware (Figure 6.38).

![Figure 6.38: Whiteware distribution.](image)

Whiteware was present in nearly every level of all excavation units at the site. Only 38 pieces were recovered from the sod layer of all 16 units and the frequency of whiteware increased in levels one and two, which together accounted for 90% of the whiteware recovered at the site. Below level two the frequencies of whiteware decreased again, containing only 6.5% of
the whiteware assemblage in level three, 1.7% in level four and less than one percent in level five. Given that most whiteware (2,490 pieces) was found in the upper excavation levels and much less (just 330 pieces) was found below level two, it is likely that this ware was used in the later occupancy of the structure, by Richardville’s descendants and is not associated with the original use and occupancy of the structure. Additionally, undecorated whiteware is known to be one of the least expensive wares produced and mainly a utilitarian ware, which fits with the shift in the use of the structure as a place of lavish entertainment by Richardville to that of an average domestic residence in the middle of the nineteenth century by LaFontaine and his family.

Twenty-five pieces of whiteware contained maker’s marks, a sample of which can be seen in Figure 6.39 above. Although none are complete, it was still possible to establish relative dates for some of them. For example, marks from the Steubenville Pottery Co. of Ohio (which
began production in 1879) and Jacob & Thomas Furnival (that produced earthenwares from 1818 to 1913) were present in the assemblage. Another fragment contained contained “E” and W.R.”, which were determined to be a J.&W. Ridgeway mark, dating from 1830 to 1855 (Godden 1964). Another mark contained “Rd N 14… Englan…”, which is known to be Victorian manufacture, with an estimated date of 1890 (Jeske and Stillwell).

The other maker’s marks present in the assemblage were fragmented and contained variations of the Royal Arms mark. Even when a full maker’s mark is absent and only partial marks are present, it is usually possible to identify the mark itself, as well as the maker of the ware and get a relative production date for the ceramic ware because the Royal Arms marks can be relatively dated; prior to 1837 the shields on these marks are more complex with an additional shield in the center, while after 1837 most of these marks contain simple quartered shields or basic designs (Godden 1991). In this assemblage, one Royal Arms maker’s mark contained a nearly complete shield (Figure 3.40) and it was a fairly simple design, with no segmentation of the shield or additional shield, indicating that it likely belonged in the latter category, post-dating 1837.

![Image of a ceramic fragment with a shield design]

Figure 6.40: Close up of Whiteware maker’s marks.

_Transferprinted Whiteware._ Transferprinted whiteware was created by applying floral, scenic and geometric designs to ceramic wares in a variety of colors that included black, blue,
brown, grey, green, purple and red colors, as can be seen in Figure 6.41 (Price 1979; Stelle 2001).

Figure 6.41: Sample of transferprinted wares.

Miller (1980) estimated the value of transferprinted wares to be as much as three to five times that of plain, undecorated wares, which places these wares in the highest price index tier primarily due to their increased sophistication, technology and cost. The presence of these wares indicates a greater financial investment in ceramics and are often correlated with increased wealth. As a whole, transferprinted wares were produced from approximately 1820 to 1860 though each had slightly different production dates within this period (Table 6.5).

Table 6.5: Transferprinted wares and their manufacture dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transferprint Type</th>
<th>Manufacture Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Transferprint</td>
<td>1830 - 1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Transferprint</td>
<td>1820 - 1860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Transferprint</td>
<td>1829 - 1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray Transferprint</td>
<td>1840 - 1860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Transferprint</td>
<td>1829 - 1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple Transferprint</td>
<td>1829 - 1860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While color can be a good temporal indicator, the type of decoration seen in the transferprints can also be useful for dating with more ornate transferprints earlier (with scenic or cottage motifs) and less complex and monochrome motifs later (Majewski and O’Brien 1987; Price 1979). Because the production dates of different transferprinted wares are known and relatively limited, they are more useful in relatively dating the site.

Nearly all units at the Chief Richardville House contain some transferprinted wares, with the exception of Units 10, 12 and 13, which contained none (Figure 6.42). All other units contained some transferprinted wares, though Units 3, 6 and 15 contained the most transferprinted wares. Similar to whiteware, the bulk of the transferprinted wares found were recovered from the first three levels of excavation and the number of transferprinted wares decreased as depth increased. However, unlike the whiteware (where 90% of the ware was recovered from Levels 0-2) level three contained a more substantial portion of the transferprint assemblage (16%). The presence of a more substantial percentage of the assemblage at a deeper level perhaps indicates an earlier use of the ware at the structure.
Flow Blue. Flow is a transferprint decoration that is produced by adding gaseous chemicals to the kiln while firing printed patterns on whiteware, which results in the flow, flowering or bleeding of colors on the ware, as can be seen in Figure 4.43 (Majewski and O’Brien 1987; Prince 1979).

![Sample of flow blue ceramics](image)

Figure 6.43: Sample of flow blue ceramics

Blue was the most frequently seen flow color (and the only color of flow ceramic found at the site), which was produced from approximately 1840 to 1879 (Prince 1979). Similar to transferprinted wares, the tighter date range of flow blue ceramics will be useful in relatively dating the units and levels in which it was found. Though flow blue wares were produced for years after Richardville’s death, the earliest production of the ware does coincide with his last few years in the structure, so he certainly could have been responsible for purchasing and using these wares. Just a few flow blue ceramics contained maker’s marks, which all came from the same Indian Stone pattern, produced by the Villa Pottery in England. This maker’s marks identified Edward Walley as the maker who operated the Villa Pottery producing this pattern from 1845 to 1865 (Figure 6.42). Unlike the other flow blue ceramics, because this mark has a
manufacture date after Richardville’s death, there is no way it could have been associated with his occupation of the structure.

![Figure 6.44: Indian Stone maker’s mark pattern](image)

Much like the transferprinted wares, flow blue ceramics have a much higher value (as much as two to three times higher) than other decorated wares (Miller 1980). The flow blue ceramics are therefore likely associated with Richardville, especially given their ornate design and higher price point, which is indicative of an elite residence. Flow blue was the second most numerous ceramic ware recovered from the site with 821 pieces (788.2g), accounting for 19% of the total ceramic assemblage at the site, as can be seen in table 6.4.

All but one unit (Unit 8) contained flow blue ceramics and much like the distribution of whiteware, the units to the south and north of the house contained the fewest flow blue ceramics (1.1% and 2.2% of the flow blue ceramics recovered, respectively). The units east of the structure did contain some flow blue ceramics though the majority of the flow blue ceramics came from units west of the house, which combined contained 740 pieces (696.6g) or 90% of the flow blue ceramics recovered from the site (Figure 6.45). Interestingly, Units 15 and 16 contained most flow blue ceramics (67%), though Units 6 and 7 (which bordered Units 15 and 16) contained far less.
Figure 6.45: Distribution of flow blue ceramic at the Chief Richardville House

Much like the other ceramics at the site, most flow blue ceramics were found in upper stratigraphic levels. Few pieces of flow blue (seven) were recovered from the sod layer, while the greatest amount was recovered from levels one and two across the site (45% and 35% of the flow blue assemblage, respectively). As with other ceramic wares at the site, decreasing amounts were seen in Levels 3 and 4 (18% and 1%). However, like transferprinted wares, a larger proportion of the flow blue assemblage was recovered from level three (18%), which perhaps represents an earlier use of this ware.

Only a few pieces of flow blue ceramics contained maker’s marks, and much like the maker’s marks on the whiteware ceramics, are highly fragmentary. As the picture below shows, the central portion of the mark is missing and only the banner underlying the mark was recovered (Figure 6.46). Even though this mark is fragmentary, it was still possible to identify it as the Indian Stone pattern, produced by the Villa Pottery in England from 1845 – 1865. Flow blue
ceramics were produced from approximately 1840 to 1880 and while it is possible that Richardville could have purchased flow blue ceramics in the few years before his death, this maker’s mark suggests that at least some of the flow blue ceramics were in use at the site after his death.

Figure 6.46 Flow blue maker’s mark

Annular banded Whiteware. Items in this category are decorated with a series of horizontal, colored rings or bands of a variety of colors, as can be seen in Figure 6.47 (Price 1979).

Figure 6.47: Sample of annular banded ware ceramics

Earlier annular banded ware exhibited narrower bands of more earthen colors, while later annular banded ware had narrower bands and were decorated with bright, bold colors (Majewski and O’Brien 1987). Annular banded ware was first produced in England by 1790 and began to be
produced in America shortly thereafter. Because the decoration of these wares is minimal and simple, Miller (1980) placed these wares in the second level of his price index, constituting some of the less expensive decorative wares. A total of nine pieces of annular banded ware were recovered from the site, all of which were quite small, only containing a portion of the banded decoration (Figure 6.48). Five and three pieces were recovered from Units 3 and 5 (respectively) east of the house and just one piece was recovered from Unit 6 west of the house (Figure 6.48). A single sherd was recovered from Level 1, while five were found in Level 2, one in Level 3 and two were of unknown vertical provenience in Unit 5.

![Figure 6.48: Distribution of annular banded ware ceramics](image)

**Yellow Ware.** Yellow ware is made from a fine, buff clay that is fired at a relatively high temperature (above 2,000 degrees Fahrenheit), and produces a porous ware until glazed (Ramsay 1976; Stelle 2001). Due to its higher firing temperature, yellow ware was studier than red ware,
yet easier to handle than stoneware. It began to be produced in the 1820s in America and was produced into the twentieth century, so it contains a median production date of 1928 (Gallo 1985). Variations of yellow ware include slip, mocha yellow ware, rockingham, oxide washes and embossing through the use of molds and similar to other undecorated wares yellow ware was placed in the first tier of Miller’s (1980) price index and had a low value. Due to its lengthy production into the present, yellow ware is not very useful for dating specific occupations of the house.

Yellow ware constituted 1.4% of the entire ceramic assemblage, consisting of 59 sherds that weigh 145.4g (Figure 6.49).

![Sample of yellow ware ceramics](image)

Figure 6.49: Sample of yellow ware ceramics

Yellow ware ceramics were found in eleven of the units excavated and a majority (36 pieces or 62%) came from the east side of the structure. Distribution patterns of yellow ware are slightly different than other ceramic wares (Figure 6.50).
For example, unlike other ceramic wares, units to the west of the house had the fewest pieces of yellow ware, with only three of the seven units containing any yellow ware. Additionally, Unit 1 contained nine pieces of yellow ware (accounting for 15% of the yellow ware assemblage) and Unit 3 contained the most yellow ware, with 21 pieces. While the horizontal distribution of yellow ware differs from other ceramic wares at the site, the vertical distribution remains much the same. Level one and two contain most of the yellow ware ceramics recovered at the site (14 and 38 pieces respectively), levels zero and three contained just two pieces of yellow ware each and none was found below level three.

Rockingham. Rockingham is a type of yellow ware that gets its name from the Swinton works, which produced the ware on the estate of Charles, Marquis of Rockingham (Barber 1976). This ceramic ware can range from yellow to cream in color and contains a surface treatment of manganese or umber to the glaze that produces a brown, mottled effect (Majewski and O’Brien 1987). Due to this surface treatment, there is a great deal of variation in the pattern...
of mottling and no two pieces of rockingham are alike (Figure 6.51).

![Sample of rockingham ceramics](image)

Figure 6.51: Sample of rockingham ceramics

The Rockingham ware was first produced after 1788 and was commonly seen in America by 1830, with its height in popularity from 1840 to 1900 (Stelle 2001). However, rockingham wares were produced until 1950, giving it a median production date of 1900, making it a good indicator for later use of the house by Richardville’s descendants. This ware fits into the second level of Miller’s (1980) price index and is a relatively inexpensive ware, which also fits with his descendant’s occupation of the house. A total of 48 pieces (207.1g) of rockingham ceramics were recovered from seven units at the site (Figure 6.52).
Interestingly, unlike other ceramic wares, most rockingham sherds were recovered from Units 10 and 11, north of the house (25) and Units 13 and 14 contain more rockingham ceramics (13) than most other units at the site, though these units usually contain fewer wares than the surrounding units. Unit 3 on the east side of the structure contained just two pieces of rockingham and this unit was the only one east or south of the structure to contain any rockingham ceramics. Because a porch covered the area north of the house before about 1900 and after the mid-1950s, the ceramics in Units 10 and 11 were likely deposited at the time where a porch did not exist, but stairs existed instead in the first half of the twentieth century. The general production dates of rockingham ceramics provide good relative dates for their deposition and the correlation to porch construction at the site also provides additional information, placing the date of the deposition of rockingham ceramics at the site to the first half of the twentieth
century by Richardville’s descendants. Rockingham ceramics found in deeper levels (Level 5 of Unit 10 for example) is therefore a good indication that mixing or disturbance has taken place in these units.

Creamware. Creamware is a soft, cream or yellow refined earthenware, with a clear alkaline or lead glaze that was common from approximately 1760 to 1820 (with a median production date of 1791) and is known to be one of the cheapest wares produced (Barber 1976; Miller 1980; Ramsay 1976; Price 1979; Hume 1978). Creamware was produced in both decorated and undecorated varieties, though only undecorated creamware was recovered from the Chief Richardville House (Figure 6.53).

A total of six creamware sherds were recovered from the site; four from level one of Unit 3 and two from level two of Unit 6 (Figure 6.54). Due to its somewhat narrow production date range, this ware will be more useful than other wares in dating occupations and use of the site. Additionally, because of the earlier production date of creamware, it is more likely to be associated with an earlier occupation of the structure by Richardville, but unfortunately only six
pieces of this ware were recovered.

**Edged Ware.** Edged ware (or shell-edge ware) is a type of whiteware that contains a molded rim motif (including scalloped impressed rims and unscalloped impressed rims) with an underglaze decoration (most commonly in blue or green), embossing along the edge of the ware or a painted decoration along the edge (Miller 1980, 1987; Stelle 2001). Edged wares were generally produced as early as the late eighteenth century and seen into the nineteenth century, with more elaborate decorations seen earlier and simpler decorations later (Stelle 2001). A total of eight pieces of edge ware were recovered from the site and all but one contained blue decoration of some sort (Figure 6.55).
Two pieces of the edged ware (letters G and H, Figure 6.54) were too highly fragmented to identify the pattern of the edge decoration, as only a sliver of blue paint is present on the sherd, while one piece (letter C, Figure 6.54) contained only a blue decoration. An additional sherd contained a raised blue dotted edge pattern (letter B, Figure 6.54), while three others contained a feather edge decoration (letters A, D and E, Figure 6.54) and one piece contained a simple white glaze with raised dots along the edge (letter F, Figure 6.54). Because these sherds contained only rims and maker’s marks or other identifying marks were not present, their patterns were used in an attempt to establish manufacture dates.

All of these pieces appear to date to the latter portion of the nineteenth century, with the unmolded, unscalloped, painted blue decoration style of edged ware produced from approximately 1850 to 1897 and the feather edged decoration dates from the 1860s to approximately 1890 (Stelle 2001). Additionally, only levels one and two contained edged ware ceramics, with level one containing five pieces and level two containing three pieces. Given the production dates of these pieces and their vertical provenience, they are likely not associated with the earliest occupation of the house. Additionally, painted, unmolded edged ware is also
among the more inexpensive decorated wares in the nineteenth century according to Miller (1980), so its use by Richardville’s descendants is not surprising.

Ironstone. Also called white granite, stone china, semiporcelain and opaque granite, ironstone is a ceramic ware made from clay, combined with ironstone slag, flint and oxide of cobalt, which produced a stronger ware and arguably a whiter ware than traditional whiteware (Barber 1976). Most ironstone is plain, white, unmolded and undecorated, however, in the middle of the nineteenth century ironstone began to be embossed with shapes including leaves, wheat corn, oats, fruit, lilies and tulips (Stelle 2001). Ironstone is difficult to differentiate from whiteware because it is so similar in appearance, however, ironstone generally has sharper angles and whiteware has more gentle curves and is thicker, containing a finer texture. Because the wares are so similar macroscopically, a tongue test can be used because it is less sticky on the tongue than whiteware and stickier than porcelain (Stelle 2001). A total of 25 pieces of ironstone were recovered from the Chief Richardville House (Figure 6.56). The twenty-five pieces of ironstone recovered from the site were undecorated and did not contain maker’s marks, making it difficult to identify a specific manufacturer and production date.
**Unidentifiable Earthenwares.** This category included a total of 69 pieces (343.9g) of earthenware ceramic that did not fit into any of the above categories. These ceramic pieces are earthenware, containing a soft, porous paste (that sticks to the tongue), but in many cases these pieces did not have any other distinguishing characteristics. Sixty-four of these ceramics were highly fragmented, only containing an inner surface (lacking decoration or glazing), while five pieces were salt-glazed. Unlike the other ceramic wares, most earthenwares were recovered from units east of the structure (Figure 6.57). Although Units 5 and 8 contained less earthenware than surrounding units, when they are factored in, units east of the house contained 65% of the earthenware ceramics recovered from the site. The other eight excavation units that contained earthenware ceramics contained fewer than five pieces each, representing a small portion of the assemblage. Vertical distributions were similar to that of other wares and a majority of unidentifiable earthenware ceramics (59%) were recovered from level one, while the sod layer contained just four pieces, twelve pieces were found level two, seven in level three, and a single piece found in level four. Due to the difficulty of further identification, firm dates for these
pieces were not established and cannot aide in relative dating at the site.

**Figure 6.57: Distribution Unidentified earthenware**

**Stoneware**

Stoneware is another large category of ceramics made from finer, denser clays with relatively thick walls and a durable, hard body and glaze used to produce utilitarian items like jugs, pitchers and crocks (Greer 2005; Ramsay 1976; Stelle 2001). Common surface treatments include unglazed plain, salt glazed, Albany slip and Bristol glaze. Salt glazing is a surface treatment achieved by adding salt to the kiln during the firing process, which produces a shiny, irregular surface that resembles an orange peel and can be used on plain stoneware or applied over colored glazes (Barber 1976; Greer 2005; Ramsay 1976). Albany slip is a brown glaze produced from natural clays from Albany, New York that are mixed with water, then applied to the interior of the vessel, the exterior or both, while Bristol glaze is an off-white to white glossy glaze made from feldspars and zinc oxide (Stelle 2001). Stoneware was produced and used over long periods of time and while it is not always possible to determine precise production dates,
the surface decoration or treatment can sometimes help in slightly narrowing down the production date. For example, Albany slipped stoneware was commonly seen by the middle of the nineteenth century (with a median production date of 1877), while Bristol glazed stoneware was not widely produced in North America until the late nineteenth century (with a median production date of 1902) and the absence of a slip-glaze on the interior generally dates prior to 1860 (Greer 2005; Stelle 2001). Beyond these broad generalities, stoneware is not very useful for dating.

Stonewares recovered from the Chief Richardville House include salt glazed Albany slipped and Bristol glazed stoneware (Figure 6.58).

![Figure 6.58: Stoneware ceramics](image)

Twelve units at the site contained salt glazed stoneware, with the largest amount found east of the structure, followed by units west of the structure and very few pieces of stoneware recovered from the units north and south of the house (Figure 6.59). The bulk of the stoneware was recovered from levels one and two, with only three pieces found in level three, a single piece
in level four and none found in the sod layer.

![Stoneware distribution diagram](diagram.png)

**Figure 6.59: Stoneware distribution**

**Porcelain**

Porcelain is a non-porous, fine-grained, dense, translucent ceramic ware that is highly vitrified and fired above 1300 degrees centigrade and can include plain white, hand painted, transfer printed, decal and gilded decoration (Barber 1976; Greer 2005; McCorvie 1987; Majewski and O’Brien 1987; Ramsay 1976; Stelle 2001). Porcelain can be hard paste, soft paste or bone china, can be of Chinese, Japanese, European, English or American in origin and is notoriously hard to date (Miller 1980). Hard paste (or Oriental) porcelain is made of kaolin or feldspar, fired at a high temperature, resulting in melting and fusing with the body, which vitrifies the vessel (Ramsay 1976). Soft paste (or artificial porcelain) is made of artificial materials (primarily crushed or powdered glass) that achieved the same type of vitrification, though at a lower firing temperature (Ramsay 1976). Much like soft paste porcelain, bone china was made by adding artificial materials, but in the case of bone china phosphate is added,
primarily in the form of bone ash (Ramsay 1976). Due to the difficulty of differentiating the different types of porcelain, the country of origin of the wares and the long production timeline of porcelain, using porcelain to date occupation of the house is not effective.

Seventy-three pieces of porcelain were recovered from the Chief Richardville House, weighing 161.0g, which made up 1.7% of the total ceramic assemblage (Table 6.4). For the purposes of this dissertation hard paste porcelain was not differentiated from soft paste porcelain and all were merely identified as porcelain. Nearly all the porcelain recovered from the site was plain and only five pieces were decorated. Four pieces of porcelain were painted and one was molded into the shape of a flower. Unfortunately, none of the decorated pieces could be further identified as belonging to a specific pattern.

Figure 6.60: Distribution of Porcelain

Units 3 and 7 contained the most porcelain with 11 and 18 pieces respectively, while other units with porcelain contained seven or fewer pieces and Units 10, 12, 2 and 9 did not contain
any porcelain (Figure 6.60). The units north and south of the structure contained the least amount of porcelain (much like the other wares) because only Units 1 and 11 contained porcelain. Like most other wares, units west of the house contained the most porcelain (48%), followed by units to the east (40%). No porcelain was recovered from the sod layer and much like the other wares, most of the porcelain was recovered from levels one and two (which contained 87% of the porcelain recovered). Very little porcelain was found below level two, with only two pieces found in level three and a single piece found in level four.

*Ceramic Vessel Form and Function*

In addition to identifying ceramic ware types recovered from the Chief Richardville House, vessel form and function were also examined in the earliest wares from the house and sorted into flatware (plates, saucers, etc.) and hollow ware (cups, bowls, etc.) when possible (Table 6.6). However, the entire ceramic assemblage is highly fragmentary; there are no complete ceramic vessels in the entire assemblage and all of the early ceramic assemblage fell into LeeDecker et al.’s (1997) smallest completeness category (0-25% complete).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel Type</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flatware</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollow ware</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentifiable</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Positive identification of ceramic sherds belonging to the flatware or hollow ware categories was possible in many cases, but approximately one-third of the early ceramic assemblage was so small and fragmentary that a confident identification could not be made.
Most (94.6%) of the early ceramic wares were some type of tableware, with only 5.4% of the early ceramic assemblage consisting of stoneware storage vessels. Additionally, just a handful of the early ceramic sherds (0.9%) could positively be identified as being hollow ware, but again the assemblage is highly fragmentary, which likely impacted the results.

*Mean Ceramic Date*

A mean ceramic date (MCD) was produced for the site as a whole, as well as each unit, individual levels in each unit and each feature (which were considered separately) in order to demonstrate a correlation between ceramic production dates and the occupation of the house and use of the site. Once MCD was produced for each level and unit, activities at the site could be connected to Richardville’s presence or his descendants’ presence at the structure and use of the site over time could be examined. Dates used for the wares were gathered from Miller et al. (2000) South (1977) and Stelle (2001) and presented in Table 6.7 below.
Table 6.7: Mean ceramic dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramic Ware</th>
<th>Production Date</th>
<th>Median Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annular Ware, Banded</td>
<td>1785-1840</td>
<td>1812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Transferprint</td>
<td>1830-1850</td>
<td>1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Transferprint</td>
<td>1820-1860</td>
<td>1845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Transferprint</td>
<td>1829-1850</td>
<td>1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>1760-1820</td>
<td>1791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decal Transferprint</td>
<td>1890-1930</td>
<td>1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow Blue</td>
<td>1840-1880</td>
<td>1860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray Transferprint</td>
<td>1840-1860</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Transferprint</td>
<td>1829-1850</td>
<td>1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironstone (White Granite)</td>
<td>1813-1900</td>
<td>1857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mocha Yellow Ware</td>
<td>1795-1840</td>
<td>1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mocha banded ware</td>
<td>1840-1900</td>
<td>1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple Transferprint</td>
<td>1840-1860</td>
<td>1845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Transferprint</td>
<td>1829-1850</td>
<td>1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Ware</td>
<td>1725-Present</td>
<td>1862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>1850-1950</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spongeware</td>
<td>1830-1860</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Glazed (Albany Slip)</td>
<td>1830-1925</td>
<td>1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>1830- Present</td>
<td>1923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Ware</td>
<td>1840 -Present</td>
<td>1928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If production dates (and therefore median production date) could not be determined for wares, they were omitted from the MCD. For this analysis porcelain, unidentified earthenwares, pink glazed ware and salt-glazed earthenware were not included in the mean ceramic date. When these wares are combined, they totaled 92 pieces, or 2% of the assemblage, so the omission of these wares likely had little impact. Also, embossed whiteware, glazed whiteware and hand
painted whiteware were conflated into the whiteware category and decorated porcelain conflated into the porcelain category when calculating mean ceramic date because specific manufacturing dates for these wares could not be determined.

The mean ceramic date for the site as a whole is 1908 and the mean ceramic dates for individual levels and units can be seen in the table blow (Table 6.8). Just three units (Units 5, 10 and 16) had mean ceramic dates in the later nineteenth century, while all other units and all features had mean ceramic dates firmly in the early twentieth century.

Table 6.8: Mean ceramic dates for levels and units at the Chief Richardville House. Highlighted cells are nineteenth century mean ceramic dates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Level MCD</th>
<th>Unit MCD</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Level MCD</th>
<th>Unit MCD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td></td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Median Production Date</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>1887 1895</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>1905 UNK 1923</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Feature 2 0 N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>1914 2 1907 1908</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>UNK 1907</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1923 1906 Feature 3 1 1912</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>2 1904</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1920 1918 3 1923 1908</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>4 1900</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1800 5 1900</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>UNK 1911</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>1885 Feature 5 1 1928</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>2 N/A 1925</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1907 UNK 1923</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Feature 6 2 1923 1923</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unit 5 had an earlier mean ceramic date due to the presence of early ceramic wares including annular banded ware, multiple transferprints and flow blue ceramics in the unit, along with relatively few pieces of whiteware (161 pieces) and other later ceramics. Unit 10 was similar in that it only contained 14 pieces of ceramics with later median production dates (including rockingham, whiteware and yellow ware) but also contained a handful of earlier wares (redware, flow blue and ironstone). Unit 16 contained many more of the same later wares (309 pieces) but contained more wares with an earlier median date (333 redware, spongeware, transferprints and flow blue).
Seventeen individual levels had mean ceramic dates in the later nineteenth century, however, six of these levels were underlain by other levels with later mean ceramic dates (Table 6.7). Additionally, all of these levels also contained later, twentieth century ceramics (including whiteware or yellow ware), indicating that some mixing or disturbance may have occurred in these units. A total of seven levels, however, were not underlain by levels with later mean ceramic dates, but most of these also did contain some twentieth century wares. Just one level, Level 3 of Unit 10, had a nineteenth century mean ceramic date (1893) and was not underlain by later wares, however, this level did contain six pieces of Rockingham ceramics, which has a median production date 1900.

The later mean ceramic date for the site as a whole, as well as the individual units is due to the presence of a large volume of later wares. For example, whiteware, which has a median production date of 1923, accounted for 67% of the entire ceramic assemblage and was present in nearly every level of every unit that contained ceramics at the site. Additionally, early wares produced during Richardville’s lifetime were not numerous. Creamware, mocha yellow ware and annular banded ware for example, are the only three wares that had production dates that began and ended during Richardville’s lifetime, as well as median production dates during his lifetime. However, just sixteen pieces of these wares combined were recovered from the site, which accounts for less than one percent of the entire ceramic assemblage. Transferprinted wares are also an earlier ceramic ware likely to be associated with Richardville and his occupation of the structure, even though transferprinted wares were produced for a decade or two after his death. As a whole, the transferprint median production date postdates Richardville’s death by five years, though they were produced for nearly two decades during his lifetime. Additionally, flow blue and sponge ware are also ceramics that were in production during Richardville’s lifetime
(though again they continued to be produced after his death) and if all six of these wares are considered to be associated with Richardville and his occupation of the structure, a total of 982 ceramic pieces (or 23% of the ceramic assemblage) can be tied to Richardville and the earliest occupation of the house. lifetime.

When these early ceramic wares are examined, it is clear that more expensive wares were present early in the occupation of the house, representing a higher economic status and investment while the later wares represented a lower economic status. Transferprinted wares and flow blue ceramics dominated the earliest ceramic wares recovered from the site, while later ceramic wares predominantly consisted of plain, undecorated whiteware. According to Miller (1980) transferprinted wares were valued at three to five times more expensive than plain, undecorated wares and flow blue ceramics were valued at two to three times more expensive than other decorated wares, while whiteware represented some of the least expensive ceramic wares produced. These correlations indicate that more expensive, high status ceramic wares were consumed at the house during its earliest occupation associated with Richardville and more plain, less expensive ceramic wares were consumed later in the occupation of the structure by Richardville’s descendants.

Glass

In sum, 3,630 pieces of glass weighing 7,919.1g were recovered from the Chief Richardville House. The category of glass was further divided into flat glass, container glass, chimney lamp glass and decorative glass, then sorted by color (Table 6.9).
Table 6.9: Glass categories from the Chief Richardville House

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glass Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chimney Lamp Glass</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Container Glass</td>
<td>1648</td>
<td>3989.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorative Glass</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat Glass</td>
<td>1785</td>
<td>3327.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3630</strong></td>
<td><strong>7919.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Container Glass.* In sum, 1,738 pieces of container glass (3989.7g) were recovered from the Chief Richardville House as seen in Table 6.10 below. The container glass was highly fragmented and no complete container glass vessels were recovered from the site. As a result, in some cases it could be determined whether containers were machine made or mold made, but it was not possible to determine if the mold-made containers were made in two or three piece molds.

Table: 6.10: Container glass from the Chief Richardville House

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Container Glass</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amethyst</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqua</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frosted</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1648</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most (51%) of the container glass was recovered from the units to the west of the house, though Units 8 and 1 also contained a high amount of container glass (148 pieces and 160 pieces as seen in Figure 6.61. However, despite the higher densities of glass in these units, the surrounding units in these areas contained much less glass container glass. The units north of the house contained the least amount of glass, again likely due to the presence of a porch in this area.

![Figure 6.61: Container Glass Distribution](image)

Ten types of container glass were recovered from the site and clear glass dominated the container glass assemblage (56% of the container glass), followed by aqua (25%) and brown glass (12%). The remaining seven types of container glass occurred in comparatively small numbers and each accounted for 2% of the container glass assemblage or less and together accounted for just under 6% of the container glass recovered from the site.

The distribution of the clear container glass mirrors that of the container glass as a whole because most (48%) clear container glass was found in units west of the structure (Figure 6.62). However, 127 pieces (or 13%) of clear container glass were recovered from units north of the
structure. This distribution differs from other container glass types and from the general container glass distribution at the site as a whole because many types of container glass (brown, aqua, amber, blue and milk glass) were completely absent from some or all of these units and when they were present, they occurred in small numbers. Additionally, just 200 total pieces of container glass were recovered from these northern units and 127 of those pieces were clear container glass.

Like clear container glass, most brown container glass (50%) was recovered from units west of the house (Figure 6.63), though Unit 1 contained the most brown container glass (27%) at the site and very little (only 14 pieces) was found in the units north of the house.
Aqua container glass differed from clear and brown container glass because few pieces were found in the units south of the house (particularly Unit 1), though the units west of the house still contained the highest amount of aqua container glass (Figure 6.64).

Figure 6.64 Aqua container glass distribution.
Green container glass was the next most numerous, with 38 pieces (Figure 6.65). The southern units contained the least green container glass (one piece), while the northern, western and eastern units contained similar amounts (10, 12 and 14 pieces respectively). The remaining six types of container glass all occur in very small numbers and constitute less than one percent of the assemblage.

![Figure 6.65: Green container glass distribution.](image)

The bulk of the container glass was found in the top few excavation levels. While the sod layer only contained 31 pieces of container glass, level one contained 726 pieces, level two contained 572 pieces and level three contained 165 pieces. The lower two excavation levels only contained seventy total pieces, with level four containing 67 and level five containing three.

**Chimney Lamp Glass.** A total of 107 pieces of chimney lamp glass were recovered from five excavation units at the site. Units west of the structure contained the most chimney lamp
glass with 64 pieces, while the units north of the structure contained 43 pieces and the units east and south of the structure contained no chimney lamp glass (Figure 6.66). Much like other glass at the site, a majority of chimney lamp glass was recovered from the top four levels of excavation. Although the sod layer did not contain any chimney lamp glass, level one contained 29 pieces, level two 55 pieces and level three 19 pieces, while levels four and five only contained two pieces of chimney lamp glass each.

![Figure 6.66: Chimney lamp glass distribution.](image)

*Decorative Glass.* Ninety pieces of decorative glass were recovered from the Chief Richardville House site. Sixty-eight pieces of decorative glass were found in the seven units west of the structure and while twenty-seven of these came from Unit 16, the largest concentration of decorative glass was found in Unit 1, south of the house (48 pieces). Only Unit 11 north of the house contained any decorative glass (just two pieces) and the units east of the house did not contain any decorative glass.
**Flat Glass.** A total of 1,785 pieces of flat glass (3327.3g) were recovered from the site, including 1,547 pieces (2869.1g) of aqua flat glass and 238 pieces (458.2g) of clear flat glass (Table 6.11).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flat Glass</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aqua Flat Glass</td>
<td>1547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Flat Glass</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1785</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the distribution of all flat glass is examined it is clear that the units south of the structure once again contain the least amount of flat glass (with just 38 pieces), while the units west of the structure contain the most flat glass (with 1,052 pieces) and units north and east of the structure contain a moderate amount of flat glass. There is a great disparity between the amounts of clear (238) and aqua (1478) flat glass recovered at the site, so densities of flat glass were examined rather than raw numbers in order to see how distributions varied between the two types of flat glass.
When the density of all flat glass is examined it is clear is that units one, two, three, ten and fourteen have the lowest densities of flat glass, while units six, nine and sixteen contain the highest densities (Figure 6.67). This then translates to the units west of the house having the highest flat glass density, while the units to the south have the lowest flat glass density and the other units fall into the middle. While this is true when both aqua and clear glass densities are examined together, it changes slightly when they are examined separately. For example, four of the seven units west of the structure have a density of less than five pieces of clear glass per square meter and another two had a density under five pieces of aqua flat glass per square meter.

**Chipped Stone**

A total of 635 chipped stone artifacts were recovered from the site (Table 6.12) and subjected to basic macroscopic analysis.
Table 6.12: Chipped stone artifacts from the Chief Richardville House

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chipped Stone Artifact</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biface</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blade</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chunks/shatter</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flake</td>
<td>602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammerstone</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified Flake</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scraper</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with the historic materials recovered at the site, the chipped stone material was predominantly concentrated in just five units on the west side of the house, along with two units north of the house. While all units contained some chipped stone materials, the remaining units at the site contained less than fourteen pieces of chipped stone materials each (Figure 6.68).
Approximately 95% of the chipped stone artifacts recovered from the site were flakes (all tertiary flakes), the distribution of which mirrors that of chipped stone materials as a whole and require no further discussion (Figure 6.69).
However, twenty-two diagnostic chipped stone artifacts were recovered from the site and will be discussed below briefly. Much like most of the materials recovered at the site, a majority of the diagnostic chipped stone artifacts were recovered from units west of the house, though a handful of diagnostic chipped stone artifacts were found in Unit 12 north of the house and in Unit 5, east of the house (Figure 6.70).

In sum, twelve stage four biface fragments were recovered and all but two were found in the units west of the house (Figure 6.71).
Four projectile points were recovered from the site that included one Madison projectile point (Figure 6.72) from Unit 14, Level 3 (Letter B), one partial corner-notched point, probably an Archaic Kirk point (Unit 13, Level 2 (Letter C)), one probable Late Archaic humpback point (Unit 15, Level 2 (Letter D)) and one Early Woodland Meadowood projectile point (Unit 12, Level 3 (Letter A)).

![Figure 6.72 Projectile points, letters A – D (left to right).](image)

Two blades (possibly Middle Woodland) were recovered at the site (Unit 6, Level 1 and Level 1 in Area C within Feature 5 of Unit 12) and four scrapers were found at the site, three from Unit 14 and one from Unit 7. Two (Letter A and B, Figure 6.73) are teardrop shaped end scrapers, one (Letter C Figure 6.73) is a broken linear side scraper and the final scraper is large and oval, likely a large flake that was retouched to be a scraper (Letter D Figure 6.73).
While biface fragments and scrapers are more diagnostic than the flakes anddebitage recovered from the site, they do not provide temporal information or help in dating the site. The Kirk, Meadowood and Madison projectile point are the only firmly identifiable chipped stone tools at the site and is associated with Archaic through Late Woodland occupations, which indicates a very long occupational history for the site itself.

**Metal**

In sum, 3,755 metal artifacts were recovered from the Chief Richardville House weighing 10,358.3g. In general, units north of the house contained the most metal artifacts, likely due to the protection the porch provided against metal detectors over the years. While the units to the north had the highest concentration of metal artifacts, some individual units around the site did have higher counts and weights and when counts of metal artifacts are compared to weights of metal artifacts, some differences can be seen in the distribution of metal artifacts (Figure 6.74). For example, it appears that relatively few artifacts were recovered from Units 1 and 6, but that they were heavier artifacts and that a higher number of lighter artifacts were recovered from Unit 13 (Figure 6.75). However, the only area with a significant discrepancy in count versus weight appears to be in Unit 1, due to the presence of three particularly heavy metal artifacts, each...
weighting over one hundred grams.

The most common metal artifacts recovered from the Chief Richardville House include nails (round, square and unidentifiable nail fragments) and unidentifiable miscellaneous metal. As can be seen in Table 6.13 most metal artifacts occurred in very small quantities (fewer than five) though some (washers, ammunition casings, wire, bottle caps, staples, tacks, lead bullets, barrel strapping, bolts and screws to name a few) were recovered from the site in somewhat larger quantities. Few artifacts in the metal category will aid in shedding light on Richardville or Natoequah’s identity, though they may help establish activity or use areas at the site. Discussions here will highlight general vertical and horizontal provenience of some of the most common metal artifacts and also touch on the presence and distribution of artifacts that are indicative of use areas at the site.
Table 6.13: Metal artifacts from the Chief Richardville House

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Lead Bullet</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammunition Casing</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>Lead Musket Ball</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Lightbulb Base</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrel Strapping</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>Magnet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Metal Lid</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolt &amp; Nut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>Metal Ring</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle Cap</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>Metal Rod</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>110.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bracket</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>214.5</td>
<td>Nut</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckle</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>Paint Can</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnt Metal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Paper Clip</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Percussion Cap</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Pliers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>159.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain &amp; Hook</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>Plumbing Pipe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>328.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clamp</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>Ring</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clasp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Rivet</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clip</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Round Nail</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>1052.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee Can</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Scissors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Screw</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cylinder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>Shotgun Shell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Ring</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>Silverware Handle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorated Metal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>Spike</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>372.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fastener</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Spike Head</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fence Nail</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>Spoon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Poker Handle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>111.1</td>
<td>Spoon Bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firing Cap</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIrming Cap</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Sprocket</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foil</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Square Nail</td>
<td>1016</td>
<td>2760.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fork</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>Staple</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artifacts</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Artifacts</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gun Trigger</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>Steel Band</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>388.3</td>
<td>Tack</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hook</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Unidentifiable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Metal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>200.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Stake</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>114.1</td>
<td>Washer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>Wheel</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knife</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>Window Screen Clamp</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lantern Bracket</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Wire</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>267.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Wrench</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3755</strong></td>
<td><strong>10358.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Nails.* A total of 1,469 nails (4,013.9g) were recovered from the Chief Richardville house. The highest concentration of nails can be found in Units 5, 8, 10, 11 and 16. When the distributions of round and square nails are compared a similar distribution is seen. Square nail distribution is similar to that of the general metal artifact distribution and while every unit contained some square nails, Units 5, 8, 11 and 16 by far had the most square nails and Units 3 and 12 contained the fewest square nails (Figure 6.76). When the site as a whole is examined, units to the west and east of the structure produced the most square nails (389 on the west side and 347 on the east side), making up 38.5% and 34.3% of the square nails recovered from the site and units north of the house contained 13% of the nails recovered at the site. Only five square nails were recovered from the sod layer (level 0), which makes sense given the heavy metal detection activity that has taken place at the site. Four hundred and ninety-eight square nails were found in level one across the site, while 338 square nails were found in level two, 79 in level three, 64 in level four and only three in level five.
Although they were found in much smaller numbers, round nails were also recovered from the site (Figure 6.77). A total of 405 round nails (1,052.5g) were recovered and were fairly evenly distributed throughout the site. Units 2 and 13 contained the fewest round nails (with one and seven round nails, respectively) while Units 8 and 11 contained the most round nails (with 50 and 79, respectively). All other units contained between 15 and 37 nails. When whole areas of the site are considered, the area south of the house contained the fewest nails with only 17, while the areas east, north and west contained very similar amounts, with 132 round nails recovered from the areas north and west of the structure and 124 round nails recovered from the area east of the house. As far as vertical provenience is concerned, eleven round nails were recovered from
level zero, 222 from level one, 118 from level two, fourteen from level three and 21 from level four. Only forty-eight unidentifiable nails were recovered from the Chief Richardville House. These nail fragments were classified as unidentifiable because they were so corroded they could not be identified. Unidentifiable nails were only recovered from Units 1, 11 and 12, though they were most heavily concentrated in Unit 12, which contained 31 unidentifiable nails. Unit 1 also contained a fairly high amount, with fourteen nails and Unit 11 only contained three unidentifiable nails.

![Figure 6.77: Round nail distribution.](image)

*Other Metal.* Aside from nails, 2,286 other metal artifacts were recovered from the Chief Richardville House, weighing 6,344.4g. The artifacts in this category are wide ranging, comprising 71 different artifact types (Table 6.12). Within this category, unidentifiable miscellaneous metal is by far the most common metal artifact recovered with 2,040 pieces, weighing 2,987.7g and accounting for 54% of the total metal assemblage recovered from the site.
The remaining artifact types within the metal category each contain very few artifacts. Twenty-nine types contain fewer than ten artifacts and 37 types contain only a single artifact. The five artifact types that contain more than ten artifacts include ammunition casings, bottle caps, screws, staples and wire. Unfortunately, these are all modern artifacts, with no association with Richardville and yield no insight into his presence at the site.

*Building Materials*

Building materials were seen in nearly every level of every unit, resulting in 25,456 pieces of building materials recovered from the site, weighing 65,547.25g (Table 6.14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Materials</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>18485</td>
<td>41485.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnt Unknown</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caulking</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cement/Mortar</td>
<td>3937</td>
<td>11126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinkers</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain Tile</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1031.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masonry/Flagstone</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>2109.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Building Materials</td>
<td>2386</td>
<td>9477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint Chips</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roofing Shingles</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roofing Tiles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slate</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>105.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stucco</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25456</strong></td>
<td><strong>65547.2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen in Figure 6.78 the units north and west of the house contained a majority of building materials recovered from the site while units to the east and south contained the fewest building materials.

Figure 6.78: Building material distribution.

*Brick.* Brick was by far the most common type of building material recovered from the site with 18,485 pieces of brick weighing 41,485.3g. Brick was found in nearly every level of every unit and an additional 2,271 pieces of brick (3,278.4g) were of unknown provenience. When brick with known provenience is examined (Figure 6.70), most brick was on the west side of the structure, while the least was on the south side of the house and units north and east of the structure contained a moderate amount. Unit 16 contained by far the highest amount of brick (7,245 pieces) while Units 13 and 15 contained the next highest concentration of brick (1,658
and 1,585 pieces, respectively). Other units did contain notable amounts of brick, but they contained less than half of that found in these units and were surrounded by units with significantly lower amounts (Figure 6.79).

The vertical distribution of brick throughout the site reveals that levels one through three (10-40 cmbd) contain most of the brick recovered at the site, with less brick seen in the sod layer and deeper than 40 cmbd. It must be noted here however, that units excavated during the first season (Units 1-9) were much shallower with an average depth of just 43 cm and most units having only three or four levels excavated. Units excavated in the second season had a deeper average depth (54 cm), with all units having at least six levels and most having seven. It makes sense then to see all brick below level five occur only in units north and west of the structure, as these were excavated in the second season and were the only units to be excavated to these depths.
Mortar/Cement. A total of 3,931 pieces (11,123g) of mortar was recovered from the Chief Richardville House, mostly found in the units west of the house. Units 13, 15 and 16 contained 776.4g, 1,099.6g and 3,425.6g respectively, which accounts for 48% of the total mortar recovered from the site. Other units north and west of the structure contained mortar, but in much smaller quantities. Unit 11 contained 393.7g of mortar though the remaining units contained much less (less than one hundred grams). However, mortar for Units 1-9 was not found in the collection, so it was either not collected, not recorded or it was misplaced at some time through the years since excavation and was therefore not included in these totals.

Flagstone/Masonry. Various pieces of masonry, limestone and flagstone were found at the site, mainly in units north and west of the house. Units 10-12 contained 111 pieces (2397.0g) of these materials, while Units 13 and 16 west of the house contained 261 pieces (1, 271.2g). It makes sense that units north of the house contained such a high quantity of limestone/masonry materials because the original front steps and entry porch was located in Units 11 and 12. Finding such a high concentration of these materials in an area that lacks such architectural features however, is highly suggestive that the area where Units 13 and 16 were located served as a dump at the site.

Miscellaneous Building Materials. These materials were found only in Units 10-16, were recorded by count and weight, then discarded. As a result, this researcher was not able to examine the actual artifacts that were in this category. Units 10, 11 and 12 north of the house contained 789 pieces of miscellaneous building materials (4,279.3), while Units 13, 14, 15 and 16 west of the house contained 1,597 (5,197.7g).

Ecofacts

A total of 3,390 ecofacts (21,636.7g) were recovered from the site, most of which were
found in units west of the house, though two of the units north of the house had the highest density of ecofacts (Figure 6.80). Again, units south of the house contained the fewest ecofacts while the units east of the house contained a moderate amount. Ecofacts were divided further by type of material and will be discussed in that fashion below.

Figure 6.80: Ecofact distribution.

*Wood.* A total of 911 pieces (750.4g) of wood were recovered from the site (Figure 6.81). Most of the wood at the site was recovered from units north of the house (817 pieces, 662.6g) and less was recovered from units west of the house (68 pieces, 24.28g), east of the house (six pieces 8.3g) and least from the units south of the house (17 pieces, 54.4g). As with other artifacts, very little wood was found in the sod level and a majority of the wood (67%) was recovered from levels one and two and significantly less from levels three though six. Since 1991 the house has been open to the public, so miscellaneous wood was likely gathered and removed.
from the site along with other surface debris, which accounts for the decreased amounts of material recovered from level 0. Additionally, the large concentration of wood north of the house is likely due to the protection that the porch provided.

**Figure 6.81: Wood distribution.**

*Bone & Shell.* In sum, 2,124 pieces of bone were recovered from the site (4,242.6g), along with nine pieces of shell (4.3g). Because the shell recovered from the site was limited, the discussion here will be solely on bone. Analysis of faunal remains was conducted using the University of Tennessee Department of Anthropology Vertebrate Comparative Collection by Christian Davenport in 1996, following the second season of excavation at the site. Bone was found in every unit, though there are large concentrations of bone in the units on the east and west sides of the house, which contain 40% and 53% of the bone recovered, respectively. The units north and south of the house contained much less bone, only accounting for 3% and 4% of the bone recovered, respectively. Lack of bone in northern units differs slightly from the distribution of other artifacts at the site, which suggests that the bone was deposited at a time
when the area north of the house was covered by an entry porch or all food remains were
deposited further back on the property, away from the main entrance to the house. While the
units west of the house contain the most bone overall, Unit 8 contained 417 pieces of bone
(990.8g), which is the unit with the highest amount of bone at the site. The vertical distribution
of bone mirrors that of all artifacts, with the sod layer containing very little bone (12 pieces) and
the frequency of bone increasing in subsequent levels, with level one containing 744 pieces and
level two containing 1,084 pieces. After level two the frequency of bone decreased drastically,
with only 208 pieces in level three, 50 pieces in level four and ten pieces in level five. No bone
was recovered below level five.

Faunal analysis of the bone recovered from the site revealed that the most common
animal remains found at the site was the domestic pig, followed by the domestic cow, white-
tailed deer, chicken and rabbit, though evidence of raccoon, groundhog, eastern cottontail rabbit,
squirrel, rats/mice, turkey and eastern box turtle were also recovered from the site (Davenport
1996; Appendix A). Although the bone was highly fragmented, some was identified down to the
species level and the number of identified species (NISP) can be seen in Table 6.15 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genus and Species</th>
<th>NISP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sus scrofa</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bos taurus</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odocoileus virginianus</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvilagus floridanus</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallus gallus</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capra hircus</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marmota monax</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rattus sp.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capra hircus/Ovis aries</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.15: NISP, adapted from Davenport (1996).
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sciurus sp.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passeriformes (Order)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrapin carolina</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procyon lotor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Davenport (1996) analysis suggests that the inhabitants of the Chief Richardville House enjoyed a diverse diet that consisted primarily of domesticated animals including pig, cow and chicken that was supplemented by wild animals including white-tailed deer. Both adolescent and adult cow and pig remains were present at the site, which speaks to the high number of these animals at the site, as well as their dietary importance to site inhabitants. Fewer chicken bones were recovered from the site, though they are smaller and less likely to be preserved than deer, cow and pig bones, which is likely why fewer were recovered. In addition to a variety of meats, analysis of cut marks on faunal remains suggests that a variety of meat cuts were consumed at the structure, though it is not known whether the butchering of the animals took place at the house or elsewhere, off site (Davenport 1996). The faunal analysis also indicated that the assemblage was highly fragmented due to trampling or scavenging. However, only sixty-five pieces of the faunal assemblage exhibited tooth marks and none exhibited extensive rodent gnawing, suggesting a quick burial of animal bones or a sufficient number of carnivores present at the site to control the rodent population (Davenport 1996).

**FCR.** A total of 71 pieces of FCR were recovered from the site, weighing 4,306.7g. FCR examined for this project only came from Units 10 -16 because there is no record for FCR from Units 1-9. Aside from noting its presence, count and weight, no additional examination was conducted with the FCR.
**Burnt Materials.** Burnt materials were not numerous at the Chief Richardville House. Burnt limestone was only recovered from Unit 15 (two pieces, 4.4g) and five pieces of unidentifiable burnt materials were recovered from Unit 6 (8.0g) and one piece from Unit 14 (4.2g). Burnt soil was found in unit 5 (96.2g) and burnt slate was found in Unit 3 (three pieces, 12.6g). Charcoal was more prevalent at the site and was found in nine of the sixteen excavation units, most of which was recovered from units north (166 pieces, 45.0g) and west of the house (45 pieces, 59.9g). Much less charcoal was found in the units east of the house (four pieces, 6.4g) and none was found in Units 1 or 2. The majority of charcoal recovered (75%) was found in the first few levels of excavation in these units, with 40.3g recovered from level one, 40.9g from level two, 9.3g from level three, 22.5g from level four and none found below level four.

**Coal.** The coal recovered from the Chief Richardville House was recorded by count most of the time, though not consistently so the distribution of coal will be discussed in terms of weight, which was recorded consistently for all coal recovered from the site. A total of 10,466.6g of coal were recovered from the Chief Richardville House, the distribution of which can be seen below in Figure 6.82.
The Units south of the house contained no coal which is similar to the low amounts of other artifacts found south of the structure. The units north of the house contained the most coal (10,178.9g) while the units west of the house contained significantly less coal (210.8g) and the four units east of the House contained just 8.1g (Figure 6.81). The largest concentration of coal was found in the first four levels of excavation (4,321.7g) and Level 2 specifically contained the highest concentration of coal with 4,166.6g, most of which (3,130.3g) came solely from level two in Unit 12, north of the house. Very little coal was found below 40 cmbd at the site (81.7g) and none was found below 60 cmbd at the site.

*Modern Miscellaneous*

As with any historic site, a good amount of modern debris was mixed in with the historic materials found at the Chief Richardville House. All units contained some modern materials, though Unit 2 contained the most, followed by Units 9, 11 and 12 (Figure 6.83).
The most common modern material recovered from the site was plastic (232) and linoleum (158 pieces). All other modern materials contained less than ten pieces each, save tar paper and polystyrene, which had 18 and 19 pieces, respectively.

**Natural Stone**

A total of 603 pieces of natural stone were recovered from the Chief Richardville House, weighing 4,230.9g (Figure 6.84). Ten pieces of the natural stone were slate (7.5g), found in level one of Unit 16 and the remaining stone was simply labeled as *natural*, counted and recorded. Only two pieces of natural stone (6.2g) were recovered from the east side of the house, while 411 pieces (2,557.8g) were recovered from the units north of the house and 172 pieces (1,087.5g) were recovered from the units west of the house (Figure 6.81). Only two pieces of natural stone (1,192.1g) were found in the sod layer, while 139 pieces (421.4g) were recovered from level one, 242 pieces (1,381.0g) from level two, 84 pieces (193.9g) from level three, 57 pieces (368.0g) from level four, 58 (91.6g) from level five and three pieces of natural stone (3.5g) were recovered from level six.
Summary of the Richardville House Excavations

Sixteen units were excavated over two seasons of fieldwork at the Chief Richardville House, which produced 42,942 artifacts in 30.12 cubic meters of soil excavated (Table 6.16).

Table 6.16: Summary of findings from excavations at the Chief Richardville House

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
<th>% of Assemblage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Materials</td>
<td>25358</td>
<td>65492.25</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>4284</td>
<td>7395.27</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecofacts</td>
<td>3930</td>
<td>21636.76</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>3630</td>
<td>7919.1</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithics</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>3755</td>
<td>10358.3</td>
<td>8.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Miscellaneous</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>337.5</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Stone</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>4230.9</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Items</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>564.3</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42943</td>
<td>118646.48</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Just a few of these artifact categories were useful in addressing identity at the site, or could even speak to the presence of Richardville and Natoequah at the site. Specifically, the artifact categories of building materials, metal, ecofacts, and modern miscellaneous materials were not useful for addressing identity at the site, which unfortunately accounted for a majority of the artifacts recovered. Ceramics and personal items were the most useful artifact categories to address identity at the site, though they only made up 10% and 0.70% of the artifact assemblage, respectively. The analysis revealed that no personal items could be associated with Richardville and the earliest occupation of the house and just a few ceramic wares could be associated with Richardville, though they were not numerous. Additionally, because Richardville occupied the structure until his death in 1841 and the house was occupied by others into the twentieth century, the main challenge was to isolate artifacts associated with Richardville from those of later site occupants, which was possible, though difficult. The chapter that follows will discuss the presence of Richardville and Natoequah at the site, identity and make comparisons to the LaFontaine House to see differences between the sites and differences in identity.
Chapter 7: Gender and Identity as Revealed by Analysis

The prominent goal of this dissertation was to examine gender and identity as revealed by the analysis of material culture recovered from the Chief Richardville House. A major complication, however, is that of seeing the individual in the archaeological record of a household. In this particular case, Richardville lived at the Chief Richardville House for just fourteen years, while later residents inhabited the structure for nearly two centuries following his death. As a result, the archaeological record is clouded and the collective material culture from the site produces a more cohesive picture of all site residents of the household through time (Hendon 1996). Even though it becomes difficult to tease out the behavior of a single individual, viewing artifacts from known time periods allows for the examination of the materials most likely associated with Richardville and the earliest historic materials at the site. In order to do this however, the focus must be on artifacts with known manufacture and use dates and there is a limited number of these types of artifacts from the Chief Richardville House.

Another inherent problem in this project is the categorization of artifacts as EuroAmerican or Native American. On the surface this dichotomy seems clear, something is either EuroAmerican in origin or Native American in origin, but much like the classification of artifacts as prehistoric or historic, it is actually a very rigid categorization with no gray area where people like Richardville and other Métis individuals might exist. In many cases, items are created by one group but used by the other group, or sometimes by both groups. So, is the categorization based on who produces the item or who uses the item? In reality, binary classifications like these are not always suitable for sites like the Chief Richardville House or individuals like Richardville because they existed in both categories or perhaps even somewhere in between. Despite these complications, it was hoped that the gender and identity of
Richardville and Natoequah would be represented by the material culture from the site and that when comparisons were made to the LaFontaine House artifact assemblage, differences in identities would be evident.

*Visibility of Richardville*

First and foremost, the house itself is the most important artifact in relation to Richardville’s presence at the site and his identity because it is highly visible and was designed, paid for and occupied by Richardville, himself. It is of EuroAmerican design, built with EuroAmerican materials and techniques and was built in a fully EuroAmerican, Greek Revival style. It is also a large structure whose interiors were sumptuously outfitted with high end EuroAmerican finishes and decorations. This house was not only a fully EuroAmerican structure, it was grand and luxurious, the finest in all of northern Indiana and Richardville made the conscious choice to design, build and live in this house. He could have lived in a traditional Miami structure or Métis log cabin, but he did not. Instead, while serving as Chief of the Miami tribe he chose to live as a EuroAmerican would and he used the house to create and validate a social identity of an upper class EuroAmerican.

In addition to the house itself, most of the artifact assemblage recovered from the house (98.5%) was EuroAmerican and very few Native American artifacts (just 637) were recovered from the site. The high incidence of EuroAmerican artifacts supports the hypothesis that Richardville used material culture to create and display the identity of an upper class, elite EuroAmerican individual. More specific dates for ceramic wares could be identified and therefore could be correlated to Richardville’s occupation of the house. The three most common ceramic wares recovered from the site are whiteware (66%), flow blue (19%) and transferprinted wares (3.4%). Both flow blue ceramics and transferprinted wares are more expensive, decorated
wares, indicating that Richardville was utilizing these wares to present the identity of an elite EuroAmerican while entertaining other upperclass Americans at his notorious dinner parties. Creamware and annular banded ware are two lower cost ceramics that were recovered from the Chief Richardville House. However, only fifteen pieces of these wares were found at the site, indicating that while they were present, they were not intensively used by Richardville and were not an intricate part of the identity that Richardville portrayed at the house.

*Visibility of Natoequah*

Unlike Richardville, Natoequah unfortunately, was not visible in the material culture recovered from the Chief Richardville House. Much like the written historical record, she left no physical trace of activity at the structure, a conclusion that hinged upon associating Natoequah’s presence with female activities and resultant artifacts at the site. Even though Natoequah specifically was not visible in the archaeological record, that is not to say that the female gender as a whole was not present at the house. On the contrary, several artifacts were recovered from the structure that are typically considered female artifacts by archaeologists including six Native American artifacts and twenty EuroAmerican artifacts. Four lithic end scrapers and a single piece of grit- and shell-tempered pottery were recovered and while these artifacts are typically associated with Native American women by archaeologists, it is highly unlikely that Natoequah was creating and using indigenous ceramics or processing animal hides by herself at the Chief Richardville House. While it may be that Natoequah embraced the Miami way of life over the EuroAmerican or Métis way of life, the volume of pottery and lithic artifacts recovered from the site was too low to support these activities by a single individual. Rather than being associated with Natoequah and the use of the structure in the first half of the nineteenth century, these
artifacts likely predate the construction and use of the structure and are associated with a prehistoric or protohistoric occupation of the area by Native Americans.

EuroAmerican female artifacts found at the site included barrettes, beads, jewelry and cosmetic tins. However, all of these artifacts post-date Natoequah’s life and were instead determined to be associated with the occupation of the house by her female descendants. Because excavation units were placed at the site in relation to the house and Natoequah is known to have resided outside the structure, it is no surprise that the material culture does not reveal Natoequah’s presence at the house. If the location of her residence were known and units were placed and excavated in that location, it would be more likely that her presence would be detected in the material culture recovered.

*The Chief Richardville House and the LaFontaine House*

The LaFontaine House has been used as a comparative site in this dissertation because Richardville built this second structure and also had a presence here for a time. Findings from the Chief Richardville House were compared to those from the LaFontaine House, which provides an interesting framework within which to discuss the personal and social identities exhibited by Richardville at each location given their different function and social contexts. Because the Chief Richardville House and the LaFontaine House served different functions, it is posited here that differences also exist between the assemblages recovered from each of the houses based on the different activities that took place at the houses. Additionally, it is hypothesized that the differences in the assemblages from each site extend beyond the disparity in the functions of the houses, and also reflect distinct identities that were created and presented by Richardville and Natoequah in the varying social contexts within which the two houses existed. Each of the social and personal identities constructed, displayed and enacted by Richardville and Natoequah served
to fulfill different social purposes at each of the sites and should have left a material signature within the archaeological record. One prominent difficulty with these analyses is the incongruity of the recordation and analytical methods used on the assemblages from the two different sites. Both count and weight of all artifacts were recorded at the Chief Richardville house for both seasons of excavation by IPFW, however, counts and weights of artifacts from the LaFontaine House were recorded inconsistently by Ball State University during their excavations, which can be seen in Table 7.1 below. Due to these differences, comparisons between the assemblages are possible, but difficult.

Table 7.1: Comparisons between the Chief Richardville House and the LaFontaine House

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chief Richardville House</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>LaFontaine House</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Materials</td>
<td>25358</td>
<td>65492.25</td>
<td>Building Materials</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>49131.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>4284</td>
<td>7395.27</td>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>4685</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecofacts</td>
<td>3930</td>
<td>21636.76</td>
<td>Ecofacts</td>
<td>2037</td>
<td>17596.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>3630</td>
<td>7919.1</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>16491</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithics</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>Lithics</td>
<td>5319</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>3755</td>
<td>10358.3</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>9525</td>
<td>10777.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Miscellaneous</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>337.5</td>
<td>Modern Miscellaneous</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Stone</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>4230.9</td>
<td>Natural Stone</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>660.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Items</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>564.3</td>
<td>Personal Items</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>42943</strong></td>
<td><strong>118646.48</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>39112</strong></td>
<td><strong>78166.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another discrepancy between the 1989 and 1999 assemblages from the LaFontaine House is that the color of flat glass was recorded in 1999 (aqua or clear) but not recorded in 1989. Additionally, when the reports from the 1989 and 1999 seasons were examined in detail, it was found that the artifact counts and weights presented in the text of the reports often did not match those presented in the tables of the reports and also differed from the counts and weights.
presented in the full catalogue of materials presented in the appendices of the reports. Despite these discrepancies, best efforts were made to compile and analyze the data from both sites in such a way that materials from all excavations from both sites were comparable. As a result, comparisons were conducted based on the type of data that was collected for each artifact category; when artifact counts were available they were compared and when artifact weights were available they were compared. One last complication with the excavations at the LaFontaine House is that unit numbers were repeated in both seasons of excavation. To avoid confusion pertaining to repeating unit numbers, units from the 1989 season will be preceded by 89 and the units from 1999 will be preceded by 99 (e.g. 89-01 and 99-01).

Despite the discrepancies between recordation, analytical methods and reporting methods, the LaFontaine site is an important comparative site to the Chief Richardville House because Richardville was present at each structure. However, at a maximum he was present at the Chief Richardville House for fourteen years (between its construction and his death) and occasionally present at the LaFontaine House for only about ten years. During the comparisons of materials from these two sites, trends can be seen in the archaeological assemblages from each location, which will be discussed here. Comparisons will begin with a discussion of broad site trends and artifact distribution at each of the sites, then shift to a more detailed discussion of the richness and diversity of each site and how it relates to Richardville’s identity.

Through the completion of this dissertation it has become clear that some key differences exist between material culture recovered from the two sites, as well as the structures themselves and that those differences stem from different site functions and different site inhabitants. First and foremost, both houses are modern, EuroAmerican structures with classic Greek Revival characteristics including symmetrical six over six, double hung windows, embellished entrances
with transom lights and low-hipped roofs (Figure 6.82 & 6.83). However, the Chief Richardville House is a large, brick built structure that was exquisitely decorated, while the LaFontaine House was a smaller, stick built structure that was modestly outfitted. Because Richardville used the house in Fort Wayne as a residence and a place for entertaining (and impressing) upper class guests, high end, luxurious finishes are expected. Similarly, because he did not live in the house in Huntington and instead used it as a business location, the more modest finishes are fitting to its use.

![Figure 7.1: The LaFontaine House](image1) ![Figure 7.2: The Chief Richardville House](image2)

Much like the houses themselves, the artifact assemblages from each site contained similar items overall but differed in ceramic wares and personal items found at each site. As can be seen in Figure 7.3, a larger quantity of early ceramic wares were seen at the Chief Richardville House (22.8% of the ceramic assemblage) than at the LaFontaine House (14.6% of the ceramic assemblage), due to differences in transferprinted wares and flow blue ceramics, which is significant and indicative of their use and occupants.
Another important difference between the two sites was the presence of women’s and children’s artifacts at the LaFontaine House, which were absent from the Chief Richardville House. The two houses contained nearly identical quantities of children’s toys, however, the LaFontaine House contained a wider variety of children’s toys than the Chief Richardville House, suggesting children at the LaFontaine House participated in a wider variety of activities (Table 7.2). The LaFontaine House assemblage also contained sewing implements, which were entirely absent from the Chief Richardville House assemblage. Much like women, children are often not detected at archaeological sites, despite their presence and activity at sites. In this case, it is known that Richardville and Natoequah had five children, which were certainly present at the Chief Richardville House, yet they left nearly no trace of their presence in terms of material culture at the house.
Table 7.2: Personal Items from both houses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Chief Richardville House</th>
<th>LaFontaine House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barette</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bead</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone Comb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone Tidliwink</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broach</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Button</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic Toy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay Pipe</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coin</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmetic Tin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cufflink</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gun Flint</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair Clip</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair Pin</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonica</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawk Bell</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewelry Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marble</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necklace Link</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pendant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain Doll</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosary fragment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewing Needle</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewing Object</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleigh Bell</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspender Fastener</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thimble</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toy Jack</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toy Fragment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>187</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Richness and diversity*

To compliment the general observations of differences between the sites, measures of richness and diversity were also calculated and examined for ceramics, personal items and glass at both sites, which allowed for a more nuanced comparison of the sites in terms of richness and diversity in the artifacts between sites.

*Ceramics.* When richness was calculated for ceramics at both sites, they had the same richness because they both contained the same number of ceramic ware types (Figure 7.4). Carlson (2017), postulates that an increased richness at a site is due to a wider variety of artifacts at the site and is indicative of that an increased range in activities took place at the site. In this case, a similar value of richness therefore indicates that similar types of ceramics were present at each house, representing a similar range of activities. On the surface this makes sense because both houses did serve as a domestic residence, however, Carlson’s primary example for richness utilizes stone tools and focuses solely on tool type while disregarding other variables including color or material. Beyond artifact type, variables including decorative pattern and color are important in the ceramic assemblages from the Richardville houses because beyond function,
decorative patterns can also shed light on the identity of an individual and on the investment of ceramic wares at the site.

While richness pertaining to ceramic types and decorative patterns remain consistent between sites, when the patterns are examined closer the richness at the structures differ. For example, transferprinted wares are present at both structures, but for the initial measure of richness all colors were conflated into the single category of transferprints. However, when individual colors of transferprinted wares are treated as a single ceramic type, the Chief Richardville House has a greater value of richness than the LaFontaine House because it contains eight types or colors of transferprinted wares, while the LaFontaine House only contains seven types (Figure 7.4).

Additionally, multiple edge decorated ceramic patterns were identified in the ceramics from the Chief Richardville House, but ceramics with an edge decoration at the LaFontaine House were simply lumped into a single category, not described in more detail or even color of
their edge decoration denoted. There is no way of knowing whether all pieces exhibit the same edge decoration pattern, different patterns or different colors. When the ceramic assemblages are divided by decoration type and color as minutely as possible, the Chief Richardville House would have a greater richness (25) than the LaFontaine House (22), though not by much.

Along with richness, the diversity of ceramic assemblages from both structures was also compared and it was found that the LaFontaine ceramic assemblage had a greater diversity than that from the Chief Richardville House. Rather than focusing on the number of ceramic ware types present, the measure of diversity instead examined the amount of each ceramic ware type present. The LaFontaine House assemblage was dominated by a single ceramic ware (whiteware at 49%), while the Chief Richardville House ceramic assemblage had two dominant ceramic wares (whiteware and flow blue, accounting for 66% and 19% of the assemblage, respectively). Because whiteware was the only dominant ware type at the LaFontaine House, the other types of ceramic wares occurred in larger numbers than they did at the Chief Richardville House. Outside the dominant ceramic ware types, the LaFontaine House ceramic assemblage contained only five ceramic wares that constituted less than one percent of the ceramic assemblage and eleven wares that constituted between one and ten percent of the ceramic assemblage. (Figure 7.5).
Conversely, the Chief Richardville House contained eight ceramic wares that constituted less than one percent of the assemblage while seven wares constituted between one and four percent of the ceramic assemblage (Figure 6.86). As a result, all other wares constituted a small portion of the assemblage at both sites, though the remaining wares at the LaFontaine site made up a larger portion of the assemblage than the remaining wares at the Chief Richardville House, giving the ceramics at the LaFontaine House a greater diversity.

Of the artifacts recovered from the sites, the ceramic artifacts were the most useful artifact to address Richardville’s presence at both houses and their earliest occupation because they were the artifacts that could be most precisely dated in the assemblage and tied to cost and therefore socioeconomic status. Approximately 977 ceramic sherds (or 22.8 of the ceramic assemblage) recovered from the Chief Richardville House and 686 sherds from the LaFontaine House (or 14% of the ceramic assemblage) could be tied to Richardville’s and Natoequah’s lifetimes and use of the houses, which are presented Figure 7.6).
Three of the five ceramic wares above (just 16 pieces) have production dates that begin and end within Richardville’s lifetime, indicating they can securely be associated with Richardville and his use of the houses. Transferprinted wares (140 pieces) and flow blue ceramics (821) on the other hand, were still produced for a decade or more following Richardville’s death, meaning that there is a chance these wares could have been purchased and used by Richardville’s descendants following his death. However, transferprinted wares and flow blue had high price indices, with transferprints having as much as three to five times higher cost than plain, undecorated wares and flow blue ceramics being as much as two to three times more expensive than other decorated wares. Even though the production date of flow blue and transferprinted wares extend beyond Richardville’s death, they are much more likely to be associated with him than his descendants due to their higher price indices. Additionally, a much higher proportion of flow blue ceramics was recovered from the Chief Richardville House, while ceramic wares of lower value were recovered from the LaFontaine House, which supports the use of the Chief Richardville House as an elite residence and entertainment venue and the use of
the LaFontaine House as a traditional domestic residence. Lastly, a higher proportion of transferprinted wares (as was found at the LaFontaine House) is indicative of a Métis presence at historic sites (Supernant 2018), which fits with the use of the LaFontaine House as a place of trading and business.

*Personal Items.* When personal items are subjected to the same measures of richness and diversity, it was found that the sites differed in richness but did not differ significantly in diversity. The LaFontaine site had a greater richness because eleven types of personal items were recovered from the site while just nine types of personal items were recovered from the Chief Richardville House (Figure 7.7).

Most notably, bone artifacts (one bone comb and one bone tiddlywink), sewing implements (spools, needles and a thimble) and a harmonica were found at the LaFontaine House, which were absent from the Chief Richardville House (Figure 7.7). Additionally, both sites contained three personal item artifact types that dominated their along with similar proportions of other personal items, so their diversity was found to be similar to one another.
Glass. In order to calculate the richness and diversity of the glass assemblages from both structures, container glass, decorative glass and chimney lamp glass were examined, while flat glass was excluded. For the purposes of this measure, container glass was divided by color and chimney lamp and decorative glass were given their own categories. Much like ceramic wares, both houses contained very similar glass assemblages as can be seen below in Table 7.3.
### Table 7.3: Container glass comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glass Color</th>
<th>Chief Richardville House</th>
<th>LaFontaine House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amethyst</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqua</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>2788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frosted</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pink</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1648</strong></td>
<td><strong>4523</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the richness of both glass assemblages was calculated and compared to one another, it was found that the LaFontaine House glass assemblages was slightly richer than that of the Chief Richardville House, but only slightly. The only difference between the types of container glass recovered from the structures was that four pieces of yellow and two pieces of red container glass were found at the LaFontaine House, while these colors of container glass were absent from the Chief Richardville House.

The LaFontaine House glass assemblage was also found to be more diverse than that of the Chief Richardville House because it contained larger numbers of multiple container glass types (Figure 7.8).
The LaFontaine House glass assemblage was dominated by clear container glass (57.1%), followed by chimney lamp glass (11.5%), seven other glass types that accounted for one to ten percent of the glass assemblage and five glass types that accounted for less than one percent of the glass assemblage. On the other hand, the Chief Richardville House glass assemblage was also dominated by clear container glass (50.4%), but then aqua and brown container glass occur in larger percentages (22% and 11%, respectively), followed by three glass types that make up between one and ten percent of the assemblage and six glass types that account for less than one percent of the glass assemblage.

**General Site Comparisons of Other Materials**

Because measures of richness and diversity were calculated only for a select number of artifact types, the remaining artifact types were subjected to very general comparisons to
examine trends at the two different sites. Due to the discrepancy in weight and count recordation for building materials, ecofacts, lithics and metal, the weights of these categories were totaled and their percentages of the assemblages calculated and compared to one another to examine larger trends. As can be seen in Table 7.4 the two sites contained similar proportions of building materials, ecofacts and metal artifacts. Beyond these basic comparisons, attention was focused on the most common artifacts, including brick and mortar/cement. Other artifacts like shingles, limestone, masonry and window caulking were recovered from both sites but exist in such low numbers that comparisons between the sites would not be useful.

Table 7.4: General artifact comparisons between the houses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chief Richardville House</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>LaFontaine House</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Materials</td>
<td>25358</td>
<td>65492.25</td>
<td>Building Materials</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>49131.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecofacts</td>
<td>3930</td>
<td>21636.76</td>
<td>Ecofacts</td>
<td>2037</td>
<td>17596.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithics</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>Lithics</td>
<td>5319</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>3755</td>
<td>10358.3</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>9525</td>
<td>10777.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Miscellaneous</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>337.5</td>
<td>Modern Miscellaneous</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Stone</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>4230.9</td>
<td>Natural Stone</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>660.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>34737</strong></td>
<td><strong>102767.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17529</strong></td>
<td><strong>78166.8</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Building Materials.** At both sites brick was by far the most common building material recovered, constituting a majority of the building materials with the LaFontaine House yielding 34,610.0 grams of brick and the Chief Richardville House producing 41,825.6 grams. While all units at the LaFontaine House contained some brick, eighty percent of the brick recovered was found in just seven units at the site. However, unlike the Chief Richardville House these units were not concentrated in a single area and instead spread out around the site (Figure 7.9). The
vertical distribution of brick was similar at both sites because half of the brick was recovered from the second and third levels and less (approximately 12%) was found on the surface level and decreasing amounts were found in the lower levels.

![Figure 7.9: Brick distribution at the LaFontaine House](image)

Much like the Chief Richardville House, mortar found at the LaFontaine House was concentrated in just a handful of units on the southeast corner of the structure, east of the structure and north of the structure (Figure 7.10). A majority of the mortar/cement recovered at both sites was found in the first four levels excavated. Levels one and two contained most (75%) of the mortar recovered from the LaFontaine House, while the Chief Richardville House contained large concentrations throughout the first four levels, with levels one and three having
particularly high concentrations (6,151g and 2,034g, respectively). However, this may simply be
due to the fact that much more mortar was recovered at the Chief Richardville House than at the
LaFontaine House.

Figure 7.10: Mortar distribution at the LaFontaine House

_Ecofacts._ The most common type of ecofacts recovered from both sites include bone,
shell, FCR and coal/slag. At the LaFontaine House, the highest density of bone occurred in just
three units, each on the east north and west side of the structure (Figure 7.11). The highest
density of bone was seen in levels three and four (accounting for 53% of the bone recovered),
with slightly less seen in levels one and two (30% of the bone assemblage) and much smaller
amounts of bone retrieved below level five. When considered together, units that contained the
highest density of bone were located north of the structure outside the backdoor, just a few
meters from the structure, a pattern also seen at the distribution of bone at the Chief Richardville
House.
In addition to bone, shell was recovered from the LaFontaine House, most of which was concentrated in the units north of the house near the back door (Figure 7.12). Level one contained the most shell with 47 pieces and frequencies decreased with depth, with level two containing just 22 pieces, level three with 18 pieces, level four with seven pieces, levels five and six with four pieces each and level eight with nine pieces of shell. The distribution of shell was similar at the two houses, with increased amounts of shell found east of the Chief Richardville House and north of the LaFontaine House near their back entrances.
The last ecofact that was recovered in substantial numbers is coal/slag, which was recovered from both structures. Most of the coal/slag found at the LaFontaine House was recovered from the north and northeast sides of the structure, near the back entrance of the house (Figure 7.13). Like most other artifacts, the bulk of the coal (80%) was recovered from the second and third levels at the Chief Richardville House, but at the LaFontaine House a majority of the coal (70%) was recovered from the first and second levels, representing a small difference between the sites.
Metal. The most common metal artifacts found at both sites were nails (Table 7.5). Other metal artifacts were recovered from both sites, including wire, ammunition casings, barrel strapping, bolts, bottle caps, buckles, hinges, metal rods, rivets, screws, flatware, springs, sprockets, staples, tacks and washers, though these occurred in much smaller numbers and infrequently at the two sites. Additionally, much of this material can be designated as machine made or modern and safely dated into the nineteenth of twentieth centuries, so they will not be discussed any further here. The category of metal sheds little light on Richardville’s presence and activity at the two structures.

Table 7.5: Nail totals for both houses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Round Nails</th>
<th>Square Nails</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Richardville House</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>1016</td>
<td>1421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaFontaine House</td>
<td>4363</td>
<td>3684</td>
<td>8047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the LaFontaine House square nails were most common in units on the southeast corner of the structure and units north of the structure, near the entrances. However, square nails are also notably absent from the units excavated in 1999, with only two square nails recovered from units 2 and 5 of the six units excavated in 1999 (Figure 7.14).

Figure 7.14: Square nail distribution at the LaFontaine House

Similarly, round nails at the LaFontaine House were also found in the units near the entrances to the structure, but were also found immediately east of the house, which is slightly different the distribution of from square nails (Figure 7.15).
The Chief Richardville House contained fewer nails in general and concentrations of nails were seen east and west of the house rather than near an entrance to the structure. Both houses are similar in their vertical distribution of nails, with the LaFontaine House containing 80% of the round nails found within the first three levels and the Chief Richardville House containing 87% within the first three levels. While a greater number of square nails were found at a deeper level when compared to round nails at both sites, the majority of the square nail assemblage was still recovered from the first three levels of excavation. Approximately 84% of the square nails at the LaFontaine House were recovered from the first three levels while an additional 16% was recovered from the lower levels with frequencies decreasing with depth. Similarly, at the Chief Richardville House approximately 83% of the square nails were recovered from the first three excavation levels and 15% were recovered from the lower levels and 2% were recovered from unknown vertical contexts.
Summary of Site Comparisons

These two sites are fairly comparable to one another because the structures are similar to each other architecturally and much of the same archaeological materials were recovered from both sites. Both structures are built in the Greek Revival style and are large, modern structures, making them more similar to each other than other structures in the same region. However, key differences do exist between the structures. The LaFontaine House is smaller than the Chief Richardville House and more conservative in construction materials and architectural style, which speaks to Richardville’s role at the site and his identity. While these are significant differences when the houses are compared side by side, they are lost when each house is considered independently because both structures were new, cutting-edge, high-style houses when built, unlike any other house seen on the frontier. However, when the material culture from each site is examined, significant differences are seen, which stem from the site occupants, activities at each site and identities portrayed at each site. First and foremost, the material culture recovered from the LaFontaine House indicate that women and children were present and active during the earliest occupation of the House, which is not seen at the Chief Richardville House. Also, the Chief Richardville House contained more high end ceramics early in its occupation, which can be tied to an elite identity portrayed by Richardville at the site. Additional findings from each site, as well as comparisons between the sites will be discussed below, along side previously held expectations.

Expectations and Results

Prior to conducting the analysis of material culture from the Chief Richardville House, four broad expectations were laid out based on preliminary knowledge of Richardville and his house, which will be addressed here alongside the findings of the analysis. While some of the
expectations were confirmed through analysis, others were not and unexpected trends came to light through the analysis as well. First and foremost, it has become clear that some differences do exist between material culture recovered from the two sites that stem from the different functions of the sites, the identities portrayed at each site, as well as different inhabitants of the site. Because site function cannot always be separated from identity, the discussion of site function will also be tied to a discussion of identity below.

*Expectation #1.* The first expectation laid out in this dissertation was that the earliest materials associated with Richardville at the house would be fewer than later materials associated with his descendants. This expectation was initially developed because it is known that Richardville spent just fourteen years at the Chief Richardville House preceding his death and that his descendants continued to occupy the structure for nearly two hundred years afterward. Additionally, he constructed the LaFontaine house at the Forks of the Wabash in the 1830s and moved his business there, restricting the time he spent at the Chief Richardville House. His presence at the Chief Richardville House should therefore be somewhat diminished due to the short duration of his life at the house and the lengthy habitation of the house by others following his death. Upon completion of the artifact analysis, this first expectation was found to be true.

In the analysis, ceramics were the most useful diagnostic artifact for relative dating at the site because the production dates of ceramic wares could be identified and ceramics produced during Richardville’s lifetime could be isolated from those known to be produced after his death and considered separately. Based on general production dates for ceramic wares, only creamware, mocha yellow ware, annular banded ware, flow blue and transferprinted wares could be tied to Richardville’s presence at the house because the other ceramic wares were either not in
production during his lifetime or their production date spanned several centuries and they could not be associated specifically with the initial occupation of the house by Richardville. Just 981 pieces of these five early ceramic wares were recovered from the site, accounting for 23% of the entire ceramic assemblage, indicating that a majority of the ceramics recovered from the site were not associated with Richardville. Additionally, most personal items, metal artifacts, building materials and modern miscellaneous artifacts can not surely be tied to Richardville’s occupation of the house and are instead associated with later occupations of the house, further supporting the first expectation.

*Expectation #2.* The second expectation held about the assemblage from the Chief Richardville House was that it would represent a different range of activities than those that took place at the LaFontaine House. More specifically, it was expected that artifacts associated with entertainment and an elite male would be found at the Chief Richardville House, while the LaFontaine site assemblage would contain artifacts related to the trading business that took place at the structure. Additionally, the LaFontaine assemblage was expected to be representative of an entire family, rather than a single individual. When the two assemblages are compared, some differences in the broad artifact categories are apparent, as seen in Table 7.6 below. The most interesting difference between the broad categories of the assemblages is an increased number of lithic artifacts at the LaFontaine House. While lithic artifacts were present at both structures, the LaFontaine House contained significantly more flakes and cores, suggesting that the site had an intensive prehistoric occupation.
Table 7.6: Broad category totals at the two sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact Category</th>
<th>Chief Richardville House</th>
<th>LaFontaine House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Materials</td>
<td>25358</td>
<td>65492.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>4284</td>
<td>7395.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecofacts</td>
<td>3930</td>
<td>21636.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>3630</td>
<td>7919.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithics</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>3755</td>
<td>10358.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Miscellaneous</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>337.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Stone</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>4230.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Items</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>564.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>42943</strong></td>
<td><strong>118646.48</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional differences are seen within the broad categories from the two sites including the amounts and types of personal items and ceramics recovered from each site. First and foremost, the LaFontaine House contained a greater number of personal items (including women’s artifacts and trade items), as well as a wider variety of children’s toys than the Chief Richardville House (Table 7.7).
Table 7.7: Personal items from the two sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Chief Richardville House</th>
<th>LaFontaine House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barette</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bead</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone Comb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone Tidliwink</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broach</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Button</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic Toy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay Pipe</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coin</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmetic Tin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cufflink</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gun Flint</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair Clip</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair Pin</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonica</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawk Bell</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewelry Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marble</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necklace Link</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pendant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain Doll Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosary fragment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewing Needle</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewing Object</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Chief Richardville House</td>
<td>LaFontaine House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleigh Bell</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspender Fastener</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thimble</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toy Jack</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toy Fragment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>187</strong></td>
<td><strong>412</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the Chief Richardville House did contain some female artifacts, they were not associated with Natoequah or the earliest occupation of the house and were instead determined to be more modern artifacts associated with later occupants of the house. The LaFontaine House on the other hand contained two glass trade beads, two hawk bells, one brass sewing thimble and one sleigh bell, all of which was assigned pre-1850 dates by Cochran (1990) and are therefore associated with the initial occupation of the house. Other sewing implements (sewing needles and a sewing spool) were also recovered from the site, indicating that women were present and active at the site, which again is different than the Chief Richardville House. Other items including one Brandon gunflint and one brass military button, were also found at the site, which is further evidence that trade activity took place and that the house was not solely a residential structure. Lastly, a wider variety of children’s toys were found at the LaFontaine House, which include a bone tiddlywink, doll parts and toy fragments, which were absent from the Chief Richardville House, suggesting children had a greater presence or increased activity at the LaFontaine House.

Ceramic wares recovered from the sites also differed from each other and when the earliest ceramic wares from the sites are examined, it is clear that the Chief Richardville House contained a large amount of flow blue ceramics, while the LaFontaine House contained a greater
amount of transferprinted wares, which is indicative of different activities at the two sites, as well as different identities presented at the two sites. Transferprinted wares are associated with a Métis presence at archaeological sites, so the increased amount of transferprinted wares at the LaFontaine House indicate the Richardville was presenting a Métis identity at the LaFontaine House, which corresponds with the trading activity that took place at the site. In contrast, the Chief Richardville House instead contained a large amount of flow blue ceramics, which is known to be some of the most expensive decorated wares produced in the nineteenth century, which instead suggests Richardville was portraying an elite EuroAmerican identity at the site.

Because glass artifacts (particularly colored glass artifacts) would have been used for decorations, glassware and ornate serving vessels, differences in glass between the two sites can be significant and may speak to different site activities. Comparable types and amounts of container glass were recovered from both sites, though some interesting differences were seen between the two assemblages. For example, the Chief Richardville House had ninety pieces of decorative glass (clear amethyst, frosted, amber and mirror glass), while very few glass artifacts from the LaFontaine House are classified as decorative. Interestingly enough, however, the LaFontaine House assemblage contains three container glass colors that are not seen at the Chief Richardville House including red, pink and yellow container glass. These glass types at the LaFontaine House are not numerous and only two pieces of red and yellow glass, along with twenty-one pieces of pink container glass were recovered from the site. Although the differences in glass artifacts are small, they are worth noting because it demonstrates differences exist between the two sites.

Expectation #3. The third expectation held about the assemblage was that the materials recovered from the Chief Richardville House would be more ornate and highly decorated than
those recovered from the LaFontaine House, due to the function of the Chief Richardville House as a place of entertainment of upper class Americans. Once again, the ceramic category provided the most information pertaining to this expectation. Whiteware accounted for a majority of both assemblages, making up a significantly larger portion of the Chief Richardville House assemblage (65%) when compared to the LaFontaine House assemblage (49%). However, the whiteware recovered from the LaFontaine House was more evenly distributed vertically throughout the occupation of the house, while the whiteware at the Chief Richardville House was clustered in the upper levels at the site. These findings suggest that whiteware was utilized later in the occupation of the Chief Richardville House, while it was utilized evenly through time at the LaFontaine House. Beyond the similarity in whiteware domination of the ceramic assemblages, there are some significant differences between these two assemblages.

The largest difference between the ceramic assemblages is that the LaFontaine House was found to be more diverse than the Chief Richardville House at a statistically significant level, which stems from the high incidence of flow blue ceramics at the Chief Richardville House (19%) when compared to the LaFontaine House (0.6%). Additionally, spongeware ceramics were present at the LaFontaine House but were entirely absent from the Chief Richardville House. These differences represent the disparity in financial investment in ceramic wares at each site, which stems from the distinct uses of the structures. On the one hand, flow blue ceramics represent one of the most expensive decorated ceramic wares available in the nineteenth century (which would have been important in hosting and entertaining guest at the Chief Richardville House and on the other hand, spongeware ceramics are known to be one of the least expensive decorated wares available in the nineteenth century (which is expected in a traditional domestic setting). Additionally, transferprinted wares accounted for a larger portion of
the LaFontaine House ceramic assemblage (10%) than the Chief Richardville House ceramic assemblage (3.4%), which is consistent with Métis habitation of the LaFontaine House. This pattern seen in the ceramic assemblage fits with the third expectation that less expensive wares were used at the LaFontaine House and more expensive wares were used at the Chief Richardville House.

Expectation #4. The fourth and final expectation was that materials from the LaFontaine House would also contain artifacts associated with women and children and represent a full range of domestic activities. Unlike the previous expectations, personal items were the key to examining these trends at the sites. The LaFontaine House contained a greater number of personal items and it was found that the LaFontaine assemblage was richer than the Chief Richardville House assemblage because some artifacts that were recovered from the LaFontaine House were absent from the Chief Richardville House. For example, while the Chief Richardville House assemblage did contain some children’s toys, it was limited to a single porcelain doll bust, one toy jack and 12 marbles, while the LaFontaine house contained one bone tiddlywink, ten toy fragments and 45 marbles. Also, a greater number of women’s artifacts were recovered from the LaFontaine House and while both sites contained women’s jewelry fragments, hair pins and beads, the LaFontaine House also contained ten sewing implements, including needles, sewing spools and a thimble, which were entirely absent from the Chief Richardville House. Although these are just a few artifacts, their presence at the LaFontaine House indicate that a wider range of domestic activities took place at the site, or at least is representative of activities of an entire family, unlike the Chief Richardville House, which supports the fourth expectation.
The Unexpected. While the above expectations were laid out prior to the analysis of the Chief Richardville House assemblage and the comparisons made to the LaFontaine House assemblage, one trend was seen during analysis that were not expected, or at least not anticipated prior to analysis. Because the focus of this research was primarily on historic materials, little thought was given to lithic or chipped stone artifacts. As it turns out, the LaFontaine House contained significantly more lithic artifacts than that the Chief Richardville House, (4,687 more lithic artifacts), which is indicative of an intensive prehistoric occupation of the site and demonstrates the importance of the location as a place of long-term residence.
Chapter 8: Conclusions

The ultimate goal of this dissertation was to determine whether Richardville and Natoequah were visible as individuals within the archaeological record at the Chief Richardville House and if so, demonstrate how they used material culture to create, maintain and portray their individual and social identities. Because historic texts do not discuss Natoequah’s activities and they address a narrow range of Richardville’s activities associated with his public persona, it was hoped that archaeological evidence would illuminate Natoequah’s presence and activities at the structure, as well as provide additional information on Richardville’s domestic activities.

In order to achieve these goals, feminist theory and identity theory were applied in the analysis of the Chief Richardville House and the materials recovered from the site. Because identity theory emphasizes the process of identification through physical objects and feminist theory views material culture as a medium that embodies social and cultural norms, when used in tandem, they can help elucidate past identities through the examination of material culture. The most significant artifact from the site is the Chief Richardville House itself, which is a fully modern, ornate and grand Greek Revival structure. Expensive, high-end ceramics were also found at the site, which were most likely associated with his use of the house as a place to entertain upper-class EuroAmericans. When examined within gender and identity theoretical frameworks, the house and ceramics become two excellent examples of how Richardville used material culture to create and portray an elite, EuroAmerican identity. Unfortunately, much like the historic record, Natoequah’s presence was not detected in the material culture from the site because the women’s artifacts found post-date her presence at the house.

When compared to the Chief Richardville House, the LaFontaine house is a smaller, less ornate and less fanciful structure. Also, the early ceramic wares recovered from the site were less
ornate and less expensive than those recovered from the Chief Richardville House, suggesting that Richardville presented a different identity at the LaFontaine House. Additionally, women’s artifacts were present at the LaFontaine House and while they cannot securely be tied to Natoequah, they date to the earliest occupation of the house and represent a different range of activities, as well as the presence of women at the house.

Overall this project revealed that while the general concept of gender can be seen in the archaeological record, it is difficult to address the gender of a single individual in the past. In this case it is partly due to the presence of simultaneous site occupants, as well as the resulting palimpsest of nearly two centuries of site occupation and a presentist, Western perspective, which cannot fully comprehend genders of the past or how they were manifested through material culture. In the end, the Chief Richardville House and the LaFontaine House provided insight into Richardville’s identity, while the artifacts associated with the houses provided little information about his identity. While the presence of a structures is not necessary to address identity in the past, these findings suggest that past identities are more difficult to access at sites where no structure is present, or at the very least suggests that identity is more easily accessed at sites where structures are present.

_Future Research_

If an individual were to be interested in conducting further research at the Chief Richardville House, it is recommended that a geophysical investigation take place before additional archaeological excavations are planned or conducted. A geophysical survey consisting of electric resistivity, electromagnetic conductivity and ground penetrating radar would provide additional information pertaining to subsurface anomalies or features that may be present at the site. The Chief Richardville House lot is relatively small, so a geophysical survey could be
conducted in a fairly short time and possibly yield highly valuable information. Past archaeological excavations have revealed that substantial disturbance related to utility installation has taken place at some locations at the structure and while these disturbances would significantly alter the results of surveys at the site, they do call into question how much of the Chief Richardville House parcel remains undisturbed. In addition to detecting historical subsurface anomalies, a geophysical survey would also provide data pertaining to the extent of disturbance that may have taken place at the site, as well as the severity of the disturbance. More importantly, such a survey could also potentially identify the location the log home where Natoequah reportedly resided in on the site. If this were accomplished and additional archaeological excavations were undertaken, a great deal of information could be gained pertaining to Natoequah, which is still lacking at this point. To compliment additional geophysical and archaeological work at this site, it would also be worthwhile to ground truth anomalies detected to determine if they are original to the site, modern disturbances to the site and assist in placing additional excavation units.
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Faunal Remains From The Preliminary Excavations at the Richardville Site

By

Christian Davenport

A total of 2,109 pieces (4,013.3 grams) of faunal material were recovered from the site. Faunal material was identified using the University of Tennessee Department of Anthropology Vertebrate Comparative Collection. See appendices for condensed list of genus and species present.

Methods

The class, order, family, genus or species of faunal material was initially determined, and identifiable classes include fish, amphibian, reptiles, aves and mammal. These classes were further divided in small/medium/large categories. Specimens that were not identifiable were placed into the size categories. These size categories were based on cortical thickness, percent of cancellous bone present, curve of the bone fragment and general fragment size. For example, a large bone fragment with thick cortical bone and a slight curve would be classified as a large mammal. Element and element side were also recorded for the identifiable fragments. Maturity for species was determined according to epiphyseal fusion.

Faunal material was also coded according to provenience, modification and states of epiphyseal fusion. Provenience for the bone material was by square, and number of individual specimens present (NISP) was determined across the site. Modification categories include tool, polished, cut marked, burned, tooth marked, weathered or ingested bone. Processing marks were also recorded as were cut marks, saw marks and chop marks. Cut marks on the bones were recorded if single or multiple striations were discerned.

The recording of single vs. double saw marks may shed light on the meat cuts that were consumed at the Richardville. Sliced meats should have two sawn sections along the bone. Whether or not it is a T-bone steak or a ham cut. If it is a whole bone sawn only on one end it could be representative of a stew or roast. Further still, a single cut could also be an example of butchering waste (Landon 1996: 120).

Square 1

Square one contained 35 bone fragments (126.9 g). Two were identifiable to species level. *Bos taurus* (cow); NISP of one; one rib. *Sus scrofa* (domestic pig); NISP of one; tooth fragment. Five pieces of bone were culturally modified from this unit. Four pieces were sawn only on one side. Only one piece was sawn on two sides.

Square 2

Square two contained 28 bone fragments (50.1 g). One fragment was identifiable to the species level. *Sus scrofa* (domestic pig); NISP of one; one lower incisor. Only two pieces of culturally modified bone were recovered from this square. The one piece was sawn on one side the other was sawn on two sides.

Square 1&2

Square one and two contained four bone fragments (197.9 g). Two fragments were identifiable to species level. *Bos taurus* (cow); NISP of one; one femur. *Sus scrofa* (domestic
pig); NISP of one, scapula fragment. The only bone fragment that was split and not sawn came from this unit. No other culturally modified bone was recovered from this unit.

**Square 3**

Square three contained 118 bone fragments (153.2 g). Five fragments were identified to the species level. *Bos taurus* (cow) NISP of one; one ulna. *Sus scrofa* (domestic pig); NISP of two; one lower incisor; one scapula fragment. *Capra hircus* (domestic goat); NISP of one; one lower second molar. *Gallus gallus* (domestic chicken); NISP of one; one coracoid. The chicken identification could also be a small *Meleagris gallopavo* (turkey). Aves, passeriformes (order); NISP of one furculum.

Eight pieces of bone were recovered which were thermally altered (i.e. burnt and calcined.) Twelve pieces of bone displayed direct evidence of cultural modification. Five other pieces of bone only had single sawn end. Six pieces of bone were sawn on two ends. Lastly only one bone fragment had cut marks.

**Square 4**

Square four contained one hundred 152 bone fragments (334.8 g). Nine fragments could be identified to species. *Bos taurus* (cow); NISP of three; one second phalange, rib, and a vertebra. *Sus scrofa* (domestic pig); NISP of three; the fourth carpal, calcaneus, and a vestigial phalange. *Sciurus sp.* (squirrel); NISP of one; one ulna. *Sylvilagus floridanus* (cottontail rabbit); NISP of one; a pelvis fragment. *Ovis/Capra* (Sheep/goat); NISP of one; metacarpal, a mid shaft fragment. *Marmota monax* (ground hog); NISP of two; one humerus and one upper incisor. The antiquity of the ground hog remains should be questioned. The bones have a different patina than the majority of the bone fragments. These remains could be intrusive in that the ground hog dug a burrow and later died in it leaving its remains. Another alternate explanation could be that the remains are older than the rest and represent remains of the prehistoric assemblage. Either way it will be considered intrusive. *Gallus gallus* (chicken); NISP of three; one carpometacarpus distal fragment, one distal humerus fragment, and one distal ulna fragment. Aves (Small bird); NISP of one, one furculum. Osteichthyes (Fish); NISP of one; the cranium. The fish bones were still greasy and had chunks of flesh still attached because of this it was considered of modern origin and will not be discussed here.

Forty six pieces of bone have direct evidence of cultural modification. Seventeen pieces of bone have a single saw mark. Twenty-seven pieces have two saw marks indicated. Two pieces of bone have cut marks. Plus, one of the two pieces also had carnivore gnawing. Another bone fragment also had carnivore gnawing.

**Square 5**

Square five contained one 178 bone fragments (479.9 g). Thirteen bones could be identified to a species. *Bos taurus* (cow); NISP of six; one astragalus, four ribs, and a vertebra. *Capra hircus* (domestic goat); NISP of one; one humerus. *Odocoileus virginianus* (white-tailed deer) NISP of two; the first upper molar. *Sus scrofa* (domestic pig); NISP of four; one canine, one first phalange, second upper premolar and one half of a mandible.

Seventeen pieces of bone have direct evidence of cultural modification. Eight other pieces of bone have a single saw mark. Eight pieces of bone have two saw marks. Nine bones have carnivore gnawing.
Square 6

Square six contained 91 bone fragments (355.5 g). Four fragments were identifiable to the species level. *Bos taurus* (cow), NISP of two; one intercarpal and one unidentified long bone shaft. *Sus scrofa* (domestic pig); NISP of two, one fibula fragment and one lower incisor. Aves (general birds), NISP of one; one synsacrums.

Four pieces of bone have direct signs of thermal alteration. Fourteen pieces of bone have direct signs of cultural modification. Three bones are saw once. Nine bones are sawn twice. Two bone fragments have cut marks. One of these nine also has carnivore gnawing present.

Square 7

Square seven contained 65 bone fragments (99.7 g). *Sus scrofa* (Domestic pig) NISP of one; one intercarpal. *Ovis capra* (Sheep/goat), NISP of one tooth fragment. Three pieces of bone from this square have signs of thermal alteration. Twelve pieces of bone have direct signs of cultural modification. Four are sawn on one side. Eight are saw on two sides.

Square 8

Square eight contained 404 bone fragments (994.7 g). Forty-six fragments were identifiable to the species level. *Bos taurus* (cow); NISP of five; one radialcarpal, one hyoid, one rib, one vertebra and one tooth fragment. *Sus scrofa* (domestic pig), NISP of 39; one third phalange, one scapula, one ulna, one carpal, one femur, one fibula, one half of a mable one third premolar lower, two phalanges, one metacarpal and 27 loose teeth fragment. *Odocoileus virginianus* (white-tailed deer), NISP of two; one pelvis fragment and one ulna fragments. *Sylvilagus floridanus* (cottontail rabbit); NISP of one, distal humerus fragment (left). *Gallus gallus* (domestic chicken); NISP of two, one scapula and one synsacrums. The chicken identification could also be a small *Meleagris gallopavo* (turkey). Aves (General bird) NISP of one; one ulna mid shaft.

One bone fragment shows evidence of direct thermal alteration. Forty-four pieces of bone have direct signs of cultural modification. Twenty bone fragments have single saw marks. Of the twenty ten have signs of carnivore gnawing. Twenty-three bone fragments have two saw marks. The only chopped piece of bone comes from this unit and it also has carnivore gnawed. Twenty-three other pieces of bone also have signs of carnivore gnawing but no cultural modification.

Square 9

Square nine contained 46 bone fragments (38.3 g). None of the fragments were identifiable to the species level. However, two fragments (2g) could be identified to an order (passerine). Three pieces of bone have direct signs of cultural modification. Two pieces of bone have single saw marks. One bone fragment has two saw marks.

Square 10

Square ten contained 15 bone fragment (81.1 g). Two fragments were identifiable to the species level. *Bos taurus* (cow), NISP of two; one femur and one rib.

Eight pieces of thermally altered bone were recovered from this square. Five pieces of culturally modified bone were recovered. Two have a single saw mark while three have two saw marks.
Square 11

Square eleven contained 21 bone fragments (65.4 g). Five fragments were identifiable to the species level. *Bos taurus* (cow), NISP of one; the second cervical vertebra. *Odocoileus virginianus* (white-tailed deer), NISP of one; one molar (fragment). *Rattus sp.* (rat), NISP of two; one femur and one pelvis. *Terrapin carolina* (eastern box turtle) NISP of one; one humerus. Aves (general bird), NISP of one; a vertebra.

Ten pieces of culturally modified bone were recovered from this square. Of these ten four pieces have single saw marks. Six pieces of bone have double saw marks.

Square 12

Square twelve contained six bone fragments (2.1 g). Only two fragments were identifiable to species. *Sylvilagus floridanus* (cottontail rabbit); NISP of two; one maxillary fragment (left) and one mandibular fragment (left). Order (passerine), NISP of one; an ulna fragment.

Square 13

Square thirteen contained 321 fragments (240.9 g). Only one was identified to the species level. *Bos taurus* (cow); NISP of one; one rib fragment.

Two pieces of thermally altered bone were recovered from this square. Thirty one pieces of culturally modified bone were recovered from the square. All have single saw marks. Only two pieces of bone have signs of carnivore gnawing.

Square 14

Square fourteen contained two hundred ninety two bone fragments (316.0 g). Fourteen fragments were identifiable to the species level. *Bos taurus* (cow) NISP of five; one carpal, one scapula, one uncarcral and two vertebrae fragments. *Sus scrofa* (domestic pig), NISP of seven; one second phalange, one scapula, one loose tooth fragment and five loose molar fragments. *Procyon lotor* (raccoon), NISP of one; second mandibular molar. *Sylvilagus floridanus* (cottontail rabbit); NISP of one; one scapula fragment (left). *Gallus cf. gallus* (domestic chicken), NISP of one; one ulna. The chicken identification could also be a small *Meleagris gallopavo* (turkey). Aves (general bird), NISP of seven.

Five pieces of thermally altered bone were recovered from the square. Fifteen pieces of culturally modified bone were recovered from this square. Four of these pieces have single saw marks. One of these pieces also has carnivore gnawing. Eleven pieces of bone have two saw marks. Four of these pieces of bone also have carnivore gnawing.

Square 15

Square fifteen contained 243 bone fragments (328.3 g). Six fragments were identifiable to the species level. *Bos taurus* (cow); NISP of one; one lateral malleolus. *Sus scrofa* (domestic pig), NISP of five, one premolar, one rib, one ulna and two loose molar fragments.

Forty one pieces of bone have cultural modifications. Twenty two pieces have a single saw mark. One these has carnivore gnawing present. Nineteen pieces of bone have double saw marks.

Square 16

Square sixteen contained 86 bone fragments (142.2). Six fragments were identifiable to the species level. *Bos taurus* (cow); NISP of five; one scapula and four rib fragments. *Odocoileus virginianus* (white-tailed deer), NISP of one; one lateral malleolus.
Four pieces of thermally altered bone were recovered from the square. Eleven pieces of culturally altered bone were recovered, three having single saw marks and nine others have double saw marks.

Identified Species

Domestic Mammals:
Domestic mammals were introduced to North American in the 1500's.
Bos taurus (Cow), Sus scrofa (Domestic pig), Capra hircus (Domestic goat).

Non Domesticated Animals

Odocoileus virginianus (White-tailed deer)
The habitat of white-tailed deer consists largely of forest, swamps, and open brushy areas. Deer group together in large units during the winter, but separate into smaller groups of two to three during the warmer months (Burt and Grossenheider, 1952).

Procyon lotor (Raccoon)
The distribution of raccoons extends from Canada to Texas. They are most abundant in hardwood swamps, mangroves, flood plains, woodlots, buildings and wetlands. They are active from sunset to sunrise (Kaufmann 1982: 567).

Marmota monax (Ground hog)
Primarily inhabits dry soils in open woodlands, thickets, rocky slopes and clearings. Most activity is diurnal, though after hibernation they may become active at night (Lee and Funderburg 1982: 181).

Sylvilagus floridanus (Eastern cottontail rabbit)
Active from early evening to late morning; burrows in the ground feeds on green vegetation in summer and twigs and bark in winter. Can be found in heavy brush, strips of forest with open areas nearby, edges of swamps and weed patches (Burt and Grossenheider 1980).

Sciurus sp. (Squirrel)
No cranial remains with teeth were recovered so species could not be determined positively. Squirrels inhabit pine and hardwood forests (Burt and Grossenheider 1952).

Family: Cricetidae (Mice, voles, rats and lemmings)
This family includes small to medium sized rodents. They live mostly on and in the ground and some in trees, in aquatic environments and others in rocky situations (Burt and Grossenheider 1980).

Birds:
Order passeriformes (song birds)

Gallus gallus (Domestic chicken) are represented in the faunal assemblage.

Meleagris gallopavo (Turkey) may be represented in the faunal assemblage.
Reptiles
Terrapene carolina (eastern box turtle)
Range from the northeastern United States west to Michigan south to Tennessee (Conant and Collins 52: 1991).

Discussion

Sus scrofa domestic pig, was the most numerous identified species present at Richardville (NISP 67). Both adults and juveniles are present in the assemblage. This is marked by the presence of unfused phalanges and long bones. However, the high NISP number may be misrepresentative since there were a high number of isolated pig teeth. It is impossible to say whether or not these teeth come from one individual or not. Either way, it is apparent that this animal was a major component of the diet.

The second most represented animal is Bos taurus cow (NISP 33). Undoubtedly these animals also contributed extensively to the diet. Both adults and juveniles are present at the site. This is marked by the presence of unfused phalanges and long bones.

However, many of the meat cuts could not be identified to a specific species but they could be grouped into size categories. The number of bones that came from a large animal like a cow is approximately one hundred. If this is taken into account, it is likely that beef surpasses that of pig in percent contribution to the diet.

The third most numerous identified species present at Richardville was Odocoileus virginianus, white-tailed deer (NISP six). It is unlikely that white tailed deer was a regular staple to the diet but rather a occasional supplementary meat.

Ranked equally with deer in number of NISP is Gallus gallus, chicken (NISP six). It is likely that chicken was a more regular food item than deer, but with the fragile nature of bird bone it does not survive long in the archaeological record and quickly becomes indistinguishable from other bird bones.

Next is Sylvilagus floridanus, rabbits (NISP four). No cut marks were noticed on the bones so it is hard to say if these animals were considered a food item or not. Capra hircus, goats (NISP of three), like deer it was likely a supplementary food item and not a main staple. The remainder of the identified species those with NISPs of one or tow, may or may not have contributed to the diet and will not be further discussed.

From the analysis of the single vs. double saw marks it is clear that the inhabitants at Richardville enjoyed a wide variety of different meat cuts, from roasts to steaks. However, I cannot say whether these were processed on the grounds or bought from a local butcher. It would be interesting to compare this faunal assemblage to a lower status site from the same time period and look for any differences.

There was a high degree of fragmentation of the faunal assemblage. Fragmentation could be a result of post depositional processes, such as trampling by large mammals or ravaging by canids. Sixty-five pieces of bone do exhibit tooth marks of large and small carnivores. Thirty-four of these pieces came from square eight. So it likely that carnivores both large and small contributed more to the fragmentation than trampling. On a related side note, none of the bones have extensive rodent gnawing. This could be a result of quick burial or that the carnivores obviously present at the site were keeping the rodent population down. Though there is no way to test or prove this assumption.
Conclusions

All of the bone material from the site was identified using the University of Tennessee Department of Anthropology Vertebrate Comparative Collection and reported according to identifiability, province, modification and maturity. The fragmentary and unfused state of many of the bones makes identification of element, let alone species, impossible.

The result of the faunal analysis suggests that the people occupying the site were primarily utilizing domesticated animal, and supplemented the diet with wild species such as deer. In NISP, pig provided the most significant portion of the diet, however, this could be misleading if one were to take into account all the sliced meat cuts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Square</th>
<th>Genus and Species</th>
<th>NISP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>Bos taurus</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>Sus scrofa</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>Sus scrofa</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&amp;2</td>
<td><em>Sus scrofa</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>Bos taurus</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>Sus scrofa</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>Bos taurus</em></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>Sus scrofa</em></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>Scirrus sp.</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>Sylvilagus floridanus</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>Capra hircus/ Ovis aries</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>Marmota monax</em></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>Gallus gallus</em></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>Passerine</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>Bos taurus</em></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>Sus scrofa</em></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>Odocoileus virginianus</em></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>Capra hircus</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><em>Bos taurus</em></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><em>Sus scrofa</em></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><em>Sus scrofa</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><em>Capra hircus</em></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>Bos taurus</em></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>Sus scrofa</em></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>Odocoileus virginianus</em></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>Sylvilagus floridanus</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>Gallus gallus</em></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><em>Bos taurus</em></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><em>Bos taurus</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><em>Odocoileus virginianus</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><em>Rattus sp.</em></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><em>Terrapin carolina</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><em>Sylvilagus floridanus</em></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><em>Passerine</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><em>Bos taurus</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td><em>Bos taurus</em></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td><em>Sus Scrofa</em></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td><em>Procyon lotor</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><em>Gallus gallus</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td><em>Bos taurus</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td><em>Sus scrofa</em></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td><em>Bos taurus</em></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td><em>Odocoileus virginianus</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** | 15 | 13 | 128
### NISP of Species
#### From Richardville

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genus and Species</th>
<th>NISP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sus scrofa</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bos taurus</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odocoileus virginianus</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvilagus floridanus</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallus gallus</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capra hircus</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marmota monax</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rattus sp.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capra hircus/ Ovis aries</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scirius sp.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passeriformes (Order)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terropin carolina</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procyon lotor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total NISP</strong></td>
<td><strong>128</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHIEF RICHARDVILLE HOUSE
(JEAN BAPTISTE RICHARDVILLE HOUSE)

HABS No. IN-157

Location:
U.S. Route 24 (junction with U.S. 24 Bypass), Huntington, Huntington County, Indiana.

Longitude 85 29.6' W
Latitude 40 53.0' N

Present Owner:
Luke Sheer

Significance:
The Chief Richardville House was the home of the chief of the Miami Indians, Pe-sha-wah, Jean Baptiste Richardville, the nephew of Chief Little Turtle. At the time the house was built, the property was on the Miami Indian reservation, and served as the tribal headquarters from 1833 until the death of Richardville's successor, Chief Frances LaFontaine, in 1847.

PART I. HISTORICAL INFORMATION

A. Physical History:

1. Date of erection: 1833.

2. Original and subsequent owners:
   1833 House built by Chief Richardville.
   1841 Death of Chief Richardville. His successor, Chief Frances LaFontaine, married Richardville's daughter and took title to the property.
   1847 Death of Chief LaFontaine. His daughter Archangel Ingleman (nee LaFontaine) took title to the property.
   1925 Death of Archangel Ingleman. Property to her heirs.

3. Alterations and additions: At an undetermined date, a rear lean-to was added as a kitchen. In 1943, Luke Sheer purchased the house and installed indoor plumbing, put cement around the base of the house to deter rodents and other burrowing animals, restored the chimney to the front of the house, and removed and reversed the exterior siding.
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CHIEF RICHARDVILLE HOUSE HABS No. IN-157 (JEAN BAPTISTE RICHARDVILLE HOUSE)

U.S. Route 24 (junction with U.S. 24 Bypass), Huntington, Huntington County, Indiana.

Longitude 85 29.6' W Latitude 40 53.0' N

Luke Sheer

The Chief Richardville House was the home of the chief of the Miami Indians, Pe-she-wah, Jean Baptiste Richardville, the nephew of Chief Little Turtle. At the time the house was built, the property was on the Miami Indian reservation, and served as the tribal headquarters from 1833 until the death of Richardville's successor, Chief Frances LaFontaine, in 1847.

PART I. HISTORICAL INFORMATION A. Physical History:

1.

Date of erection: 1833.

Original and subsequent owners:

1833 ' House built by Chief Richardville.

1841 Death of Chief Richardville. His successor, Chief Frances LaFontaine, married Richardville's daughter and took title to the property.
1847 Death of Chief LaFontaine. His daughter Archangel Ingleman Cnee LaFontaine) took title to the property.

1925 Death of Archangel Ingleman. Property to her heirs.


Alterations and additions: At an undetermined date, a rear leanto was added as a kitchen. In 1943, Luke Sheer purchased the house and installed indoor plumbing, put cement around the base of the house to deter rodents and other burrowing animals, restored the chimney to the front of the house, and removed and reversed the exterior siding.
CHIEF RICHARDVILLE HOUSE
HABS No. IN-157 (2)

B Historical Context:

The Chief Richardville House was built in the summer of 1833 by the chief of the Miami Indians. In 1826, the treaty of Paradise Springs guaranteed government provision of an Indian reservation of ten square miles and $600.00 for the construction of houses for Indian chiefs. In exchange, the Indians sold the most of their land north of the Wabash. At that time the U.S. government agents presented an outline representing the type of house considered in the outlay of funds. These houses were essentially two-room structures with a loft above. In 1832-34, the city of Huntington was founded on the eastern border of Richardville's tract. At this time, another treaty was being negotiated with the Miami's, which fell through in the autumn of 1833, when Richardville learned that the government agents were attempting to purchase Miami reservation lands for one-fifth their value. Before the collapse of negotiations, Chief Richardville began construction on the house, enlarging the rear wing, which conformed to the two-room with upper loft prototype, by adding a two story main block. The house was located at the fork of the Wabash and Maumee rivers where the portage for the rivers terminated. The portage path was used in winter when the Little River, which connected the Maumee to the Wabash, was frozen, and in the summer when the water level in the Little River was too low for transport. The income derived from control of the portage path was substantial, and Richardville came to be known as the "Nabob of the Wabash". Chief Richardville's primary home was in Fort Wayne, Indiana, but the house in Huntington was used as the tribal headquarters of the Miami Indians until the death of his successor, Chief Frances LaFontaine.

For photocopies of photographs of the house see data pages 8 and 9.

Prepared by Eleni Silverman
Historian, HABS, (4/11/84)
From a paper by Ron Baker, Ken Gantz, Mark Swanson, and Ken Tilbury prepared at Ball State University in March of 1971.
The Chief Richardville House was built in the summer of 1833 by the chief of the Miami Indians. In 1826, the Treaty of Paradise Springs guaranteed government provision of an Indian reservation of ten square miles and $600-00 for the construction of houses for Indian chiefs. In exchange, the Indians sold the most of their land north of the Wabash. At that time the U.S. government agents presented an outline representing the type of house considered in the outlay of funds. These houses were essentially two-room structures with an upper loft above. In 1832-34, the city of Huntington was founded on the eastern border of Richardville's tract. At this time, another treaty was being negotiated with the Miami's, which fell through in the autumn of 1833, when Richardville learned that the government agents were attempting to purchase Miami reservation lands for one-fifth their value. Before the collapse of negotiations, Chief Richardville began construction on the house, enlarging the rear wing, which conformed to the two-room with upper loft prototype, by adding a two-story main block. The house was located at the fork of the Wabash and Maumee rivers where the portage for the rivers terminated. The portage path was used in winter when the Little River, which connected the Maumee to the Wabash, was frozen, and in the summer when the water level in the Little River was too low for transport. The income derived from control of the portage path was substantial, and Richardville came to be known as the "Nabob of the Wabash." Chief Richardville's primary
home was in Fort Wayne, Indiana, but the house in Huntington was used as the tribal headquarters of the Miami Indians until the death of his successor, Chief Frances LaFontaine.

For photocopies of photographs of the house see data pages 8 and 9.

Prepared by Eleni Silverman Historian, HABS, (4/11/84)

From a paper by Ron Baker, Ken Gantz, Mark Swanson, and Ken Tilbury prepared at Ball State University in March of 1971.
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CHIEF RICHARDVILLE HOUSE  
HABS No. IN-157 (3)  

The following documentation was developed by students at Ball State University, under the direction of David R. Hermansen, Professor, in 1971. It was donated to the Historic American Buildings Survey and was neither edited by nor supervised by members of the HABS staff.

PART II. ARCHITECTURAL INFORMATION:

A. GENERAL STATEMENT

1. Architectural Merit and Interest: The Chief Richardville dwelling was built in the summer of 1833 near Huntington, Indiana. It is a typical example of an offer made to Indians at this time by the government in exchange for some land. However, it is probably the only example in the area of a wood frame house built during that period.

2. Condition of Fabric: Fair to poor. Parts of the house are deteriorating with some structural members beginning to fail.

B. DESCRIPTION OF EXTERIOR:

1. Overall Dimensions: 56' x 42'

2. Number of Stories: The house is in two parts. The south wing is two stories with an attic. The north wing is one and a half stories with a basement beneath.

3. Layout, Shape: The shape is basically an "L" with one lean-to and two porches attached.

4. Foundations: These are of stone rubble and roughed faced. The original foundation has been somewhat added to since the house was built for preservation reasons.

5. Wall Construction, Finish and Color: The exterior walls of the south wing are of 5" wood stud construction; the north wing, 5" wood stud construction. The exterior is faced with horizontal clapboard siding painted white. This is the original siding of the house which was reversed in 1944 by its present owner. The small lean-to on the west side of the house has vertical exterior siding.

6. Structural System, Framing: The house is a wood framing system, wall bearing construction. Interior walls are stud framed on both levels. The first floor joists are 3" x 9" timbers, 21" o.c., and
A. GENERAL STATEMENT

1. Architectural Merit and Interest: The Chief Richardville dwelling was built in the summer of 1833 near Huntington, Indiana. It is a typical example of an offer made to Indians at this time by the government in exchange for some land. However, it is probably the only example in the area of a wood frame house built during that period.

2. Condition of Fabric: Fair to poor. Parts of the house are deteriorating with some structural members beginning to fail.

B. DESCRIPTION OF EXTERIOR /

1. Overall Dimensionsi 55* x -42.'

2. Number of Stories: The house is in two parts. The south wing is two stories with an attic. The north wing is one and a half stories with a basement beneath.

3. Layout, Shape: The shape is basically an "L" with one lean-to and two porches attached.

k. Foundations: These are of stone rubble and roughed faced. The original foundation has been somewhat added to since the house was built for preservation reasons.
5. Wall Construction, Finish and Color: The exterior walls of the south wing are of 6" wood stud construction; the north wing, 5" wood stud construction. The exterior is faced with horizontal clapboard siding painted white. This is the original siding of the house which was reversed in 19\(^\text{th}\) by its present owner. The small lean-to on the west side of the house has vertical exterior siding.

6. Structural System, Framing: The house is a wood framing system, wall bearing construction. Interior walls are stud framed on both levels. The first floor joists are 3" x 9" timbers, 21" o.c. and
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The following documentation was developed by students at Ball State University, under the direction of David R. Hermansen, Professor, in 1971. It was donated to the Historic American Buildings Survey and was neither edited by nor supervised by members of the HABS staff.

PART. II. ARCHITECTURAL INFORMATION!
supported from failure by metal posts added later in the basement. Ceiling height in the basement is 6'-3". The south wing has a ceiling height of 9'-10" on first floor, 8'-9" on the second floor. The north wing is 8'-9" ceiling height on first floor and 6'-11" to the peak on the second floor.

7. Porches, Stoops, Bulkheads, etc.: The house has two porches and one lean-to. A 10' x 30' open air porch is attached to the east side of the house. Construction is simple. Five square cut timber columns support a beveled roof projecting from the north wing. Another porch on the north side was supported by one column and butted into the lean-to on the west side for further support. It is much smaller in size, yet simple in construction. The lean-to on the west side has vertical wooden siding on three sides with a tin facade on the east. This tin is impressed with an imitation concrete block pattern.

8. Chimneys: Originally there were three chimneys. One being in the south wing, one in the north wing, and one in the lean-to. The rectangular chimney of the south wing still exists and is of red brick. It is simple with no cap on top. The square chimney of the lean-to is red brick on the bottom half with a clay tile stack on the top half. The missing chimney was in the north wing and went to the kitchen.

9. Doorways and Doors: There were originally exterior doors but one door leading to the porch from the south wing was blocked up. The exterior doors are all similar and simple. They are solid wood consisting of six recessed panels. The only significant doorway is that of the south entrance into the south wing. Here the simple panel door is flanked on each side by a glass sidelight broken into four equal segments with three mullions. Each sidelight is flanked by two square cut columns with stair-stepped capitals. They support a very simple wooden entablature. This entire doorway is then recessed into the exterior wall and then framed again by two larger square cut wooden columns with simple entablature on the exterior wall itself.

10. Windows and Shutters: The windows are wooden double hung. There appears to have been shutters on the windows at one time, but they no longer exist. The sills and jambs are a simple construction and painted white. In the south wing, mullions divide each sash of the window into six equal glass panels. The windows in the upper story of the north wing are equal in size to only one sash of the double hung windows which appear throughout the rest of the house.
supported from failure by metal posts added later in the basement. Ceiling height in the basement is 6'-3". The south wing has a ceiling height of 9'-10" on first floor, 8'-9" on the second floor. The north wing is 8'-9" ceiling height on first floor and 6'-11" to the peak on the second floor.

7. Porches, Stoops, Bulkheads, etc. The house has two porches and one lean-to, A 10' x 30' open air porch is attached to the east side of the house. Construction is simple. Five square cut timber columns support a beveled roof projecting from the north wing. Another porch on the north side was supported by one column and butted into the lean-to on the west side for further support. It is much smaller in size, yet simple in construction. The lean-to on the west side has vertical wooden siding on three sides with a tin facade on the east. This tin is impressed with an imitation concrete block pattern.
8. Chimneys: Originally there were three chimneys. One being in the south wing, one in the north wing, and one in the lean-to. The rectangular chimney of the south wing still exists and is of red brick. It is simple with no cap on top. The square chimney of the lean-to is red brick on the bottom half with a clay tile stack on the top half. The missing chimney was in the north wing and went to the kitchen.

9. Doorways and Doors: There were originally exterior doors but one door leading to the porch from the south wing was blocked up. The exterior doors are all similar and simple. They are solid wood consisting of six recessed panels. The only significant doorway is that of the south entrance into the south wing. Here the simple panel door is flanked on each side by a glass sidelight broken into four equal segments with three mullions. Each sidelight is flanked by two square cut columns with stair-stepped capitals. They support a very simple wooden entablature. This entire doorway is then recessed into the exterior wall and then
framed again by two larger square cut wooden columns with simple entablature on the exterior wall itself.

10. Windows and Shutters; The windows are wooden double hung. There appears to have been shutters on the windows at one time, but they no longer exist.

The sills and jambs are a simple construction and painted white. In the south wing, mullions divide each sash of the window into six equal glass panels. The windows in the upper story of the north wing are equal in size to only one sash of the double hung windows which appear throughout the rest of the house.
11. Roof: The south and north wings of the house are covered by wooden shake gable roofs butting each other at a 90° angle. The two porches and the lean-to have shed roof and are covered with wooden shakes.

C. DESCRIPTION OF INTERIOR

1. Basement: The basement exists only under the north wing of the house. Its height is only 6'-3" with a dirt floor and open to the outside and inside by north stairways.

First Floor: Main entrance is from the south into the south wing. The entrance hall contains a stairway up to the second floor; and also opens to the living room to the west and, at one time, to the porch on the north. The living room opens on the north to the north wing and here is the dining room, and beyond that, the kitchen. Both dining room and kitchen have entrances onto the porch to the east.

Second Floor: From the entrance hall of the south wing there leads a stairway up to two bedrooms. North of these bedrooms and in the north wing are two more bedrooms for servants. These have entrance through a stairway on the north side of the north wing.

Attic: The only attic space is that in the south wing. There is no direct access to it from the second floor.

2. Stairways: There are four stairways in the house—three wooden interior stairways and one cement exterior stairway. The stairways in the entrance hall is an open wooden stairway, very simple in construction style. Beneath it is a toilet installed during a later period. The newel post is somewhat massive, yet similar to the balusters in that it is very simple. The other two interior stairways are also wooden, yet narrower and not as formal as the entrance hall stairway. They are in the north wing; one leading up to the second floor and one leading down to the basement.

3. Flooring: The basement has a dirt floor. All other floors, those of the first floor and second floor, are wood planking. The rooms in the north wing on the first floor have linoleum covering the wood planking. There is also checkerboard linoleum or tile in the entrance hall.
11. Roof: The south and north wings of the house are covered "by wooden shake gable roofs butting each other at a 90° angle. The two porches and the lean-to have shed roof and are covered with wooden shakes.

C. DESCRIPTION OF INTERIOR

1. Basement: The basement exists only under the north wing of the house. Its height is only 6'3" with a dirt floor and open to the outside and inside by north stairways.

First Floor: Main entrance is from the south into the south wing. The entrance hall contains a stairway up to the second floor; and also opens to the living room to the west and, at one time, to the porch on the north. The living room opens on the north to the north wing and here is the dining room, and beyond that, the kitchen. Both dining room and kitchen have entrances onto the porch to the east.

Second Floor: From the entrance hall of the south wing there leads a stairway up to two bedrooms.
North of these bedrooms and in the north wing are two more bedrooms for servants. These have entrance through a stairway on the north side of the north wing.

Attic: The only attic space is that in the south wing. There is no direct access to it from the second floor.

2. Stairways: There are four stairways in the house--three wooden interior stairways and one cement exterior stairway. The stairways in the entrance hall is an open wooden stairway, very simple in construction' style. Beneath it is a toilet installed during a later period. The newel post is somewhat massive, yet similar to the balusters in that it is very simple. The other two interior stairways are also wooden, yet narrower and not as formal as the entrance hall stairway. They are in the north wing; one leading up to the second floor and one leading down to the basement.

3. Flooring: The basement has a dirt floor. All other floors, those of the first floor and second floor, are wood planking. The rooms in the north wing on the first floor have linoleum covering the
wood planking. There is also checkerboard linoleum or tile in the entrance hall.
4. Wall and Ceiling Finish: The basement walls are exposed stone rubble foundation. Similarly the ceiling of the basement is exposed floor joist timbers. All of the interior rooms of the house are wood lath and plaster covered. The living room in the south wing is painted with light green walls and a white ceiling. The master bedroom in the south wing on the second floor is covered with striped wallpaper, and the room next to it, which is above the entrance hall, is covered with flowered wallpaper. In the north wing, on the first floor, the dining room walls and ceiling are painted pink; the kitchen walls and ceiling painted white; and the lean-to walls and ceiling, pink. On the second floor of the north wing, the servants rooms are painted a light pink. The attic in the south wing is believed to be exposed timbers.

5. Doorways and Doors: All interior doors are solid wood with recessed panels. There are eight doors on the first floor and two on the second floor. The framing is handled in a simple manner.

6. Special Decorative Features: There are two significant fireplaces in the dwelling. Both are on the west wall of the south wing. One is in the living room on the first floor and the other in the master bedroom on the second floor. Both have rectangular openings, wooden framed in a simple style, and are painted white. There is an area on the floor in front of the fireplace in the master bedroom which is bricked, whereas in the living room fireplace, the wood plank floor is carried right up to the hearth.

7. Notable Hardware: Most of the doors seem to have porcelain door knobs. Cupboard door handles are metal. Metal flashing is used at the joint between the south wing and the north wing of the dwelling. Also it appears around the chimney of the south wing.

8. Mechanical Equipment: There is little equipment in the house. The only mentionable item is the cast iron plumbing which was placed in the house around 1943.

D. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

1. General Setting: The Richardville House is located in a rural area west of Huntington, Indiana. It lies north of the Little Wabash River and faces south. U.S. 24 bypass parallels the dwelling to the east and old 24 west bounds it on the south. There are several other residences adjacent to and west of the dwelling.
Wall and Ceiling Finish: The basement walls are exposed stone rubble foundation. Similarly the ceiling of the basement is exposed floor joist timbers. All of the interior rooms of the house are wood lathe and plaster covered. The living room in the south wing is painted with light green walls and a white ceiling. The master bedroom in the south wing on the second floor is covered with striped wallpaper and the room next to it, which is above the entrance hall, is covered with flowered wallpaper. In the north wing, on the first floor, the dining room walls and ceiling are painted pine green; the kitchen walls and ceiling painted whiter and the lean-to walls and ceiling, pink. On the second floor of the north wing, the servants' rooms are painted a light pink. The attic in the south wing is believed to be exposed timbers.

Doorways and Doors: All interior doors are solid wood with recessed panels. There are eight doors on the first floor and two' are the second floor. The framing is handled in a simple manner.
There are two significant fireplaces in the dwelling. Both are on the west wall of the south wing. One is in the living room on the first floor and the other in the master bedroom on the second floor. Both have rectangular openings, wooden framed in a simple style, and are painted white. There is an area on the floor in front of the fireplace in the master bedroom which is bricked, whereas in the living room fireplace, the wood plank floor is carried right up to the hearth.

Notable Hardware: A lost of the doors seem to have porcelain door knobs. Cupboard door handles are metal. Metal flashing is used at the joint between the south wing and the north wing of the dwellings. Also, it appears around the chimney of the south wing.

5.

6.

7.

8. Mechanical Equipment! There is little equipment in the house. The only mentionable item is the
cast iron plumbing which was placed in trie house around 19^3-

D. SITS AND SURROUNDINGS

1. General Setting: The Richardville House is located in a rural area west of Huntingdon, Indiana. It lies north of the Little Wabash River and faces south. U.S. 2^ bypass parallels the dwelling to the east and old 24- West bounds it on the south* There are several other residences adjacent co and west of the dwelling.
2. Outbuildings: North of the dwelling, about 40 feet, is a 4'x4' wooden outhouse with a tin roof.

PART III. SOURCES OF INFORMATION

A. Secondary and Published Sources:


2. Outbuildings'. North of the dwelling, about 40 feet, is a Vx4 wooden outhouse with a tin roof.
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See Field Records for originals
APPENDIX C: LaFontaine National Register of Historic Places Form

United States Department off the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Inventory—Nomination Form

See instructions in How to Complete National Register Forms
Type all entries—complete applicable sections_________________

1. Name

Chief Richardville House and Miami Treaty Grounds

and/or common IndianHouseandForksoftheWabash

OMB No. 1024-0018 Exp. 10-31-84

historic

2. Location

street & number

city, town state

west of Huntington on U.S. and IN 9/37

N/A not for publication

3. Classification

Category Ownership district X public
X building(s) private structure both

J( site Public Acquisition object in process

J£_

museum
park
private residence religious scientific transportation

street & number
city, town

Huntington County Courthouse

Huntington

state Indiana 46750

state Indiana
Huntington
Indiana

_X_ vicinity of
code

018

Status
X occupied

county
Huntington

Present Use _X_ agriculture
commercial educational entertainment government industrial

code

069

unoccupied

work in progress Accessible

X yes: restricted yes: unrestricted

being considered

N/A no military other

4. name

city, town Huntington N/A vicinity of

5. Location of Legal Description courthouse, registryofdeeds, etc.

Register of Deeds Office

Owner off Property

Mr. and Mrs. Luke Scheer. Sr. street&number 1018 Guilford Street

6. Representation in Existing Surveys

title N/A date

yes X no

depository for survey records city, town

N/A
has this property been determined eligible?

federal state county local

state
7. Description

**Condition**
- excellent
- good
- fair
- deteriorated
- ruins
- unexposed

**Check one**
- unaltered
- altered
- original site
- moved
date

**Describe the present and original (if known) physical appearance**

The Forks of the Wabash is the point where Little River enters the Wabash River. The area included in this nomination comprises approximately 46 acres, including the Indian House, and is a portion of the 250 acres owned by the Luke Scheer family. Since the property was acquired in 1943 from the descendants of Chiefs Richardville and Lafontaine, the scenic quality of the area has been preserved, and no cutting has been allowed.

Trees line the banks of this tract. An eight-acre island is included, with a corn field rimmed by tall sycamores. At its downstream end is a grove of large cottonwoods. The area includes the site of the former Miami Inn, which was destroyed by fire in 1956. No new construction has been permitted.

The 1833 Chief Richardville House is a simple three-bay, asymmetrical house of frame construction. The front portion of the original "L" shaped structure is two stories high, with the rear portion one and a half stories. A 12 foot by 12 foot, one-story addition was attached to the rear of the building in c. 1880. The building has recently been renovated by the Huntington North High School Junior Historical Society, after having stood vacant for about 20 years. In 1978, the group received a Young Preservationist Award for the project from the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

The exterior of the building has clapboard siding, and a gabled, wood-shingled roof. The original windows were six-over-six, some of which have been replaced with single-pane windows. The front entry, located in the righthand bay, is typical of the Greek Revival style, framed by pilasters supporting a simple entablature. Most of the glass in the transom and side lights is original. There are one-story, covered porches on the side and rear of the building.

The house has been painted in what are believed to be the original paint colors throughout. The exterior has been coated with a solid color oil base stain, in a russet color with a cream color for the trim.

On the interior, the house has three fireplaces, located in the first floor living room, the original kitchen, and the second floor master bedroom. With the exception of the middle room downstairs, all of the floors appear to be original.

The side entry hall has an open stairway. The stair banister and newel post are black walnut and are original. Each step has two walnut balusters slightly curved at the top. Most of the lower balusters are new replacements. Much of the woodwork is walnut as are the panels of the Christian doors. Some of the woodwork appears to have been originally grained in an oak finish.

There are two main bedrooms over the main portion of the house, and two back bedrooms for servants which are only accessible from a steep back stairway leading up from the kitchen. The ceilings in the bedrooms and hall have been extensively repaired. Plaster has been patched with walls being left in almost their original condition.

The only outbuilding to the house is a relatively recent "outhouse" with a concrete floor.
7. Description

Condition

_excellent

Check one unaltered

_X_ altered

Check one
X original site
moved date
deteriorated
ruins
fair unexposed

^ good

Describe the present and original (iff known) physical appearance

The Forks of the Wabash is the point where Little River enters the Wabash River. The area included in this nomination comprises approximately 46 acres, including the Indian House, and a portion of the 250 acres owned by the Luke Scheer family. Since the property was acquired in 1943 from the descendants of Chiefs Richardville and LaFontaine, the scenic quality of the area has been preserved, and no cutting has been allowed.
Trees line the banks of this tract. A eight-acre island is included, with a cornfield rimmed by tall sycamores. At its downstream end is a grove of large cottonwoods. The area includes the site of the former Miami Inn, which was destroyed by fire in 1956. No new construction has been permitted. The 1833 Chief Richardville House is a simple three-bay, asymmetrical house of frame construction. The front portion of the original "L" shaped structure is two stories high, with the rear portion one and a half stories. A 12 foot by 12 foot, one-story addition was attached to the rear of the building in 1880. The building has recently been renovated by the Huntington North High School Junior Historical Society, after having stood vacant for about 20 years. In 1978, the group received a Young Preservationist Award for the project from the National Trust for Historic Preservation. The exterior of the building has clapboard siding, and a gabled, wood-shingled roof. The original windows were six-over-
six, some of which have been replaced with single-pane windows. The front entry, located in the righthand bay, is typical of the Greek Revival style, framed by pilasters supporting a simple entablature. Most of the glass in the transom and sidelights is original. There are one-story, covered porches on the side and rear of the building.

The house has been painted in what are believed to be the original paint colors throughout. The exterior has been coated with a solid color oil base stain, in a russet color with a cream color for the trim.

On the interior, the house has three fireplaces, located in the first floor living room, the original kitchen, and the second floor master bedroom. With the exception of the middle room downstairs, all of the floors appear to be original.

The side entry hall has an open stairway. The stair banister and newel post are black walnut and are original. Each step has two walnut balusters slightly curved at the top.
Most of the lower balusters are new replacements. Much of the woodwork is walnut as are the panels of the Christiandoors. Some of the woodwork appears to have been originally grained in an oak finish.

There are two main bedrooms over the main portion of the house, and two back bedrooms for servants which are only accessible from a steep back stairway leading up from the kitchen.

The ceilings in the bedrooms and hall have been extensively repaired. Plaster has been patched with walls being left in almost their original condition.

The only outbuilding to the house is a relatively recent "outhouse" with a concrete floor.
8. Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Archeology</th>
<th>Conservation</th>
<th>Landscape Architecture</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Sculpture</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Military</th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Humanitarian</th>
<th>Theatre</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other (Specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400-1499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500-1599</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600-1699</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700-1799</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X 1800-1899</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specific Dates: House: 1833  Builder/Architect: N/A

Statement of Significance (in one paragraph)

The Chief Richardville House, and Miami Indian Treaty Grounds (Forks of the Wabash) have major historical significance for Indiana and the Old Northwest. The region was once dominated by one of the most important Indian tribes in American history, the Miami Nation, and the sites under construction provide an important reminder of that tribe's once great prestige and influence. By the 1700s the Portage Path between the Maumee and the Wabash Rivers was a major French trade route. The Miami Indians controlled the traffic on that route. The Chief Richardville House, built in 1833, was the home of the last two principal chiefs of the Miamis and was the first frame house constructed in the area.

Three major treaties, concluded in 1834, 1838, and 1840, that provided for removal of the tribe, were negotiated at the nearby Treaty Grounds. The tribe boarded canal boats at this site for the journey to a new reservation west of the Mississippi in 1846.

The Forks of the Wabash was the western terminus of the overland path linking the Maumee River and Great Lakes System with the Wabash River and Mississippi Valley System. Early inhabitants of the region probably developed the Portage Path about 11,000 years ago. Prehistoric evidence includes signs of early agriculture, indicating some settlement in the region. The prevalence of looseflint rock, and reports from early white visitors to the region that the Miami Indians called the region below the Forks "Father Flint," suggest that, prior to the extensive introduction of the metal implements, local Indians found the site a prime source of material for weapons and tools.

The Miami Nation moved into the area about the end of the 18th century as the powerful Iroquois Tribe, weakened by warfare, reduced its area of control. After the founding of Detroit in 1701 and the establishment of French military and trading posts throughout the Mississippi Valley System, the Wabash-Maumee portage became the principal trade route connecting Quebec and New Orleans. The prevalence of French traders and soldiers throughout the region, and the close, even intimate, association that they developed with members of the Miami tribe had major impact upon the history of the area.

One of the several French families that dominated trade in the Old Northwest during the 18th century was the Drouet family. Claude Drouet de Richerville, of minor French nobility dating to the 12th century, came to New France in 1686. By the 1730s several of his sons were engaged in the western trade. A grandson, Antoine-Joseph Drouet de Richerville, traded at Kekionga or Miamitown, now Fort Wayne, between the 1750s and 1770s.

By the same period, one Miami family controlled transportation on the Portage Path. This control provided the family with revenue from the movement of furs and trade goods and gave them prominence within the tribe. By the late 1750s, Tecumwah, sister of Little Turtle, the principal chief of the Miamis, directed the portage business.
8. Significance

Period prehistoric

1400-1499 1500-1599 1600-1699 1700-1799

_ X_ 1800-1 899 1900-

Specific dates

Areas of Significance—Check and justify below

archeology-prehistoric archeology-historic agriculture architecture
art
commerce communications
community planning conservation economics
education
engineering exploration/settlement industry
landscape architecture law
literature
military
music
philosophy
X politics/government
religion science sculpture social/humanitarian theater transportation other (specify)

invention Treaty Grounds: 1826-1845

House: 1833 Builder/Architect

Statement of Significance (in one paragraph)
The Chief Richardville House, and Miami Indian Treaty Grounds (Forks of the Wabash) have major historical significance for Indiana and the Old Northwest. The region was once dominated by one of the most important Indian tribes in American history, the Miami Nation, and the sites under construction provide an important reminder of that tribe’s once great prestige and influence.

By the 1700s, the Portage Path between the Maumee and the Wabash Rivers was a major French traderoute. The Miami Indians controlled the traffic on that route.

The Chief Richardville House, built in 1833, was the home of the last two principal chiefs of the Miami’s and was the first frame house constructed in the area.

Three major treaties, concluded in 1834, 1838, and 1840, that provided for removal of the tribe, were negotiated at the nearby Treaty Grounds. The tribe boarded canalboats at this site for the journey to a new reservation west of the Mississippi in 1846.
The Forks of the Wabash was the western terminus of the overland path linking the Maumee River and Great Lakes System with the Wabash River and Mississippi Valley System. Early inhabitants of the region probably developed the Portage Path about 11,000 years ago. Prehistoric evidence includes signs of early agriculture, indicating some settlement in the region. The prevalence of loose flintrock, and reports from early white visitors to the region that the Miami Indians called the region below the Forks "Father Flint," suggest that, prior to the extensive introduction of the metal implements, local Indians found the site a prime source of material for weapons and tools.

The Miami Nation moved into the area about the end of the 18th century as the powerful Iroquois Tribe, weakened by warfare, reduced its area of control. After the founding of Detroit in 1701 and the establishment of French military and trading posts throughout the Mississippi Valley System, the Wabash-Maumee portage became the
principal trade route connecting Quebec and New Orleans. The prevalence of French traders and soldiers throughout the region, and the close, even intimate, association that they developed with members of the Miami tribe had major impact upon the history of the area.

One of the several French families that dominated trade in the Old Northwest during the 18th century was the Drouet family. Claude Drouet de Richerville, of minor French nobility dating to the 12th century, came to New France in 1686. By the 1730s several of his sons were engaged in the western trade. A grandson, Antoine-Joseph Drouet de Richerville, traded at Kekionga or Miami town, now Fort Wayne, between the 1750s and 1770s. By the same period, one Miami family controlled transportation on the Portage Path. This control provided the family with revenue from the movement of furs and trade goods and gave them prominence within the tribe.
By the late 1750s, Tecumwah, sister of Little Turtle, the principal chief of the Miami's, directed the portage business.
9. Major Bibliographical References

Please see continuation sheet

10. Geographical Data

Acreage of nominated property: Approx. 46 acres
Quadranlage name: Bippus, Indiana
Quadranlage scale: 1:24000

UTM References

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1 6</td>
<td>6 2 3 7 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 5 2 6 2 5 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>6 2 4 0 7 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 5 2 5 8 4 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>6 2 3 0 3 8 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 5 2 5 8 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1 6</td>
<td>6 2 2 6 8 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 5 2 5 2 9 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verbal boundary description and justification

Please see continuation sheet

List all states and counties for properties overlapping state or county boundaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>state</th>
<th>code</th>
<th>county</th>
<th>code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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X national ___ state ___ local

As the designated State Historic Preservation Officer for the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-665), I hereby nominate this property for inclusion in the National Register and certify that it has been evaluated according to the criteria and procedures set forth by the National Park Service.

State Historic Preservation Officer signature

Title: Indiana State Historic Preservation Officer
date: 6-27-85

For NPS use only

I hereby certify that this property is included in the National Register

Keeper of the National Register
date: 9/16/85

Attest:
date:

Chief of Registration
9. Major Bibliographical References

Please see continuation sheet

10. Geographical Data  Acreage of nominated property  Approx. 46 acres

Quadrangle name  Bippus, Indiana  UTM References

ALM| l6|2|3|7|0,0| l4,5|2,6|2,5,0| Zone Easting Northing

CI|1i6|2|3|8|I|4|I5|l5|l8|l9|0|1

El,III,II,II,I,|FU111,l,,11,1,,1|0,111,11,11,11,11|HU111,11,1,1,1,1

Verbal boundary description and justification

Please see continuation sheet

List all states and counties for properties overlapping state or county boundaries

state___N/\____________code____county______________ ___ code

state code

11. Form Prepared By

county

code

October, 1978

219/356-6104, Ext. 34

name/title

Jean Gernand and Mary Kelsay Huntington North H.S. Junior

organization  Historical Society______
12. State Historic Preservation Officer Certification

The evaluated significance of this property within the state is:

_______ X____ national ______ state____ local ______________________________

As the designated State Historic Preservation Officer for the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-665), I hereby nominate this property for inclusion in the National Register and certify that it has been evaluated according to the criteria and procedures set forth by the National BarKk Sservice.

StateHistoricPreservationOfficersignature Cty* f** C** C** C** C** title Indiana

State Historic Preservation Offic date 6-27-85

city or town Huntington

state

Chief of Registration

Quadrangle scale 1:24000

B .61 1612,410.7,01 |4,5|215|8i4,0 Zone Easting Northing

|6|2|2|6|8|0|
United States Department of the Interior
Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service

National Register of Historic Places
Inventory—Nomination Form

Chief Richardville House and
Miami Treaty Grounds  Item number 8  Page 2

Tecumwah and Antoine-Joseph Drolet de Richerville had by 1760 established a relationship that produced, it is believed, four children including Jean-Baptiste Drolet de Richerville, born in 1761. By all accounts, Tecumwah was an extremely able individual who apparently devoted her time to insuring that her son became principal chief after her brother died. When Antoine-Joseph returned to eastern Canada sometime during the 1780s, she raised Jean-Baptiste herself. Beyond thoroughly training her son, she is believed to have stage-managed the event that gave Jean-Baptiste a reputation for bravery and assured his election as principal chief, the saving of a white captive from burning at the stake.

Richardville needed no false reputation. He spoke fluent French, Miami and English and, although shy, was well-respected. He took part in most of the major events that occurred in the region after he came of age. Richardville, for example, was part of the Indian force that defeated General Harmar in 1790. Better known, possibly, as a diplomat than a warrior, he was signatory to the Treaty of Greenville in 1795, the Treaty of Fort Wayne in 1803, and the Treaty of Greenville in 1805. The Miami elected Richardville head chief in 1813.

Chief Richardville continued control of the portage. This control, his extensive land holdings, and the bonuses he received from the United States government each time he signed a treaty, insured his personal wealth. By 1841 his estate was valued at almost one million dollars, and some observers considered him the wealthiest Indian alive. Historians generally consider Richardville to have been an excellent chief. Although he lined his own pockets and took care of family and friends, he also arranged good terms for other Miamis and staved off removal of the tribe for many years.

By 1831, the pressure of white settlement around Fort Wayne became too great, and Richardville moved the tribe westward to the Forks of the Wabash. The frame house now known as the Chief Richardville House was built in 1833. The structure is distinguished as the home of the last two principal chiefs of the Miami Nation in Indiana. It is believed to have been the first frame house constructed in the area. Most of Huntington County in 1833 was dense wilderness with only an occasional log cabin as a sign of white settlement. Only four white families lived nearby in what is now the city of Huntington.

In 1834, 1838, and 1840, the Miami Nation and the United States government negotiated major treaties, providing for land cession and eventual removal of the tribe, at a site near the Chief Richardville House now known as the "Treaty Grounds." In the treaty of 1834, the United States Government recognized Chief Richardville's ownership of a large tract of land running down from the Forks of the Wabash, including the site of the present Chief Richardville House. The basis for the arrangement was a grant of land given the Chief's mother years earlier by the French government. The Indians made further land cessions in treaties signed in 1838 and 1840. In 1841, the Miamis finally acceded, at Richardville's urging, to government demands that the tribe move to a reservation west of the Mississippi River. This decision was made during a council meeting held on the Treaty Grounds, and, in 1846, when the Indians finally departed Indiana, they boarded canal boats at those grounds for the sad journey westward.

Richardville died in 1841 at the age of eighty. He willed the land, confirmed his in the 1834 treaty, including the Chief's house, to his descendants. His daughter, Catherine, thus became the owner. She was married to Francis Lafontaine who was also elected the new principal chief. Lafontaine resided in the Chief Richardville House until 1846 when he led the tribe to its new reservation.
Tecumwah and Antoine-Joseph Drouet de Richer-vine had by 1760 established a relationship that produced, it is believed, four children including Jean-Baptiste Drouet de Richardville, born in 1761. By all accounts, Tecumwah was an extremely able individual who apparently devoted her time to insuring that her son became principal chief after her brother died. When Antoine-Joseph returned to eastern Canada sometime during the 1780s, she raised Jean-Baptisteherself. Beyond thoroughly training her son, she is believed to have stage-managed the event that gave Jean-Baptiste a
reputation for bravery and assured his election as principal chief, the saving of a white captive from burning at the stake.

Richardville needed no false reputation. He spoke fluent French, Miami, and English, and, although shy, was well-respected.

He took part in most of the major events that occurred in the region after he came of age.

Richardville, for example, was part of the Indian force that defeated General Harmar in 1790.

Better known, possibly, as a diplomat than a warrior, he was signatory to the Treaty of Greenville in 1795, the Treaty of Fort Wayne in 1803, and the Treaty of Grouse! and in 1805.

The Miami selected Richardville head chief in 1813.

Chief Richardville continued control of the portage. This control, his extensive land holdings, and the bonuses he received from the United States government each time he signed
atreaty, insured his personal wealth. By 1841 his estate was valued at almost one million dollars, and some observers considered him the wealthiest Indian alive. Historians generally consider Richardville to have been an excellent chief. Although he lined his own pockets and took care of family and friends, he also arranged good terms for other Miami's and staved off removal of the tribe for many years.

By 1831, the pressure of white settlement around Fort Wayne became too great, and Richardville moved the tribe westward to the Forks of the Wabash. The frame house now known as the Chief Richardville House was built in 1833. The structure is distinguished as the home of the last two principal chiefs of the Miami Nation in Indiana. It is believed to have been the first frame house constructed in the area. Most of Huntington County in 1833 was dense
wilderness with only an occasional log cabin as a sign of white settlement. Only four white families lived nearby in what is now the city of Huntington.

In 1834, 1838, and 1840, the Miami Nation and the United States government negotiated major treaties, providing for land cession and eventual removal of the tribe at a site near the Chief Richardville House now known as the "Treaty Grounds."

In the treaty of 1834, the United States Government recognized Chief Richardville's ownership of a large tract of land running down from the Forks of the Wabash, including the site of the present Chief Richardville House.

The basis for the arrangement was a grant of land given the Chief's mother years earlier by the French government.

The Indians made further land cessions in treaties signed in 1838 and 1840.

In 1841, the Miami's finally acceded, at Richardville's surg
ing, to government demands that the tribe move to a reservation west of the Mississippi River. This decision was made during a council meeting held on the Treaty Grounds, and, in 1846, when the Indians finally departed Indiana, they boarded canal boats at those grounds for the sad journey westward.

Richardvillediedin1841attheageofeighty.

Hewilledtheland,confirmedhisinthe 1834treaty,includingtheChief'shouse,tohisdescendants. Hisdaughter,Catherine, thusbecametheowner.

ShewasmarriedtoFrancisLafontainewhoalsoelectedthe newprincipalchief.

LafontaineresidedintheChiefRichardvilleHouseuntil1846when he led the tribe to its new reservation.
He then returned to Indiana where he died the following year. Catherine lived in the home until her death, and the descendants of Richardville retained ownership of the property until 1943.

The Chief Richardville House and Miami Indian Treaty Grounds are some of the few remaining signs of a major part of the early history of the Old Northwest. The grounds here under consideration, retained by Richardville's descendants until 1943, are the last remnants of his once extensive holdings in the area. Left relatively undisturbed, they represent the central and primary area of the Treaty Grounds, where the Miami met annually to receive their payments from the government prior to their removal in 1846. Together with the Richardville House, they are a significant cultural resource for the community, the state, and the nation.

**ADDENDUM, June, 1985**

Although several locations immediately west of Huntington were used as gathering areas for the Miami Indians, the site which retains the best integrity and which was used most consistently for the annual governmental payments and treaty negotiations is the area identified as the Treaty Grounds at the Forks of the Wabash. Occasionally, annuities were dispensed by the government to the Indians at locations just south of the river, and later another area about a mile north and west of the Richardville House was also used as Indian payment grounds. However, the land at the Forks of the Wabash on the north side of the river was used most frequently, and historical records include frequent references to the use of this area for various meetings of the Miami Indians. The infrequent use of the other sites, as well as their alteration through farming and modern development, decreases their significance relative to the Treaty Grounds. The Treaty Grounds remain as a relatively unaltered area which was most consistently used for negotiations and payments by the federal government to the Miami Indian Nation, from 1826 to 1845.

Because of the temporary nature of the annual Indian gatherings, the precise boundaries of the encampment changed each year. Although the occupied area changed from time to time, the center of the gathering was usually toward the east end, at the forks of the Wabash. Historical accounts frequently mention council meetings being held at the forks of the Wabash directly across from the Richardville House. The camp would extend from that point to the west along the north side of the river to take advantage of a number of river springs which provided water for daily needs. The area included in the nomination is that portion which corresponds to 19th century maps. While it is possible that at times the Indian Council may have occupied a larger area, the land included in the nomination represents the core of the property which was most consistently used over the years.

No archaeological investigations have been conducted at the treaty grounds. The treaty grounds and Richardville House present a unique opportunity to recover historic archaeological data important to our understanding of the historic Miami occupation of the region to, and post-dating, their removal by treaty from Indiana. Such data in undisturbed and recoverable context will provide a basis for testing hypotheses and answering questions concerning enculturation of the Miamis, their subsistence patterns, lifeways, trade networks and economic systems, and numerous other critical research areas. In addition, archaeological investigations may provide a much needed base of diagnostic material culture and site patterning data useful for comparing with contemporary Euro-American sites and distinguishing them from Miami Indian sites of the period from the early 1830s to the late 1840s. Archaeological investigations at the Richardville House and within the treaty grounds boundaries should greatly increase their interpretive value and explanatory potential.
HethenreturnedtoIndianawherehediedthefollowingyear. Catherinelivedinthehome until her death, and the descendants of Richardville retained ownership of the property until 1943. The Chief Richardville House and Miami Indian Treaty Grounds are some of the few remaining signs of a major part of the early history of the Old Northwest. The grounds here, under consideration, retained by Richardville's descendants until 1943, are the last remnants of his once extensive holdings in the area.
Left relatively undisturbed, they represent the central and primary area of the Treaty Grounds, where the Miami met annually to receive their payments from the government prior to their removal in 1846. Together with the Richardville House, they are a significant cultural resource for the community, the state, and the nation.

ADDENDUM, June, 1985

Although several locations immediately west of Huntington were used as gathering areas for the Miami Indians, the site which retains the best integrity and which was used most consistently for the annual governmental payments and treaty negotiations is the area identified as the Treaty Grounds at the Forks of the Wabash. Occasionally, annuities were dispensed by the government to the Indians at locations just south of the river, and later another area about a mile north and west of the Richardville House was also used as Indian payment grounds.

However, the land at the Forks of the Wabash on the north side of the
river was used most frequently, and historical records include frequent references to the use of this area for various meetings of the Miami Indians. The infrequent use of the other sites, as well as their alteration through farming and modern development, decreases their significance relative to the Treaty Grounds. The Treaty Grounds remain as a relatively unaltered area which was most consistently used for negotiations and payments by the federal government to the Miami Indian Nation, from 1826 to 1845.

Because of the temporary nature of the annual Indian gatherings, the precise boundaries of the encampment changed each year. Although the occupied area changed from time to time, the center of the gathering was usually toward the east end, at the forks of the Wabash. Historical accounts frequently mention council meetings being held at the forks of the Wabash directly across from the Richardville House. The camp would extend from that point to the west along the
north side of the river to take advantage of a number of river springs which provided water for daily needs. The area included in the nomination is that portion which corresponds to 19th century maps. While it is possible that at times the Indian Council may have occupied a larger area, the land included in the nomination represents the core of the property which was most consistently used over the years.

No archaeological investigations have been conducted at the treaty grounds. The treaty grounds and Richardville House present a unique opportunity to recover historic archaeological data important to our understanding of the historic Miami occupation of the region to, and post-dating, their removal by treaty from Indiana. Such data in undisturbed and recoverable context will provide a basis for testing hypotheses and answering questions concerning enculturation of
the Miami's, their subsistence patterns, lifeways, trade networks and economies, and numerous other critical research areas. In addition, archaeological investigations may provide a much needed base of diagnostic material culture and site patterning data useful for comparing with contemporary Euro-American sites and distinguishing them from Miami Indian sites of the period from the early 1830s to the late 1840s. Archaeological investigations at the Richardville House and within the treaty grounds boundaries should greatly increase their interpretive value and explanatory potential.
Roberts, Bessie Keenan, "Richardville, Chief of the Miamis", (Pamphlet, Fort Wayne Library).
Tipton Papers, Vol II, P. 698.
Combination Atlas Map of Huntington County, Indiana. Chicago: Kingman Brothers, 1879.
History of Huntington County, Indiana. Chicago: Brant and Fuller, 1887.
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Beginning at a point where the southern right-of-way line of U.S. Highway 24 intersects the eastern boundary of the property belonging to Luke Scheer; thence in a southerly direction along said property line to the northern bank of Little River; thence along the northern bank at normal stage of the Little and Wabash Rivers to an intersection with the western boundary of the property belonging to Luke Scheer; thence in a northerly direction along said property line to the southern right-of-way line of U.S. Highway 24; thence along the southern right-of-way line of U.S. Highway 24 to the intersection of the highway with a private lane leading from the highway north to a five-acre "farmette" property owned by others; thence in a northerly direction along the eastern edge of said private lane to the southern boundary of said five-acre "farmette" property; thence in an easterly direction along said property line to a point where it intersects with the western right-of-way line of Indiana Highway 37 (U.S. Highway 24 By-Pass); thence along the western right-of-way line of Indiana Highway 37 to a point where it intersects the southern right-of-way line of U.S. Highway 24; thence along the southern right-of-way line of U.S. Highway 24 to the place of beginning, containing approximately 46 acres.
Beginning at a point where the southern right-of-way line of U.S. Highway 24 intersects the eastern boundary of the property belonging to Luke Scheer; thence in a southerly direction along said property line to the northern bank of Little River; thence along the northern bank at normal stage of the Little and Wabash Rivers to an intersection with the western boundary of the property belonging to Luke Scheer; thence in a northerly direction along said property line to the southern right-of-way line of U.S. Highway
24; thence along the southern right-of-way line of U.S. Highway 24 to the intersection of the highway with a private lane leading from the highway north to a five-acre "farmette" property owned by others; thence in a northerly direction along the eastern edge of said private lane to the southern boundary of said five-acre "farmette" property; thence in an easterly direction along said property line to a point where it intersects with the western right-of-way line of Indiana Highway 37 (U.S. Highway 24 By-Pass); thence along the western right-of-way line of Indiana Highway 37 to a point where it intersects the southern right-of-way line of U.S. Highway 24; thence along the southern right-of-way line of U.S. Highway 24 to the place of beginning, containing approximately 46 acres.
Chief Richardville House and Miami Treaty Grounds
The Treaty Grounds site is predominantly wooded with two large, open grassy areas. One of the open areas is located in the middle of the site adjacent to the river. The other open area is in the northeast corner of the site adjacent to U.S. Highway 24 and State Road 37. In the early 19th century, the treaty grounds included open areas as well as wooded portions. There are probably more trees today than there were 150 years ago. Historical accounts indicate that the Treaty Grounds contained at least one log structure which apparently served a dual purpose as a trading store and Council House. During times of annual governmental payments to the Indians, distributions were made to between 70 and 80 Indians. Some of the individuals were housed in the Council House while most occupied tents. Some years, during the payment times, white traders came into the area and erected makeshift shanties from which they dispensed their wares.

To date, no archaeological investigations have been conducted at the Richardville House or within the boundaries of the treaty grounds. The potential for intact subsurface archaeological deposits is high, given the length and intensity of the historic environs. Intensive archaeological investigations may provide substantive data to permit the continuing interpretation and explanation of the Richardville House and the treaty grounds through time.
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The Treaty Grounds site is predominantly wooded with two large, open grassy areas. One of the open areas is located in the middle of the site adjacent to the river. The other open area is in the northeast corner of the site adjacent to U.S. Highway 24 and State Road 37. In the early 19th century, the treaty grounds included open areas as well as wooded portions. There are probably more trees today than there were 150 years ago. Historical accounts indicate that the Treaty Grounds contained at least one log structure which apparently served a dual purpose as a trading store and
Council House. During times of annual governmental payments to the Indians, distributions were made between 70 and 80 Indians. Some of the individuals were housed in the Council House while most occupied tents. Some years, during the payment times, white traders came into the area and erected makeshift shanties from which they dispensed their wares.

To date, no archaeological investigations have been conducted at the Richardville House or within the boundaries of the treaty grounds. The potential for intact subsurface archaeological deposits is high, given the length and intensity of the historic environs. Intensive archaeological investigations may provide substantive data to permit the continuing interpretation and explanation of the Richardville House and the treaty grounds through time.
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VERBAL BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION

HISTORIC FORKS OF THE WABASH, INC.

A part of the West One-Half of Tract 1 in the Reserve of Ten Sections, Township 28 North, Range 9 East, Huntington County Indiana, granted to John B. Richardville described as follows: Commencing at the intersection of State Road 9 (Huntington Bypass) with the centerline of Highway 24, west of the City of Huntington, Indiana; then 200 feet N 71 degrees 58 minutes W, along the centerline of said highway 24, to a "+" in the concrete median; thence 75.35 feet S 18 degrees 02 minutes W to a steel tube on the South right-of-way line of said highway, said tube being the point of beginning of this description; thence 276.4 feet, N 70 degrees 05 minutes 20 seconds W along said right-of-way; thence 217.1 feet, N 71 degrees 58 minutes W along said right-of-way; thence 617.41 feet, N 71 degrees 44 minutes along said right-of-way; thence 105.5 feet, S 1 degree E; thence 144 feet, S 85 degrees 32 minutes E; thence 290 feet, S 66 degrees, 02 minutes E; thence 119 feet, S 10 degrees 30 minutes E; thence 195 feet, S 26 degrees 47 minutes E; thence 271 feet, S 67 degrees, 52 minutes E; thence 315.3 feet, S 82 degrees 26 minutes E to right-of-way of State Road 9; thence 274.2 feet, N 19 degrees 01 minutes 41 seconds E along said right-of-way; thence 130.1 feet, N 25 degrees 05 minutes 08 seconds W along said right-of-way to the point of beginning. All in Huntington Township, Huntington County, Indiana and containing 7.25 acres, more or less.
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1. NAME OF PROPERTY

Historic Name: Akima Pinwia Awaji (Chief Jean-Baptiste de Richardville House)

Other Name(s)/Site Number:

2. LOCATION

Street & Number: 5705 Elffson Road

City/Town: Fort Wayne

State: Indiana  County: Allen  Code: 063  Zip Code: 46839

3. CLASSIFICATION

Ownership of Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Property</th>
<th>Building(s)</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private: X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public-Local: ___</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public-State: ___</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public-Federal: ___</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Resources within Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Noncontributing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Contributing Resources Previously Listed in the National Register:

Name of Related Multiple Property Listing: N/A
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1. NAME OF PROPERTY

Historic Name: Akima Pin5iwa Awiiki (Chief Jean-Baptiste de Richardville House) Other

Name/Site Number:
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2. LOCATION

Street & Number: 5705 Bluffton Road City/Town: Fort Wayne

State: Indiana County: AllenCode: 003
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Ownership of Property

Not for publication: Vicinity:

Zip Code: 46809
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Structure: Object:
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Name of Related Multiple Property Listing: N/A
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Number of Contributing Resources Previously Listed in the National Register: 2
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4. STATE/FEDERAL AGENCY CERTIFICATION
As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, I hereby certify that this nomination ____ request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60. In my opinion, the property ____ meets ____ does not meet the National Register Criteria.

Signature of Certifying Official Date

State or federal Agency and Bureau

In my opinion, the property meets ____ does not meet the National Register criteria.

Signature of Commenting or Other Official Date State or federal Agency and Bureau
5. NATIONAL PARK SERVICE CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that this property is:

___ Entered in the National Register
___ Determined eligible for the National Register
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___ Removed from the National Register
___ Other (explain):

________________________________________
Signature of Keeper Date of Action
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6. FUNCTION OR USE

Historic: DOMESTIC

Current: RECREATION & CULTURE

7. DESCRIPTION

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

Sub: single dwelling Sub: museum
ARCHITECTURAL CLASSIFICATION: Mid-nineteenth century: Greek Revival OTHER: I-House

MATERIALS:
Foundation: Stone (limestone)
Walls: Roof: Other:
Brick, stone (limestone) wood (shingle)
wood

AKIMA PINŠIWA AWIIKI (CHIEF JEAN-BAPTISTE DE RICHARDVILLE HOUSE)

Summary Statement of Significance

The akima Pinšiwa Awiiki is a rare and exceptionally well-preserved example of an extant treaty house in the United States that was constructed as the direct result of treaty-making between American Indians and the US government. Built in 1827 as part of the terms of the 1826 Treaty between the Myaamia (Miami) and the United States, the akima Pinšiwa Awiiki was the primary residence and locus of Pinšiwa’s activities as a sovereign leader in Myaamia negotiations with the United States government during the years 1818 to 1841. The akima Pinšiwa Awiiki is nationally significant under National Historic Landmark (NHL) Criterion 2 for its association with Pinšiwa, the akima (civil chief) of the Myaamia. Pinšiwa was able to maintain the cultural identity of his tribe while achieving and maintaining tribal consensus under his strong leadership.
The akima Pinšiwa Awiiki is also eligible under NHL Criterion 1 because much of the Old Northwest Territory was shaped by treaties brokered by Pinšiwa, allowing for more than half of the Myaamia to remain in their traditional homeland even after much of the territory was ceded to the United States. By weathering the political changes brought about the westward expansion of the United States, the waning of European influence in the Great Lakes, and changing US policy toward American Indians, Pinšiwa profoundly shaped the political landscape of his people, the state of Indiana, and the Old Northwest Territory of the United States.

**Describe Present and Historic Physical Appearance.**

**Site and Location**

The house is situated on a low ridge that is near the geographical center of a tract of land Pinšiwa received in a fee-simple land grant as part of the terms of the 1818 Treaty of St. Mary’s. The ridge is one of the highest points in the area. Pinšiwa specifically sited the house to provide an overview of the important Myaamia- controlled portage between the *mameewa siipiwi* (St. Mary’s River) and the *pwaawikamisiipi* (Little Wabash – weak-water river), and the traditional village of the *cecaahkwaki* (crane band) of the Myaamia. Pinšiwa inherited the specific control of this portage from his Myaamia mother, Tahkamwa (Crossbill – *Loxia spp.*). The house was constructed as a result of the 1826 treaty negotiated by Pinšiwa, which included an agreement for the US government to build houses for him and eight other Myaamia chiefs. The US government provided $600 for each house, and Pinšiwa added $1,600 of his own money to have a more substantial house constructed.

The akima Pinšiwa Awiiki is located in what is now the southwestern part of Fort Wayne, Indiana, colloquially known as Waynedale. In the Fort Wayne area, Pinšiwa was known and is remembered by most Euro-Americans as Chief Jean-Baptiste de Richardville, and the land in
the area around the house is identified as the “Richardville Reserve.” Descendants of Pinšiwa owned the akima Pinšiwa Awiiki and resided in it until at least 1908. Between 1907 and 1908, several parcels of land, one of which included the house, were sold to the Savin/Alden family. Carrie Savin/Alden and her husband, Judge Samuel R. Alden, never lived in the house or at the site, but leased the property to tenant farmers for many years. In 1942, the portion of land directly north of the house was sold to the Southwest Conservation Club. In 1950, the Alden’s son, Whiting, sold the house and land to the Lincoln National Bank, who then sold it to Isabelle May. Through her husband’s company, Wayne Center, Inc., the house and property continued to be leased to tenants until 1983 when Burt Keenan

1 Pinšiwa is pronounced “Pin-ZHOO-wah.” The Myaamia are commonly and historically known as the Miami. The Myaamia names of people are capitalized in this nomination, although this is not the practice of modern Myaamia speakers. Other Myaamia words are not capitalized but are instead italicized.

2 Sara J. Savin, et al. (presumably other family members) purchased a portion of the land in 1907. In 1908, Carrie Savin Alden (Sara’s daughter) purchased another portion of the Richardville Reserve that included the akima Pinšiwa Awiiki.

purchased the akima Pinšiwa Awiiki. In 1991, Keenan sold the akima Pinšiwa Awiiki to the current owner, the Fort Wayne-Allen County Historical Society.
The akima Pinšiwa Awiiki is located in the St. Mary’s River Valley near the vicinity of the traditional Myaamia village Kiihkayonki (Kekionga). The St. Mary’s River flows northwest from headwaters in Auglaize County, Ohio, to its confluence with the St. Joseph River in Fort Wayne, Indiana. According to Myaamia geography, the *mameewa siipiwi* (St. Mary’s River) meets the *kōchiihsasiipi* (St. Joseph River) and continues to Lake Erie. The two rivers combine to form the *taawaawa siipiwi* (Maumee River), which flows northeast to Lake Erie. The St. Mary’s River forms the south and western border of the Maumee River Basin and forms part of the boundary between the Tipton Till Plain and the Maumee Lacustrine Plain, or Black Swamp Natural Area.

Fort Wayne, Indiana, is located at the confluence of the rivers and sits on a continental divide. Rainwater from Fort Wayne flows north and east to the Great Lakes via the St. Mary’s and St. Joseph Rivers. Rainwater from two miles west of the confluence at Fort Wayne flows south and west to the Mississippi River via the Little River, Wabash River, and Ohio River. For the Myaamia, the flow is from the *pwawikamisiipi* (Little Wabash, meaning “weak-water river”) to the *waapaahšiki siipiwi* (Wabash River) which continues west to the Mississippi.

The Little Wabash River Valley between the Great Lakes and Mississippi River drainages was known as the “nine-mile portage,” and was a critically important link in transportation controlled by the Myaamia. For the Myaamia and other American Indian nations as well as travelers, settlers, and traders from the United States and Europe, this transportation node was a crucial juncture for water-based travel. The Myaamia referred to the area as the “Gateway.” In speaking of *Kiihkayonki*, Mihšihkinaahkwa (Little Turtle) identified it as “that glorious gate ... through which all the good words of our chiefs had to pass, from the north and the south, and from the east and the west.”
**General Description**

Today, the Pinšiwa property is less than one acre in size, reduced from the numerous parcels of the original Pinšiwa treaty settlement land in the early-to-mid-1800s. The land to the north of the house retains much of its original topography and landscape and is now the grounds of the Southwest Conservation Club. To the east, south, and southwest of the property some quarrying for sand and gravel occurred during the mid-twentieth century. The steep slope in those directions has since become covered in second-growth forest. The land to the west along either side of Bluffton Road, Indiana State Road One (1), is lined with commercial and residential development, the view of which is obscured by trees in the yard area of the akima Pinšiwa Awiiki. The house does not face Bluffton Road, instead it is oriented toward the banks of the *mameewa siipiwi* (St. Mary’s River), which is approximately one-quarter mile to the north-northeast.

3 Allen County, Indiana, deed records on file in the Allen County Courthouse, Fort Wayne, Indiana.

4 Michael McCafferty, *Native American Place-Names of Indiana* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2008), 74-86. According to McCafferty, the Maumee River retains the original Myaamia name and understanding of the river, as an extension of the St. Mary’s River to the east, and not as a new river created from the confluence of the St. Mary’s and St. Joseph.

5 Ibid., 20-38, and 102. The Myaamia considered the Ohio River to be a tributary of the Wabash, which continued west to the confluence with the Mississippi.
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A narrow asphalt drive, circa 1950, extends from Bluffton Road east to the house, and widens to create a parking area on the north side of the house. The drive continues around the east, south, and west sides of the house, returning to the main drive. On the north side of the house, two mature “twisted” Silver Maple (*Acer saccharinum*) trees stand at equal distances from the main entrance. At this time, it cannot be determined whether the twisting of the Silver Maples was caused by an act of nature or by human manipulation. The Myaamia refer to the Silver Maple as *soowanaahki*. These two remarkable trees are contributing landscape elements to the akima Pinšiwa Awiiki. Within the lawn area surrounding the house are located two mature Lilac trees (*Syringa spp.*), that may be contemporary to the residency of Pinšiwa’s family during the nineteenth century. A grouping of Eastern White Pines (*Pinus strobus*) was planted on the west side of the house, near the point where the circle drive meets the main drive, and are contemporary with the paved driveway. The driveway and grouping of pine trees occurred after the period of significance and are non-contributing elements to the site.

The akima Pinšiwa Awiiki was built in 1827. It is massed as an I-House with a two story side-gable rectangular main block that has a one-and-a-half story, gabled rear wing attached to the southwest corner. The rear alcove thus formed has a porch located under the eaves, which follows the rake of the rear wing’s roof. Trim details of a wide frieze board, entrance surround, and gable returns are consistent with early Greek Revival style in northern Indiana. The five bay
facade faces north. The walls of the house are soft red brick laid in an American bond style. Sills and lintels are plain-dressed limestone.

The walls of the foundation are *waapahsena* (limestone), which has a symbolic meaning to the Myaamia people. The *waapahsena* rubble walls of the foundation are topped by a cut stone water table with vertical tooling on the main block’s facade. Other walls have no water table, only the coursed rubble *waapahsena* foundation is visible. The walls of the entire house are topped by a wood entablature beneath close, boxed eaves. The entablature is a typical American interpretation of the Greek three-part feature, with architrave defined by a simple necking molding, plain frieze, and cornice. The cornice conceals a built-in guttering system.

The first floor of the five-bay facade has a wide central door flanked by two windows on each side with five windows in alignment above on the second floor. The basement level has four openings aligning with the windows. Each window has a wood grille with square vertical bars. Concrete steps access the front entry. The wood shouldered surround with a box cornice frames the entry’s four-panel door. The door has tall upper panels and short lower ones and is set deeply into the wall with wood jamb panels lining the entryway. Original lock hardware and hinges remain on the door. The narrow transom over the door is original and has two panes with narrow muntins. Because the original, wood six-over-six double hung sash windows were removed at some point, newly-milled replicas of the original windows have been installed. First floor windows have solid panel shutters with the original iron shutter dogs, and the second floor windows have louvered shutters. All of the shutters are painted green, with the color suggested by other contemporary examples of French homes of the

---

7 George M. Ironstrack and Daryl Baldwin, Myaamia Project, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, to Angie Quinn, December 19, 2008, ARCH, Inc. files, Fort Wayne, Indiana.
Because it has not been determined whether or not the two twisted Silver maples have Myaamia cultural significance, it is not advisable to ring-date the trees.

Ironstrack and Baldwin, Myaamia Project. “In myaamia limestone is “waapahsena” - literally ‘white stone’ - this is an animate noun which marks the stone as significant to Miami people. I believe that it is this stone that gives the Wabash River its name. While its inclusion as a building material was probably made because of availability and construction practices of the day, its inclusion would have been significant for the myaamia who gathered there.”
is believed to be original to the house, as evidenced by a pre-1894 historic photograph that shows the original Greek Revival porch.

Circa 1915, the porch was enclosed as a sunroom-like feature and its roof line merged with that of the ell. The original porch configuration was restored in 2003. The east side porch of the ell has a half gable or shed roof with the ridge line just below a wood, full entablature mimicking that of the main block. The porch’s wood deck floor rests on brick piers partially covered by a skirting board. The open area under the porch is blocked off by vertical, wood lattice bar frames that span between the piers. A broad set of wood steps provides access to the porch from the south. Also clad in wood shingles, the porch roof is carried on three stout square Doric columns, and a similar pilaster against the back of the main block. The half-gable of the porch is sided with horizontal boards and a modest entablature molding runs atop the columns and around to the half gable. The ell roof and porch roof have metal half-round gutters on the east side. In 2003, an ADA accessible lift was installed to provide access to the porch on the ground adjacent between the middle two porch columns. Metal plates conceal the square opening for the lift, when it is not in use. The control buttons are on a three foot high post set in the ground next to the lift. Under the porch, the east wall of the ell has, at its south end, a plank door, and a window on the north end. The rear wall of the main block has a door under the porch.

The south gable end wall of the ell has no first floor openings and two square, symmetrically placed, wood three-over-three double hung windows. Eaves are minimal and are trimmed with a narrow raking cornice. The west wall of the ell is flush with the west wall of the two-story main block. There are two six-over-six windows on the first floor of this wall of the ell, each placed toward the outside corners. The roof of the ell has a small, square, brick chimney roughly
centered in the mass of the ell. The chimney rises to just above the eaves line of the main block of the house.

**Exterior Rehabilitation of the Akima Pinšiwa Awiiki**

Shortly after purchasing the akima Pinšiwa Awiiki in 1991, the Fort Wayne-Allen County Historical Society decided to re-roof the house. During the 1992 inspection of the roof prior to the re-roofing, it became evident that the existing roofline was the product of an alteration at some time after the initial construction of the house. The eave projections were made of a variety of reused materials. In the course of their research regarding the history of the akima Pinšiwa Awiiki, the historical society located a historic photograph of the Hanna house that was contemporary to the akima Pinšiwa Awiiki. The house was owned by Samuel Hanna, and its construction is credited to his brother Hugh Hanna, who was one of the construction supervisors for the akima Pinšiwa Awiiki. Details from the Hanna house historic photograph provided useful evidence for the historical society’s future rehabilitation plans for the akima Pinšiwa Awiiki.

When nominated to the National Register of Historic Places in 1997, the exterior of the akima Pinšiwa Awiiki still had stucco walls and an overhanging roof with scroll-sawn rafter ends. A number of these features probably were included in a remodeling done circa 1915 by the owners...
of the property (Savin/Alden) at that time. The circa 1915 alterations also included the installation of six-over-one sash replacements on almost all of the windows, the stuccoing of the exterior, and the enclosure of the rear porch alcove with a ribbon of high windows to create a sun room. Taken together, these features were likely intended to refashion the exterior in the manner of the popular Colonial Revival style of that time. Another feature that may also have been a part of that renovation was the addition of a one-bay porch that, until 1995, sheltered the front door. It had a classical architrave supported by two Tuscan piers. At some time after 1915, a garage was attached to the house. The outline of a lower roof on the rear wing’s gable shows the location of a wood-frame garage addition that was demolished probably in the 1960s.

The Fort Wayne-Allen County Historical Society determined that the most significant period of the building was during its occupancy by Pinšiwa from 1827 to 1841, and these dates guided the rehabilitation effort that took place between 2002 and 2003. With funds from the federal Save America’s Treasures grant program, the Fort Wayne-Allen County Historical Society completed an exterior rehabilitation of the akima Pinšiwa Awiiki in 2003. The rehabilitation was reviewed by the National Park Service, the Indiana Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology, and the staff of the Fort Wayne Historic Preservation Review Board for compliance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. Ratio Architects, Inc., an Indianapolis firm, provided architectural services for the project.

The rehabilitation focused on the exterior, since the interior retains much of its original appearance in the principal rooms. The project corrected three major items: the removal of the stucco on the exterior walls, the restoration of the original rear porch configuration, and the replacement of windows with replicas of the original six-over-six sash type. Other related items included the restoration of the wooden entablature and repair of some of the exterior doors to
their original condition. The front door of the akima Pinšiwa Awiiki was also restored to its original Greek Revival appearance with a surround flanked by engaged pilasters framed behind a shouldered architrave casing. The muntins for the replica windows were based on those originals found on the transom over the front door.

During the 2002 work season, workers removed the tightly adhered stucco and carefully cleaned and repointed the original brick. Damage to the original brick from the stucco removal resulted in the replacement of some of the bricks (less than 10 percent), and some of the scar marks from the stuccoing are visible. The new brick does not noticeably vary in color from the original brick.

Once cleaned, the original bricks were found to be in good condition. In one area, an additional window had been cut into the second floor west gable end, south of the center chimney. This window sash and casing was removed, and new brick carefully toothed-in to make a veneer patch on the exterior.

The original porch roof was discovered under the circa 1915 porch roof line while investigating the back porch. A historic photograph of Sahkonkwa (James R. Godfroy) sitting on the back porch of the house revealed the style of the original columns, which was useful for the restoration of the porch. Evidence of the addition of a
bathroom to the porch area was easily discernible. The bathroom was removed during the rehabilitation, and openings from the house to the porch were restored to the original door and window.

**Description of the Interior and Interior Rehabilitation of the Akima Pinšiwa Awii**

The interior of the akima Pinšiwa Awii is a central hall I-House with one room on either side of the stair hall on each floor of the main block and the space in the rear wing unevenly divided into two rooms by a lateral partition. The four rooms of the main block were heated by gable-positioned hearths with interior chimneys. The house has plastered walls and ceilings and hardwood floors of oak and poplar. The akima Pinšiwa Awii has an unfinished basement under the main block with rubble walls that have been reinforced with concrete; a crawl space extends under the rear wing. In addition to the front stairway in the main block, enclosed stairs against the south wall of the rear wing provides access to a loft.

The central hall is dominated by the main staircase that is located on the west side of the room. The newel post has a simple urn-shaped profile. The stair has a balustrade composed of tapered spindles standing on the open ends of the treads and supporting a delicate ogee-section handrail. Though portions are now painted, the entire stairway, excluding the oak treads, appears to be made of walnut. The handrail continues uninterrupted up the stairway and forms radial corners that follow the return of the upper run of treads and the rectangular stairwell opening. A door under the upper run of the stairs opens to the back porch. The door located at the east end of the north wall in the hall provides access to the basement.

The room to the east of the hall on the first floor was presumably the parlor. A hearth is centered on the east wall of the room, flanked by alcoves formed by the chimney’s projection. Broad casings with shouldered architrave trim formed by a plain square bolection are used on the parlor
casings, and the same motif is repeated in the design of the room’s mantelpiece. The tall baseboards are capped with a plain Doric torus. The windows are set into shallow reveals behind the casings and have paneled aprons beneath their sills. This same treatment, but with the use of shouldered profiles limited to the mantle only, is repeated in the presumed dining room on the west side of the first floor. The dining room also differs in that the fireplace is flanked on either side by cased openings that presently have cupboards surmounted by open shelving. The cupboard doors appear to have been made by cutting down original full-length doors. The masonry of the dining room fireplace is covered with a modern brick and tile veneer, and the floor is a ca. 1950 replacement in maple.

The treatment of the dining room fireplace wall is repeated in the east chamber on the second floor, where the original full-length doors open to shallow closets. The arrangement seen in the parlor is repeated in the west second-floor chamber. A modern window which had been added to the south of the mantle was removed during the 2003 rehabilitation. Though the use of wide bolection casings continues through the chambers on the second floor, the windows are set above plain sills and aprons, and the use of shouldered profiles is omitted everywhere. The tall baseboards in these rooms have plain beveled tops.

The rear wing of the house appears to be the area most altered over time. At present, there is a room immediately behind the dining room and a smaller room beyond. The first room has a door and recently restored window on its east wall; the door provides access to the rear porch. The room has a window on its west wall and a door into the dining room in the center of its north wall. An ADA compliant restroom was added on the west wall of the room during the 2003 rehabilitation. The south wall of this room is a frame partition that has a cupboard-cum-bookcase
built into it on the west side of a concealed chimney. A simple chair rail extends around the
room, but at a height that puts it above the sill line of the window. Pinšiwa’s large,

Historic Integrity

The akima Pinšiwa Awiiki retains historic integrity for its period of significance, 1827-1841. Built in 1827, the akima Pinšiwa Awiiki is a rare example of a US treaty house overlooks the traditional Myaamia portage area, and is oriented to the banks of the mameewa siipiwi (St.
Mary’s River), which is approximately one-quarter mile to the north-northeast. The akima Pinšiwa Awiiki retains a strong sense of feeling and cultural association for the Myaamia. Many of the Eastern Myaamia continue to live and work in Indiana and live within a few miles of the akima Pinšiwa Awiiki, including his direct descendants, some of whom are actively engaged in interpretation and education programs at the akima Pinšiwa Awiiki.

The house sits on land that Pinšiwa negotiated for in the 1818 treaty between the Myaamia and the US government, adding to the overall integrity of setting, association, and feeling. The house is sited on land that was traditionally of great significance to the Myaamia and Pinšiwa’s family. The land to the north of the house, including the grounds of the Southwest Conservation Club, retains much of its original topography and landscape, and thus, retains a strong sense of setting, feeling, and association for the akima Pinšiwa Awiiki. Although the land to the south had been quarried at one time, the land is now covered over by second-growth forest that obscures evidence of the quarry. Trees on the grounds surrounding the akima Pinšiwa Awiiki also obscure the view of the commercial and residential development on Bluffton Road, located about a quarter mile west of the house.

Archeological excavations of the akima Pinšiwa Awiiki site have documented prehistoric occupation of the site during the Late Archaic period (3000-5000 BP), Late Woodland period (AD 500-1300), and the early historic period of the late eighteenth and nineteenth century. The excavations have proven valuable in providing information about both the akima Pinšiwa Awiiki and its occupants, and in providing strong evidence that Pinšiwa, his family, and portions of the Myaamia village resided at this site prior to the 1827 construction date of the house.

While not enough archeology has been performed at the site to evaluate the property under NHL Criterion 6, the information gained from these excavations has the potential to provide important
context for understanding the productive life of Pinšiwa and the life of his family. Therefore, the archeological resources here contribute to Criterion 2.
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For two field seasons in 1992 and 1995, students of the Indiana Purdue University Fort Wayne Archaeological Field School, under the direction of Dr. Robert J. Jeske, participated in archeological excavations at the Pinšiwa/Richardville site. A total of fifteen two-by-two and one one-by-two meter units were excavated at the site.

Historic materials that date to the period of significance recovered at the site include historic ceramics, metal items, including a razor, bullet shells, pocket knife fragments, percussion caps, and silver spoon fragments, bone and shell artifacts indicating diet, shell buttons, architectural materials, and clay pipe stems.

While some of the site has been disturbed by sewer and water pipes and modern construction, areas around the house and beneath the asphalt drive continue to have excellent stratigraphic integrity. These areas hold additional potential to provide information about the location of buildings no longer extant such as outbuildings, foundations, privies, and, more importantly, key social information associated with Pinšiwa and his family, and the perceptions of both the Myaamia and European community with whom he interacted.

While not high-style architecture, the akima Pinšiwa Awiki displays a level of stylistic appearance, workmanship, and use of materials commensurate with the status of the akima
Pinšiwa and the importance of the Myaamia. The akima Pinšiwa Awiiiki was a grand and elaborate home constructed of red brick with a waapahsena (limestone) foundation in contrast to the log construction of most homes in the larger Fort Wayne, Indiana, area during that period. The use of waapahsena (limestone) in the foundation is of cultural significance to the Myaamia. The akima Pinšiwa Awiiiki retains exceptional integrity in its design, workmanship, materials, feeling, and association.

The extent to which the present house is the same building that was constructed for Pinšiwa in 1827 is illuminated by a document now in the Indiana State Library. The papers of John Tipton, the Indian Agent who was responsible for the construction of nine houses that were provided for prominent Myaamia according to the terms of the 1826 Treaty of Paradise Springs, are located there. A sheet dated August 30, 1827, entitled “1827 Plan of J. B. Richardville’s House,” combines the modern functions of architectural plans and specifications, as well as the construction contract. The floor plan, shown on one side of the page, is surrounded by handwritten specifications. The floor plan shows a scheme that is a mirror-image of the present house as it exists today with respect to the placement of the rear wing. The rear wing itself is shown as a single room seventeen square feet with a hearth centered on its end (south) wall and no rear stairs. The reversal of the floor plan re-oriented the house to protect the back porch from the prevailing southwesterly winds.

The interior of the house is intact in terms of having retained most of the original plan, as well as the principal architectural elements: front door surround, stairway, fireplaces, and monumentally-scaled woodwork and mantelpieces. Though the French carpets, wallpapers, and draperies that were once described by visitors have long since vanished, enough remains of the original character of the house to provide compelling tangible evidence of Pinšiwa’s presence in
this place. A recent investigation of early interior finishes provides some clues for future restoration projects.

Ronald Koenig, *A Finishes Investigation & Study of the Interior of the Pinšiwa/Richardville Residence Fort Wayne, Indiana* (Fort Wayne, IN: Fort Wayne-Allen County Historical Society, 2003). Koenig found few examples of original wallpaper finishes in either of the front parlors, but did find flakes of gold leaf in the original varnish of the baseboards of the east parlor. This would indicate that gold-leaf had been applied to some decorative element in the room during the construction phase. In addition, evidence in the dining room area indicated that a rich, deep blue had been painted on the walls above a chair rail at the time of construction.
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This unique property remains as a rare resource type representing the life and accomplishments of the Myaamia *akima* Pinšiwa, who successfully led and negotiated for his people in the face of the political encroachment and the geographic expansion of the United States government into tribal homeland.
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8. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE
Certifying official has considered the significance of this property in relation to other properties:

Nationally: X Statewide: Locally:

Applicable National Register Criteria:

Criteria Considerations (Exceptions):

NHL Criteria:

NHL Criteria Exceptions: NHL Theme(s):

Areas of Significance: Period(s) of Significance: Significant Dates: Significant Person(s):

Cultural Affiliation: Architect/Builder: Historic Contexts:

AX BX CX DX

A B C D E F G 1 and 2

N/A

1. Peopling Places

5. Ethnic homelands
6. Encounters, conflicts, and colonization IV. Shaping the Political Landscape

4. Political ideas, cultures, and theories. Ethnic Heritage: Native American

1827-1841

N/A

*akima* Pinšiwa (Chief Jean-Baptiste de Richardville) N/A

A. G. Ballard, Hugh Hanna, William Rockhill

V. Political and Military Affairs, 1783-1860 G. Jacksonian Democracy, 1828-1844

X. Westward Expansion of the British Colonies and the United States C. Military-Aboriginal American Contact and Conflict

1. East of the Mississippi, 1763-1850
State Significance of Property, and Justify Criteria, Criteria Considerations, and Areas and Periods of Significance Noted Above.

Summary Statement of Significance

The akima Pinšiwa Awiiiki is a rare example of a treaty house remaining in the United States that was constructed as the direct result of treaty-making between American Indians and the United States government. Built in 1827 as part of the terms of the 1826 Treaty between the Myaamia (Miami) and the United States, the akima Pinšiwa Awiiiki was the primary residence and the locus of Pinšiwa’s activities as a sovereign leader in Myaamia negotiations with the United States government during the years 1818 to 1841.

The akima Pinšiwa Awiiiki is nationally significant under National Historic Landmark (NHL) Criterion 2 because the house is the most important place associated with Pinšiwa, the akima (civil chief) of the Myaamia. Pinšiwa was able to maintain the cultural identity of his tribe while achieving tribal consensus under his strong leadership. His efforts resulted in treaties that shaped much of the Old Northwest Territory, and that allowed for more than half of the Myaamia to remain in their traditional homeland, even after much of the territory was ceded to the United States. The akima Pinšiwa was a nationally significant American Indian statesman and leader.

The akima Pinšiwa Awiiki is also eligible under NHL Criterion 1 because it represents the particular skillfulness of the Myaamia in weathering the political changes caused by the westward expansion of the United States, the waning of European influence in the Great Lakes, and changing federal policy toward American Indians. Pinšiwa profoundly affected the political landscape of his people, the state of Indiana, and the Old Northwest Territory of the United States.
The akima Pinšiwa Awïiki is eligible under two National Historic Landmark Themes; I. Peopling Places: ethnic homelands and encounters, conflicts, and colonization; and IV. Shaping the Political Landscape: Political ideas, cultures, and theories. The period of significance for the akima Pinšiwa Awïiki is 1827-1841, which is the period from the construction and occupation of the house by Pinšiwa until his death in 1841. It is important to note that Pinšiwa lived at the site of the house prior to its construction. The site was historically significant to Pinšiwa’s Myaamia family because of the portage overview it provided. A major village of the Myaamia, Kiihkayonki (Kekionga), was located within a few miles of the house site.

Events Leading to the Ascendancy of Pinšiwa as the Akima of the Myaamia

Pinšiwa (Bobcat), whose Euro-American name was Jean-Baptiste de Richardville, was born in 1761 to a Myaamia mother, Tahkamwa (Crossbill – Loxia spp.), and a French father, Antoine-Joseph Drouet de Richerville. He inherited powerful traditions from both of his parents. The mixed blood or “Métis” birth was  

14 This nomination was completed with assistance from: 1. The Myaamia Project, Miami University of Ohio, particularly George M. Ironstrack and Daryl Baldwin. The Myaamia Project, created in 2001, is a tribal initiative located within an academic environment to advance the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma's language and cultural revitalization efforts. The Myaamia Project is directly supported by the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma and Miami University; Creager Smith, Preservation Planner, City of Fort Wayne, Indiana, with the early versions of this document; Dani Tippman, Interpreter/educator at the akima Pinšiwa Awïiki, a Pinšiwa descendent, and member of the Miami Nation; Michael McCafferty, Algonquian linguist on the faculty of the Department of Second Language Studies at Indiana University, and on the Historical Landscapes of the Miami Committee, Myaamia Project, Miami University of Ohio.

451
According to McCafferty, the modern term for a head chief is spelled “akima.” The earlier historic civil chief had a different function, and was referred to as “akimaawa.” Akima will be used throughout this nomination to reflect the specific role of Pinšiwa among the Myaamia.

The Richerville name underwent a spelling change in the late eighteenth century, and most texts refer to Pinšiwa, the son, as Richardville. A small town in central Indiana retains the pronunciation of the earlier form, as it is known as “Russiaville.”
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common in the Northwest Territory. Although “Métis” is a term commonly used today by historians and anthropologists, during his lifetime Pinšiwa never used this term to refer to himself. From a Myaamia point of view, marriage connected families and produced alliances. The children of these marriages often served their communities as leaders and negotiators because they enacted, as well as symbolized the alliances key to communal success. Pinšiwa’s heritage came from French nobility on his father’s side, and from his mother’s side he was descended from a long line of Myaamia akimas (civil chiefs) of the cecaahkwaki (crane) band.

The Myaamia, or Miami, are an Algonquian speaking people most closely related in language and culture to the Kaskaskia and Illinois nations. Traditionally residing in the western Great Lakes, the Myaamia, Kaskaskia, and Illinois were among the westernmost Algonquian peoples during the prehistoric and early contact periods. By the early 1800s, the Algonquian tribes spread
across much of the eastern seaboard of Canada and the United States, and extended into the Southeast and west as far as the Mississippi River.

When French explorers and traders first penetrated northern Indiana, they encountered Myamia and other Algonquian people of the Great Lakes migrating back into the lower Great Lakes region. The return of the Myamia to the area followed a century of warfare and displacement during a westward expansion by the Iroquois. By 1700, the Myamia had led the Algonquian peoples against the Iroquois, forcing them to retreat from the Great Lakes region. The Myamia then returned to their traditional lands south of Lake Michigan and Lake Erie.

The Myamia did not restrict themselves to the courses of rivers via canoes; they also developed trails that cut more directly across prairie and wooded areas. By charging a toll to those that sought passage by trail or canoe, the Myamia acquired great wealth and prestige. The Myamia flourished at strategic confluences and portages throughout the Old Northwest Territory, from central Illinois to northwestern Ohio. Before 1700, the Myamia located their major village at the confluence of the St. Mary’s and the St. Joseph Rivers. There, according to the Myamia, the mameewa siipiwi (St. Mary’s River) met the kóchiihsasiipi (St. Joseph River) and continued to Lake Erie. The Myamia also controlled both sides of an important portage route between the mameewa siipiwi (St. Mary’s River) and the waapaahšiki siipiwi (Wabash River), with additional control of the Forks of the Wabash River at present-day Huntington, Indiana.

The French made trade contacts with the Myamia and other American Indians and built a series of forts and posts at strategic waterway junctions throughout the northwest. These forts and trading posts facilitated travel between Canada and Louisiana, but also served to protect French colonial claims and their trade from the British. The French established a trading post, and built
two forts at the confluence of the *mameewa siipiwi* (St. Mary’s River) and *kóchihsasiipi* (St. Joseph River) in what is now downtown Fort Wayne. The first fort, Fort St. Philippe des Miamis, was built in 1722 on the *mameewa siipiwi* (St. Mary’s River), a short distance from the confluence, near the east end of the portage to the *waapaahšiki siipiwi* (Wabash River). A Myaamia

15 Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 1-49. Pinšiwa was one of a large number of French-Indian Métis who resulted from the Bourbon French-American policy of sending three groups of French to the colonies of New France and Louisiana: nobles (both grand and écuyer classes) for government and military matters, Catholic bishops and missionaries, and licensed traders. Both the traders and the gentry were encouraged to live among and intermarry with the local American Indians. Accompanying priests were to convert, marry, and baptize.

16 Michael McCafferty to Angie Quinn, ARCH, Inc., November 14, 2008, ARCH, Inc. files, Fort Wayne, Indiana. McCafferty notes that the Myaamia translates to *cecaahkwaki* in their language, with the “c” pronounced “ch,” as in child. The older term, Atchachacongouan, is a garbled spelling of an Ojibwe word for the Myaamia.

17 White, *Middle Ground*, 1-49.

18 McCafferty, *Place-Names*, 74-86. According to McCafferty, the Maumee River retains the original Myaamia name and understanding of the river, as an extension of the St. Mary’s River to the east, and not as a new river created from the confluence of the St. Mary’s and St. Joseph.
village was close by, where a number of French traders also lived. The second, Fort Miamis, was built in 1750 on the right bank of the kóchíihsasíipi (St. Joseph River) just above the confluence and in the center of a cluster of Myaamia villages and traders. The principal village among this cluster was Kiikhayonki (Kekionga) and the whole area was often referred to as Miamitown. Kiikhayonki was a highly important commercial site and transportation node, and has been described as “only slightly less a strategic and military site than Detroit or Michilimackinac.”

Pinšiwa’s father, Antoine-Joseph Drouet de Richerville, was a lieutenant attached to the second French fort near Kiikhayonki in the 1750s. The Drouets were among the landed gentry of France, and the Richerville estate was one of the Drouet estates that dated back to 1201. Financially troubled, Antoine-Joseph Drouet de Richerville came to the Kiikhayonki area to trade with the Indians and “rebuild his family’s lost fortune.”

Pinšiwa’s mother had an equally distinguished heritage. Tahkamwa (Maria Louisa) was the sister of Pakaana, the Myaamia’s akima (principal civil chief). Tahkamwa most likely served as an akimaahkwia (women’s chief) at Kiikhayonki, and oversaw many of the aspects of village life. “Women of the elite, or chiefly class, could also hold positions as either village or war chiefs or medicine women, the same designations used among the men...As chiefs, their power was inherited through their fathers, who would also have been chiefs. Tahkamwa was the daughter of a chief and was probably a chief herself, since she engaged in activities that came under the domain of a woman chief.”

Jehu Hay, the British Agent at Detroit in 1774, described Tahkamwa as possessing powerful political influence. He also stated, “she is capable of doing a good deal of mischief and the rest
of the French Traders are under some apprehension that she will...” Prospering from her political control of the portage, from which as much as $100 a day was earned, Tahkamwa was an established trader whose example and tutelage guided her son.

Both Pakaana and Tahkamwa were of the cecahkwaki (crane band) of the Myaamia. She and Pakaana were the great-niece and great-nephew of an earlier akima, Wisekaukautshe, known to the French as Pied Froid. The marriage of Antoine-Joseph Drouet de Richerville and Tahkamwa (also known as Maria Louisa) brought


20 White, *Middle Ground*, 448.


24 Karen Marrero, “‘She is Capable of Doing a Great Deal of Mischief;’ A Miami Woman’s Threat to Empire in the Eighteenth Century Ohio Valley,” *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History* 6, no. 3 (2005): 11.


28 Marrero, “‘She is Capable of Doing a Great Deal of Mischief,’” 5; Beatty, *History of Fort Wayne and Allen County*, 11; and Stewart Rafert, *The Miami Indians of Indiana: A Persistent People, 1654-1994* (Indianapolis, IN: Indiana Historical Society Press, 1996), 37. It has been hypothesized that Pakaana and Tahkamwa were the children of Aquenackqua and an older Pakaana, and the grandchildren of French trader Pierre Roi and Margaret Ouanbankikoue, sister of Wisekaukatsche (Pied Froid). But, according to Ironstrack and Baldwin: “Tribal genealogists believe that the Margaret who shows up in the marriage record in Montreal is not the mother of Tahkamwa because the baptismal records of children born to that woman do not match any of Tahkamwa's siblings... "Roi" (king) was a common way Europeans referred to an *akima*, so “dit Roi” could also be interpreted to mean that she was the daughter of a chief (the elder Pakaana) and not the daughter of a French man named Roi.”
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together vital government and trade connections in Canada with *cecaahkwaki* trade and political connections for their son Pinšiwa (or Jean-Baptiste to the French). Pinšiwa, who was probably born in *Kiihkayonki*, was one of four children of this marriage; little is known of the other three. Pinšiwa was born into a community whose political status had changed after the British triumph in the French and Indian War. British troops had replaced the French garrison at *Kiihkayonki* in 1760. Antoine-Joseph Drouet de Richerville arranged several visits to Canada for his son and oversaw his formal Catholic education in Detroit.
Richerville left Kiihkayonki and returned to Canada in the 1770s, after Tahkamwa ended their relationship and married an important trader named Charles Beaubien. The acrimonious divorce between Tahkamwa and Richerville was eventually adjudicated in 1774 in Detroit in what, for the time, must have been an extremely controversial and public case. At issue was not only the property and wealth of the akimaahkwia Tahkamwa, but also her control over the vital, lucrative portage. Tahkamwa’s claim to the portage rights was supported by her brother Pakaana and her new husband Beaubien. Capt. Richard Berringer Lernoult, the British commander at Detroit, confirmed Tahkamwa’s control over the portage and her right to profit from its use. How this public feud affected the thirteen-year-old Pinshiwa is unknown, but it seems clear that he and his family fully understood the source of their power and were unwilling to surrender it. After the divorce, Pinshiwa remained with his Myaamia family and was raised to adulthood in that tradition. It is not known if Pinshiwa had any further contact with his father.

To attain the role of akima, or civil chieftainship of the Myaamia, the aspirant had to follow a highly formal and ceremonial procedure. Although the Myaamia were patrilineal in social structure, power was transferred matrilineally. Thus, the akima Pakaana inherited power from his great uncle Wisekaukautshe, and his own successor would be a son of one of his sisters, e.g., Pinshiwa, the son of his sister Tahkamwa. The ceremonial earning of the akima status consisted of a series of activities. Initially, the sister of the akima would wage a political campaign to win support for her son among their people, and the son would then confirm his fitness for election by performing a public act of unusual courage, daring, and leadership. Such public acts were documented for both Pakaana and Pinshiwa and are remarkably similar. In 1764, a young Pakaana rescued Captain Thomas Morris from death by a group of angry Myaamia. In about 1785,
Pinšiwa saved an unnamed Euro-American prisoner from death, who publically thanked him when they met many years later in Ohio.

Leadership among the Myaamia was focused on service to the tribe. In 1720, Charlevoix described the leadership style of the Myaamia: “These chiefs generally have no great marks of outward respect paid them, and if they are never disobeyed, it is because they know how to set bounds to their authority. It is true that they request or propose, rather than command; and never exceed the boundaries of that small share of authority with which they are invested.” The akima represented the consensus of the community. In 1832, as akima, Pinšiwa voiced his understanding of Myaamia community consensus, saying in reference to the US government, “Father, I have told you I do not speak for myself but for my people... What you hear from me is the voice of the Miamies.”

---

29 Marrero, “‘She is Capable of Doing a Great Deal of Mischief,’” 1-3, 14-18.


31 Ironstrack and Baldwin: “Leadership in our community was never about authority, it was focused on service...Among our community I look to the quote in the above text by Pinšiwa as an example of what he learned from his service and tutelage under the akima Pakaana.”
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During the American Revolution, the Myaamia, like many of the Algonquian peoples, supported the British. Pakaana and Charles Beaubien, Pinšiwa’s step-father, participated in the capture of Vincennes. In 1780, Beaubien lost his trading post in an attack on Kiikhayonki led by a French officer named LaBalme. After the attack on Kiikhayonki, Mihšihkinaahkwa (Little Turtle) gained his initial fame as a warrior and the position of neenawihtoowa (war chief) by striking LaBalme's camp west of Kiikhayonki. Mihšihkinaahkwa and his war party killed LaBalme and many of his men; about half of LaBalme's force escaped.

Throughout his life Pinšiwa learned to be a cultural broker with the surrounding Indian tribes, the French, the English, United States military leaders and government officials, and the growing numbers of US settlers who crossed the Ohio River into Indian land. These situations required Pinšiwa’s ability to negotiate and broker between parties who had profoundly different, “mutually incomprehensible” worldviews. Pinšiwa spoke the language of the Myaamia, as well English and French. The “Middle Ground” approach and process required a rough balance of interest, need, and power between the parties. As the Pays d’en haut (Great Lakes “upper country”) matured and civilizations increasingly collided, the cultural brokerage of leaders such as Pinšiwa became ever more crucial. The presence and interaction of Myaamia, French, British, Spanish, United States citizens, other tribes of the Great Lakes, and those tribes fleeing
US frontier expansion, made the collection of *Kiihkayonki* villages in which Pinšiwa was raised as cosmopolitan a community as any that existed in the Great Lakes region.

At a young age, Pinšiwa had been trained to utilize his heritage, ingenuity, and skill, to become an influential assistant to his uncle, the *akima* Pakaana. He also became a trader under the tutelage of his mother and stepfather, Charles Beaubien. Pinšiwa’s command of the language and customs of the Euro-American world gave him an advantage as he attempted to maintain the “Middle Ground” equilibrium between Euro-American and Indian cultures. Educated in both the French and Myaamia tradition, he gradually ascended to *de facto* status as *akima* upon the removal of his uncle to Vincennes after 1785, and became fully recognized as *akima* by the Myaamia and the United States government by 1818.

As Pinšiwa matured into his role as *akima*, he also married, and raised several children. It is thought that the marriage took place between 1780 and 1800, and his children were born between about 1790 and 1810. He married Naatowehkwa, who may have been Iroquois (her name means “Iroquois Woman” in Myaamia). She was the daughter of Waapehspana (White Raccoon), one of the leaders of the Myaamia. Naatowehkwa and Pinšiwa’s children included: Kiinkwaatehkwa (“Long-Sewn-Hair,” who was also known as LaBlonde and

---


34 Michael McCafferty to Angie Quinn, ARCH, Inc., August 6, 2008, ARCH, Inc. files, Fort Wayne, Indiana.


White, *Middle Ground*, ix-x.

Gayle Thornbrough, ed., *The Correspondence of John Badollet and Albert Gallatin, 1804-1836* (Indianapolis, IN: Indiana Historical Society, 1963), 168. John Badollet to Albert Gallatin, September 25, 1810. There are numerous references to Pinšiwa’s mastery of language and to his astute business sense, which is also a strongly-held belief of Pinšiwa’s present-day descendants.

White, *Middle Ground*, i-x.


Michael McCafferty to Angie Quinn, August 11, 2008, ARCH, Inc. files, Fort Wayne, Indiana. Although the modern Myaamia call their Second Chief niishonaminki, McCafferty writes that, if the term were used during Pinšiwa’s life, it was probably the older form niinshonaminki. Its historic use has not been documented.
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Marie Louise); Araansoona (“Bullrush Mat”, also known as Susan); Waapimankwa (“White Loon”, also known as Joseph); Pakankiihkwa (“A Woman Striking,” also known as Catherine);
John (some sources list his Myaamia name as Aughquamauda, meaning “Difficulty”) and, Maayaaahkwa (“Noon,” also known as Louis). His sons, John and Waapimankwa (Joseph), were educated at McCoy’s School in Fort Wayne, Indiana, and at schools in Detroit, Michigan. His daughters were schooled by the Sisters of Providence in Terre Haute, Indiana. Maayaaahkwa was described as blind in several sources, and there is no record that he attended school. John (Aughquamauda) is not listed after the 1818 treaty and appears to have died before 1826. Waapimankwa (Joseph) died before the completion of the 1834 Treaty, which noted: “To John B. Richardville, principal chief of the Miami tribe, one section of land on the five mile reserve, opposite the mouth of the Mississineway River, to include the improvement made by Joseph Richardville, deceased.”

In 1786, the Myaamia leaders Mihšihkinaahkwá (Little Turtle) and Cecaahkwa (known as both La Grue and Le Gris) wrested leadership of a vast American Indian alliance from the Mohawk chief, Joseph Brant. The alliance included seven Canadian tribes, segments of the Iroquois, and the tribes between the Great Lakes and the Ohio River. Pakaana soon joined Mihšihkinaahkwá and Cecaahkwa as leaders of the new alliance. Anger over the heavy-handed United States treaties and over the encroaching US settlers had coalesced into powerful consensus. This alliance was called the Miami Confederacy because although Myaamia numbers were small compared to many of the others, Myaamia leadership had proven to be the most capable both militarily and diplomatically. The Miami Confederacy centered its activities at Kiihkayonki, near the headwaters of the Maumee River.

In 1787, Pinšiwa’s uncle Pakaana was accepted as a guide for the new American commander at Fort Vincennes, General Josiah Harmar, who went on a goodwill tour to the Kaskaskia in central
Illinois. Pakaana also provided several services to the succeeding Vincennes commander, Major John Francis Hamtramck. In 1788, Pakaana was sent by Hamtramck to a council with British Indian Affairs Commissioner McKee. While Pakaana was absent, Hamtramck was unable to protect Pakaana’s new village located north of Fort Vincennes. A band of Kentucky militia destroyed Pakaana’s village without Hamtramck’s knowledge. Pakaana heard the grim news at Terre Haute on his return journey from the meeting with McKee and never proceeded on to Vincennes. An understanding between the Myaamia and the United States at this point might have halted the formation of the Miami Confederacy and the wars of the 1790s. Instead, a bitter Pakaana turned implacably anti-American.

In October 1790, the Myaamia villages at and around Kiihkayonki were burned by the order of General Josiah Harmar. The Miami Confederacy had expected a much larger army and had stationed their forces around the area. To protect the villages, the Miami Confederacy had evacuated people to the north and west. Mihšihkinaahkw’a’s forces were closest to Harmar’s army, northwest of Kiihkayonki, and between the army and the hidden location of the villagers. Mihšihkinaahkwa’s confederated force of Myaamia, Ottawa, and Iroquois defeated Harmar’s army, which lost 183 soldiers in the battle. In one of his few military experiences, Pinšiwa was one of the Myaamia warriors.


43 Kappler, *Indian Affairs*, 2:427. Also see Nathe West to Chief John B. Richardville [Pinšiwa], May 20, 1839, History Center Digital Collections, Allen County-Fort Wayne Historical Society, Fort Wayne, Indiana, accessed
By the summer of 1791, the Miami Confederacy acquired more arms from the British at Detroit. In November, United States’ forces under General Arthur St. Clair reformed in Cincinnati and marched north to Kiihkayonki, bent on avenging the army’s previous defeat. The Miami Confederacy attacked the Army in northwest Ohio. The US Army was routed and suffered 847 casualties, nearly 50 percent of their force. It was a substantial victory by the Miami Confederacy over the United States military.

In 1794, General Anthony Wayne formed another army at Cincinnati and slowly and methodically advanced his troops towards Kiihkayonki. When the British abandoned the Confederacy, and without Mihšihkinaahkwa’s leadership, Wayne defeated the Miami Confederacy on the taawaawa siipiwi (Maumee River) to the east of Kiihkayonki, near Lake Erie at the Battle of Fallen Timbers, Ohio (NHL, 1960). This defeat of the Miami Confederacy allowed General Wayne to enter the homeland of the Myaamia. Wayne and his troops marched west to the headwaters of the Maumee River and built a fort overlooking the villages of Pakaana and Cecaahkwa, in the center of Kiihkayonki (now downtown Fort Wayne, Indiana). For Pinšiwa
and the Myaamia, the 1790-1794 War marked a turning point; the US military defeat of the Miami Confederacy marked the last concerted use of military force by the Confederacy.

The akima Pakaana served the cecaahkwaki (crane) band of Myaamia for many years, and on their behalf, refused to attend the 1795 treaty conference unless it was held at Kiikhayonki. When General Wayne decided on Greeneville, Ohio, as the location for the treaty negotiation, Pinšiwa represented Pakaana at the conference. The neenawihtoowa (war chief), Mihšihkinahawkwa also attended. Much has been written about Mihšihkinahawkwa's eloquence at that meeting. However, Secretary of War Timothy Pickering wrote that the speeches that accompanied the treaty signing were unremarkable, "... except the speech of Richardville, Miami Chief." This marked the onset of Pinšiwa’s ascendency to the position of akima of the Myaamia.

Pinšiwa signed the 1795 Greenville Treaty, his first, as a leader of the Myaamia and Eel River Tribes. This treaty established the negotiation protocol for future American Indian/US treaties. The pattern included the United States repudiation of the conquest treaties in the 1780s, the recognition of American Indian rights to their land, rote statements of friendship, a definition of cessions, and the establishment of a boundary. Although American Indian rights to ownership of the land were extinguished, hunting rights were allowed. Annuities and trade goods were provided. The right of the United States to purchase the land, the right to evict squatters, and the ability to license trade was reserved for the federal government. From the Greenville Treaty in 1795 through the last treaty in 1871, a total of 361 treaties were negotiated nationally.

The Greenville Treaty seriously diminished Myaamia military power and their influence on the frontier. It also breached the old British Proclamation Line for the Indian Territory and opened the land for US settlers. The southern two-thirds of Ohio and a slice of southeast Indiana were
ceded to the U.S., along the old treaty line determined in 1785. All former French and British post cessions would now belong to the United States. Small cessions were made on strategic transportation sites, including tracts at the Fort Wayne confluence and on the long portage from Fort Wayne to Huntington. In the near future, the pressure for more land concessions in Indiana would again fracture Myaamia unity and severely strain their leadership. The Greenville Treaty was a turning point for the further geographic contraction of the Myaamia lands.


48 Rafert, Miami Indians of Indiana, 60. Along with Pakaana, Mihtohseenia (Metocina), and Hibou (Owl), who were chiefs of other Myaamia bands, also refused to sign the 1795 Greenville Treaty.


50 Rafert, Miami Indians of Indiana, 60.

Cross-cultural sharing and the fluidity between cultures that characterized the area was typical of the early transitional state between borderlands and bordered lands that had resulted from both national and international developments. Following the Greenville Treaty, relationships between US settlers, the Myaamia, other tribes, and the Métis traders in the Fort Wayne area became increasingly complicated. In 1791, a government “factory” system was created. It established government trading posts, or factories, to bring in revenue and curb the sale of
whiskey to Indians. The intention of the plan was to offer better goods at cheaper prices than private traders, and, thus, eliminate the business of the Mètis traders. In 1793, the US government established a system of Indian agents to oversee Indian matters, which primarily concerned the distribution of annuities by the Secretary of War. The Indiana Territory was created in 1800, with William Henry Harrison as Territorial Governor and Vincennes as the capitol. Land Acts were passed by the US government in 1796 and 1800 that included more specifications for government land sales in order to satisfy the demands of settlers as well as to produce government revenue.

The neenawihtoowa (war chief) Mihšihkinaahkwa and his adopted European-American son-in-law, Eepiikanita (William Wells), have dominated the historical record, overshadowing Pakaana and Pinšiwa. Mihšihkinaahkwa and Wells’ support of Americanization policies was opposed by many Myaamia traditionalists. However, their stance found favor with government officials in Philadelphia in 1796 and 1797, and in Washington, DC in the 1800s. The US government appointed Wells the Fort Wayne Indian agent in 1796, but he only served in that capacity from 1802 to 1809. When Wells and Mihšihkinaahkwa visited President Jefferson in 1802, Wells also requested the additional office of factor—the manager of the government factory (trading post)—in Fort Wayne. However, Wells’ request was rejected in favor of a clerk from Secretary of War Dearborn's office, John Johnston. Conditions for the United States in Fort Wayne after 1800 became a tangled web of competing lines of authority between the Secretary of War Office, the governorships of Indiana and Michigan, and the Fort Wayne land agents, factors, and fort commandants.
Between 1795 and 1805, Pakaana, Pinšiwa, and an older chief called Hibou, became the counterweights to the pro-US assimilationist views expressed by Mihšihkinaahkwa. In an 1805 letter to the Secretary of War, Harrison noted, “Nine tenths of that Tribe who acknowledge Richardville [Pinšiwa] and Peccan [Pakaana] for their chiefs ... utterly abhor both Wells and the Turtle.” For the Myaamia in the Kiihkayonki area, the breach widened between the Pakaana-Pinšiwa leadership and that of Mihšihkinaahkwa and Wells. Pakaana, Pinšiwa, and Hibou struggled to maintain Myaamia culture and a traditional subsistence lifestyle, and also to retain tribal independence and control of the tribe’s destiny. The morass of conflicting goals and ambitions, as well as competing traders and power seekers, provided fertile ground for the plans of William Henry Harrison, the Indiana Territorial Governor.

Harrison maneuvered the American Indians into a series of land concessions in 1803, 1805, and 1809. In the 1803 Treaty of Fort Wayne, nine tribes agreed to cede one-and-a-half million acres of land around the Indiana territorial capital at Vincennes. All French land titles were preserved, and the Indians got 159 bushels of salt


53 The Northwest Ordinance of 1787 had legalized the right of the new US government to arrange for the survey and sale of government land in the Northwest Territory and for the eventual creation of states.

54 Mann, “Silenced Miami,” 399-427, for a discussion on historical “silences” and the Myaamia.

55 Rafert, Miami Indians of Indiana, 38; cites the Myaamia name for Hibou as “Meshingomesa.” Hibou was Pakaana’s brother and Pinšiwa’s uncle. He had been a chief in his own right and in his elder years became a speaker
for Pakaana and Pinšiwa; and Mann, “Silenced Miami,” 399-427. The French referred to Hibou as “Owl.” There can be some confusion regarding Myaamia names because names were given again to later descendants.

56 Esarey, Governor’s Messages and Letters, 1:76-77; quoted in Mann, “Silenced Miami,” 401.

57 Anson, Miami Indians, 149, 152, 161; Poinsatte, Outpost, 31, 44-46, 50-55; and Carter, Life and Times of Chief Little Turtle, 146.
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annually in lieu of the use of the salt springs on the ceded land. Pinšiwa and Mihšihkinaahkwaw signed for the Myaamia. Pinšiwa again signed for the Myaamia in the 1805 Treaty of Grouseland, which ceded all Indian land in southern Indiana above the Ohio River to the U.S.; this cession included traditional Myaamia hunting grounds. The cessions also cut into the lands of the Kaskaskia, Kickapoo, and Piankeshaw.

Confronted by the “land hunger and hard bargaining” of the territorial governor, William Henry Harrison and the rising Native cultural movement under the brothers Tenskwatawa and Tecumseh, the effect of Pinšiwa’s cultural brokerage was limited during that period. From 1805 to 1812, Pakaana and Pinšiwa tried to maneuver a neutral way for the Myaamia between the anti-American movement led by Tecumseh and the pro-Americanism promoted by Mihšihkinaahkwaw and Wells. Pakaana's primary concern was with Myaamia unity and prestige; he harbored no love for Americans and no trust in the British. As a result of the rising tension between the United States and Britain in 1807, British influence increased among the Myaamia. During this
period, both Pakaana and Pinšiwa sought out allies beyond the traditional Myaamia sphere of Indiana. Pinšiwa maintained relations with the British at Fort Malden, and Pakaana courted the Spanish in Arkansas.

The 1809 Treaty of Fort Wayne was a watershed for Myaamia—United States relations. A large group of American Indians, including the Myaamia living on the Eel River, Potawatomi, and Delaware, encamped in Fort Wayne for a treaty council during which they ceded nearly three million acres of their lands, roughly the middle third of Indiana. This was a treaty that Pinšiwa did not sign, and he was not present for the negotiations, “although he was especially sent for.” John Badollet, the Registrar of the Land Office at the Northwest Territory’s administrative heart in Vincennes, noted in a September 25, 1810, letter to diplomat Albert Gallatin, “I myself have observed one Pishoowah or Richarville a half blooded Indian who speaks French as well as I do, is with his uncle Pacawn, a grand chief of the Miamis and besides very much of a gentleman, I have seen that man, for some hidden reason affectedly thrown in the background and treated with very little ceremony which usage he has deeply felt.”

Without Pinšiwa’s counsel, landownership disputes erupted among the Myaamia. Harrison also withheld previously negotiated treaty annuities. The Myaamia ended up settling for new annuities of $500 and an additional $200 and salt. The Myaamia were successful in negotiating a definite boundary for their remaining land, which would prove invaluable for the treaty negotiations that occurred between 1818 and 1840.

Widespread American Indian resentment of the 1809 Fort Wayne Treaty’s huge land cession propelled Tecumseh into leadership of a new American Indian alliance, and caused other
Algonquians to support the British. The treaty also scuttled any hope that Pakaana, Pinšiwa, or Mihšihkinaahkwa might have had in keeping the Myaamia out of the uprising completely. Some of the Myaamia warriors joined Tecumseh’s war of

58  Rafert, *Miami Indians of Indiana*, 70. See also the “About the White House-Presidents,” accessed June 8, 2009, http://www.whitehouse.gov/about/presidents/williamhenryharrison, which states: “His prime task as governor was to obtain title to Indian lands so settlers could press forward into the wilderness.” See also the in-depth essays created by the University of Virginia on William Henry Harrison's life and administration,” accessed June 8, 2009, http://millercenter.org/president/harrison, which notes: “While governor, Harrison negotiated many treaties with the Native Americans of the region, and most of them deprived the Indians of their lands for little money in return.”


61  For treaty purposes, William Henry Harrison considered the Myaamia tribes on the Eel River to be a separate tribe from the other Myaamia. Ironstrack and Baldwin, Myaamia Project.

62  Charles N. Thompson, *Sons of the Wilderness; John and William Conner* (Indianapolis, IN: Indiana Historical Society, 1937),

63  Thornbrough, *Correspondence of John Badollet and Albert Gallatin*, 168.
resistance against Euro-American encroachment on Native lands and culture. The Myaamia were caught between the assimilated tribes in Ohio and the overwhelming anti-American tribes of Indiana, and those to the west and north. During the War of 1812, Indiana Governor Harrison ordered the attack and destruction of Myaamia villages and fields on the Wabash and Mississinewa, although the Myaamia inhabitants had remained neutral until that point. Pinšiwa and his family, along with many other Myaamia, left Indiana for British-held land in Detroit, and returned after the conclusion of the war.

In 1813, after Harrison defeated the British and Tecumseh in Canada, an armistice council was held in Detroit. Using a formalistic treaty ritual, the American Indians admitted their error in believing in British victory and offered token military support to the United States. The tribes signing the armistice were the Myaamia (which included the Pakaana-Pinšiwa group, Wea, and Eel River bands), Chippewa, Ottawa, Potawatomi, and Kickapoo. Pakaana signed with two other Myaamia chiefs; Pinšiwa signed with the Potawatomi.

At the Greenville treaty conference in 1814, more than 4,000 Indians attended. The Myaamia, however, were the last to arrive. Pakaana and Kitunga (Charley) from the Eel River village spoke for the Myaamia, and protested that the treaty blamed all Myaamia for those few who fought with Tecumseh, and argued that the official policy of the Myaamia had been neutrality. More than fifty American Indian leaders signed the 1814 treaty. Only two Myaamia leaders refused to sign. The signers agreed to stand with the United States against the British if fighting resumed in the Great Lakes region. Pakaana signed for the Myaamia and Wea.
An additional treaty at Greenville in 1815 further regulated relations between the United States and American Indian tribes. This treaty was signed by 113 leaders of the Great Lakes nations. The 1815 treaty was the last one signed by Pakaana, who died sometime before 1816. The 1815 Treaty ended Myaamia military power on the frontier. But, at the same time, historian Bert Anson notes: “... the greatest tribute to Miami adaptability and acumen must be the admission that in such circumstances they were able to maintain some of the political and cultural unity and identity and to secure from their white conquerors an unusual amount of financial security, as well as some degree of harmonious rapport.” These accomplishments were the direct result of Pinšiwa’s ascent to the position of akima.

**Pinšiwa as the Akima of the Myaamia**

From 1818 until his death in 1841, Pinšiwa, as the consummate “man in the middle ground” was able to delay, frustrate, and ultimately, out-negotiate the treaty commissioners sent to secure Myaamia removal from Indiana. During that period, Pinšiwa lead an effort on behalf of the Myaamia to amass money, and outright ownership of land. With Pinšiwa, along with the leadership of the Palaanswa (Francis Godfroy) family, the Šipaakana- Mahkoonsihkwa (Slocum) family, and the Mihšiinkweemiša family, the Myaamia negotiated exemptions from removal and distributed enough wealth among the families to ensure that over half of the Myaamia were able to

---

64 Rafert, *Miami Indians of Indiana*, 72-73. 65 Ibid., 75.


General Harrison and Governor Cass wrote to the Secretary of War following completion of the treaty, stating: “We flatter ourselves that both the matter and manner of the instrument will be satisfactory; two or three Miami chiefs only, of those that attended, refused to sign...We gave them all distinctly to understand, that no neutrals would be permitted unless they remain within the settlements. If they object to this, it is our decided opinion that they ought to be seized and taken to a place where they can do no injury.”


---
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remain in Indiana after their official removal in 1845. Few American Indian leaders of that period were as able to withstand the dynamic westward expansion of the United States. Pinšiwa was arguably the most successful negotiator among the American Indian nations of the Great Lakes during the years of the Early Republic.

The strategy of US treaty negotiators during that time period was to separate and isolate the bands of the tribe. In a letter to the Secretary of War, Cass, Tipton, and Ray wrote: “It was then important that the Indians should be separated into bands, by the intervention of our settlements. As long as they can roam unmolested through the country, we may in vain expect either to reclaim them from the savage life they lead, or to induce them to seek a residence where their habits and pursuits will be less injurious to us.”

---
But, as treaty succeeded treaty, Pinšiwa and the Myaamia were able to weave together a network of village reserves, lands held in Indian patent, and lands held in fee-simple that contained most of the traditional portage and marshy prairie. These lands, along with tribally-owned lands south of the *waapaahšiki siipiwi* (Wabash River), provided for several years a contiguous area of Myaamia-controlled territory.

By 1818, Pinšiwa understood the value of Myaamia land and the United States government’s concept of property ownership. Following the necessary discussion and consensus building with other Myaamia leaders, Pinšiwa worked out a strategy of land ownership, money, goods, and services that would afford some security and sustenance for the Myaamia people. This strategy appears in his first treaty as *akima*, the 1818 Treaty of St. Mary's in Ohio. Pinšiwa headed the group of sixteen civil and military leaders who were signatories. The US commissioners were Indiana Territorial Governor Jonathan Jennings, Indiana Judge Benjamin Parke, and Territorial Governor of Michigan and Superintendent of Indian Affairs for the Northwest Territory, Lewis Cass. Holding that office from 1813 to 1831, Cass became Secretary of War and served in that role until 1836. Cass was a commissioner for the Myaamia treaties of 1814, 1818, and 1826. He would also appoint the commissioners for the 1834 treaty.

The 1818 St. Mary’s treaty opened central Indiana for US settlers and marked not only a US land acquisition of unprecedented dimensions from Native Americans; it also demonstrated Pinšiwa’s grasp of US land ownership law and American Indian policy. The Myaamia, through Pinšiwa, served notice in this treaty that they were aware of US land hunger and would use that hunger and their own strategic position as bargaining chips. In a letter to the Secretary of War after the conclusion of the 1818 Treaty, Commissioner Benjamin Parke wrote that, “...the feelings and views of the Indians have undergone a great revolution, within a few years; they begin to
understand the value of their property; Miamis were present who knew the price at which the Government sold the lands in the neighbourhood of Fort Harrison (near Terre Haute, Indiana); and they were also sensible of the importance attached to the acquisition of their country.”

Specifically, in the 1818 treaty, the Myaamia ceded undisputed title to the United States of about 4,300,000 acres, and one-half interest with the Delaware of about 3,860,000 acres. This was all the Myaamia land south of the Wabash River except for the tribal lands in the Big Reserve, five smaller reserves, and twenty-one villages and individual grants. The Big Reserve tribal lands lie along the Wabash from the mouth of the Salamonie River to the mouth of the Eel River and an equal distance south, about thirty-five plus square miles in all. Individual grants were Indian patents that could not be sold without the permission of the US President,

73 Ibid., 179.
74 Benjamin Parke to John C. Calhoun, December 7, 1818. Benjamin Parke Papers, Special Collections, Indiana Historical Society, Indianapolis, Indiana.
the fee-simple land grant to the *akima* Pinšiwa.

Unlike Indian patents, the fee-simple land grant conveyed full legal title under US law. While the fee-simple grant was taxable, it was also saleable or transferable at the will of the holder. The Pinšiwa fee-simple grants were for eleven sections of land (7040 acres) of which five sections lay on the east and west banks of the *mameewa siipiwi* (St. Mary's River) south of Fort Wayne. Pinšiwa and his family had likely settled at this traditionally-occupied Myaamia and familial site in 1814, after their return from Detroit. A Philadelphian traveling in Indiana visited Pinšiwa’s home on the *mameewa siipiwi* (St. Mary’s River) in 1821, and noted many log cabins in the vicinity, which were probably Pinšiwa’s village. Thus, in the 1818 Treaty, Pinšiwa negotiated for ownership of the land that had been home to his Myaamia family for generations past. As part of the treaty terms, Pinšiwa was also able to direct and choose the sections of land that were granted to other individuals. During that period, the grant of fee-simple land was noted as important. Commissioner Benjamin Parke wrote of the fee-simple grants to Pinšiwa; “The value of the land is of no importance; but the precedent may have an injurious effect on future negotiations. The claim would have been cheerfully commuted for money; but he was determined to have the land.”

The Myaamia were to receive perpetual annuities of $15,000 for their 1818 land sessions, a sum considered “extravagant” by one of the Commissioners. This amount is tangible testimony to the hard bargaining of the *akima* Pinšiwa. The Myaamia also negotiated for continuation of previous annuities, construction of a sawmill and a gristmill, agricultural implements, and an annual delivery of 160 bushels of salt.
As akima, Pinšiwa led by achieving consensus among the Myaamia, and then by carefully brokering those decisions among other Indians, traders, settlers, and government officials. Thus, Pinšiwa was able to continue the cultural tradition of decision-making by the Myaamia and many other American Indian communities. The office of the akima was far from autocratic, a fact of overriding importance in the overall evaluation of Pinšiwa. He dressed in European or Myaamia clothing, depending on the circumstances. Although Pinšiwa spoke French and English fluently, he spoke only the Myaamia language in negotiations and used an interpreter, as befitted his role as the akima of the Myaamia. And, although he was literate, he signed the treaties by adding his mark, along with the other leaders. As the akima of the Myaamia, Pinšiwa required the full accord and support of the other Myaamia chiefs for all important decisions.

There were those that were critical of Pinšiwa, such as Benjamin Parke, who sat across the negotiating table from Pinšiwa at the 1818 Treaty. Parke wrote: “Richardville [Pinšiwa] is the Principal Chief of the Miami Nation, avaricious, shrewd, acquainted with the value of property, and his manners that of a well-bred Gentleman. He was decidedly in favor of the treaty, but anxious to provide for himself, and his selfish views had the sanction of the Chiefs of the Mississenaway Town, without whose concurrence a treaty could not be obtained.”

There are two treaties identified in Kappler that predate the 1818 St. Mary’s Treaty fee-simple clauses. In the 1817 Treaty with the Cherokee, article 8 gives fee-simple ownership to the surviving widows and children of reservation grantees. In the 1817 Treaty with the Wyandot [et al.] fee-simple land ownership was granted, but in a supplementary 1818 treaty the fee-simple ownership was modified to reservation status. The 1817 Wyandot treaty negotiated in Wapakonta, Ohio, was nearby Fort Wayne, Indiana, and included the Delaware and Potawatomi. Thus, it is conceivable that Pinšiwa had knowledge of that treaty. Also, Lewis Cass was the US negotiator for both the 1818 Myaamia and the 1817 Wyandot treaties.
References to sections, acres, and land cessions are as stated in each of the treaties. The numbers of sections and acreages are not consistent from treaty to treaty, and actual acreage and land amounts can be contradictory.

Parke to Calhoun, December 7, 1818, Parke Papers. 


Parke to Calhoun, December 7, 1818, Parke Papers.

Nonetheless, Parke’s comment substantiates the Myaamia style of leadership in which the actions of an *akima* required the consensus of other tribal leaders, and that Pinšiwa acted on behalf of the Myaamia.

As Hugh B. McKeen wrote to Indian Agent Tipton in 1826; “These Miami General are a damned rebellious race, and I believe what Lafountain tells me that Richardville is the Key and nothing can be done without his assent.” During this period of shifting land rights, some Euro-Americans criticized tribal leaders, and Pinšiwa, in particular, for receiving individual grants, and for enriching themselves and their families at the expense of the rest of their people. But, most Euro-Americans failed to understand that a key component to the leadership status of the Myaamia hereditary chiefs involved their responsibility of generosity to the people, and their willingness to aid the distressed in the tribe. The wealth of the *akima* was also the wealth of his people.
Many of Pinšiwa’s contemporaries found him to be laudably prudent, careful, and deliberate, a patient listener, even beloved and esteemed. The trader George W. Ewing called him a “distinguished and extraordinary man,” and Hugh McCulloch, Secretary of the Treasury for three Presidents, remarked that he was a man “of whom no one ever got the better in a trade.” John Tipton called him "the ablest diplomat of whom I have any knowledge. If he had been born and educated in France, he would have been the equal of Talleyrand." In a tribute to Pinšiwa’s generosity, historian Wallace Brice noted, “his kind and charitable hand was never withheld from the distressed of his own people or from the stranger.” Myaamia chiefs acquired their status by showing generosity to their people, and providing assistance to the distressed in the tribe. Pinšiwa fulfilled the role of akima in accordance with Myaamia tradition.

The 1820s were one of Pinšiwa’s most productive periods. He was in his sixties. His children were grown and scattered from Fort Wayne to Logansport in northeastern Indiana. By 1825, it was clear that Pinšiwa had solidified his standing as akima and he became a prominent force in the Myaamia Nation’s destiny. Pinšiwa worked to establish rapport with the new Indian agent, John Tipton, and traveled to Detroit on business and information-gathering missions. Pinšiwa, and Meehcikilita (LeGros) of the Mississinewa area, both provided information on Myaamia language and customs to Lewis Cass, Superintendent of Indian Affairs in 1822, who was particularly interested in anthropology. Later, Cass asked Pinšiwa and Meehcikilita to host his secretary C. C. Trowbridge, who continued studies of the Myaamia culture during the winter of 1824-25. Both Meehcikilita and Pinšiwa supplied Trowbridge with information that was published in his book, *Meearmear Traditions.*
Pinšiwa as Treaty Negotiator

By 1826, the Potawatomi had already ceded most of their land in northern Indiana to the US government. At the 1826 Paradise Springs Council, held near where the nimachihsinwi (Mississinewa River) flows into the waapaahšiki siipiwi (Wabash River), Pinšiwa and Myaamia leaders Meehcikilita (Le Gros) and Palaanswa (Francis Godfroy) were concerned about being able to save the isolated Myaamia villages in Potawatomi territory in the northern part of Indiana. There was also increasing pressure in Indiana for a canal. The Erie
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88 Trowbridge spelled the tribal name as “Meearmeear,” rather than “Miami” or “Myaamia.” Ibid, vi.
Canal had been finished in 1825, and there was great interest in northern Indiana for an Erie-Wabash canal that would connect Lake Erie to the Wabash River system. The proposed route included Myaamia lands between Fort Wayne and the *waapaahshiki siipiwi* (Wabash River).

In the 1826 Paradise Springs Treaty, the Myaamia ceded to the United States their claims to all their land north and west of the *waapaahshiki siipiwi* (Wabash River) and *taawaawa siipiwi* (Maumee River) with the exception of six village reservations, the small Mississinewa tribal reserve, and two individual reservations. They also allowed a provision that Indiana "may lay out a canal or a road through any of these reservations, and (appropriate) for the use of a canal, six chains (396 feet) along the same." For "part consideration for the cession herein made" the Myaamia negotiators obtained a number of additional items including the following:

- Goods to the value of $31,040.53 for the Myaamia.
- Additional goods in 1828 to the value of $26,259.47.
- An 1827 annuity of $25,000 and $10,000 in goods; an 1828 annuity of $25,500 and $5,000 in goods; and an annual annuity of $25,000 as long as the Myaamia exist as a tribe.
- One wagon and one yoke of oxen for each of nine leaders and for the band at the Forks of the Wabash.
- A $600 house for each of nine leaders, including Pinšiwa (more about these below).
- 200 head of cattle (four to six years of age), 200 head of hogs.
• Annually to the Myaamia tribe, 2,000 pounds of iron, 1,000 pounds of steel, and 1,000 pounds of tobacco.
• Five laborers to work three months a year for small villages and three laborers to work for three months a year for the Mississinewa band.
• United States to pay claims against the Myaamia for $7,727.47.
• $2,000 annually for support of "poor infirm" Myaamia and the education of their youth "as long as Congress may think proper" and "expended under the direction of the President."
• Indian land patents to 17 named individuals (18 3/4 sections or 6,750 acres).
• Some Myaamia lands granted by the 1818 treaty were to be purchased at prices listed in an accompanying schedule by the United States government.
• Myaamia tribal members were given permission to hunt on ceded lands as long as they remained in US government hands.

Commissioners Lewis Cass, James Ray, and John Tipton and thirty-eight Myaamia leaders signed the treaty.

The lengthy negotiations resulted in terms that were stated in great financial detail and which reflected the trader instinct and practical business sense of the akima Pinšiwa. The treaty was an expensive agreement for the US government, and was not popular in Indiana or Washington, D.C., because the Myaamia ceded relatively little land and the settlement cost to the United States was far higher than in other treaties. John Tipton
wrote that without the generous payment of goods and houses for the chiefs, there would have been no treaty at all.
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was also negotiated at Paradise Springs one week earlier by the same commissioners, Cass, Tipton, and Ray, who negotiated the Myaamia treaty. For the cession of most of their land, the Potawatomi received:

- $30,547.71 in goods
- $2,000 annuity that was to last for twenty-two years.
- $2,000 annually for the purposes of education “as long as Congress may think proper” and “expended under the direction of the President”
- A mill, and miller
- A blacksmith
- Indian Land Patents to 96 named individuals (43 1/4 sections or 27,680 acres)
- Potawatomi tribe was given permission to hunt on ceded lands as long as those lands remained in US government hands.

The 1826 Creek Treaty provided for the cession of all the tribe’s remaining land in Georgia, and for the removal of the tribe to territory west of the Mississippi within twenty-four months. For this cession they received:

- $217,000
- $20,000 annually
- $100,000 to the “Chief McIntosh” faction of the tribe. $15,000 immediately and
the remainder to their party after their arrival in their new lands if they number 3000, if less than that proportionately less money.

The Chippewa Treaty of 1826 granted to the US government all mineral and metal rights in Chippewa lands and they agreed to the previous 1825 Treaty of Prairie du Chien. In return the Chippewa received:

- 640 acres for “half-breeds”
- $2,000 annually to be continued “at the pleasure of the Congress”
- For education, one section and $1,000 annually to be continued “at the pleasure of the Congress”

Clearly the different treaties had different cessions because of the geographic, political, and economic differences of the tribes involved. However, within the relative construct of nineteenth-century Indian treaties, it is apparent that the Myaamia compensation was greater than that of other tribes who either, in the case of the Potawatomi and Chippewa received far less, or in the case of the Creek, ceded far more land. After the 1826
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Paradise Springs [Myaamia] Treaty, the Commissioners wrote that the treaty itself was the result of a “long, tedious negotiation in which every exertion was used to procure a cession for the United States.”

1826 Myaamia Treaty Houses and the Akima Pinšiwa Awiiki

According to the 1826 Paradise Springs Treaty there were to be nine houses, “not exceeding the value of six hundred dollars for each of the following persons: namely, Joseph Richardville, Francois Godfroy, Louison Godfroy, Francis Lafontaine, White Raccoon, La Gros, Jean B. Richardville [Pinšiwa], Flat Belly, and Wau-we-as-see.”

Each Myaamia leader, who received a house from the 1826 Paradise Springs Treaty, chose his own site for the construction of his house. The houses were all to be built in a similar style. The Tipton Papers include a plan and detailed specification for the houses; each included a brick hall and parlor with total dimensions of 16’ x 32’. The specifications, advertised for competitive bidding, also included:

- 4 windows of 12 lights each 8 x 10 glass
- 2 Common Batten Doors, Hung with Iron Hinges, the front Door to have a good Knob
- Lock & partition Door to have a latch and Bolt
- A Chimney in each end of the House of the usual size
• The foundation to be of hard Brick or stone to begin 18 inches below the surface of the earth and to be 18 inches thick

• The House to be one story high – 8 feet between the floors, the walls to be 9 inch thick & covered with good joint shingles – two floors of 1 1/4 Inch board

• All to be finished & completed in a neat durable and workmanlike manner, by the 25th of December next.

Most of the houses were constructed for less than the allotted $600. Several of the Myaamia complained about not receiving the total value, and Tipton responded by adding additional features to their houses. He noted in a letter sent to Lewis Cass on November 21, 1827, But there is persons he[re] base enough to tell the Indians that the U States would pay $600 for each house and that the Agent would pocket the saving [sic]. This produced uneasiness and when the Indians applied to me I entered into further contracts with the builders to make additions to some of the houses, to Joe Richerville, F Lafontaine, and L Godfroys house each a cellar, to Flat bellys cubboards [sic], an additional door, shutter and lock, for J B Richerville I contracted for a house of the value of $2200 of which sum I have p[aid] $600, he is to pay the balance, all the other houses are built for the sum at which they were bid off...
At the time of the 1826 Paradise Springs Treaty, the *akima* Pinšiwa added $1,600 of his own funds in order to build a much nicer house than had been provided for in the treaty. Pinšiwa had acquired wealth from his negotiation of favorable treaty settlements, but most of his wealth resulted from his many years as a successful trader. He took advantage of the ability of skilled builders, in rapidly growing Fort Wayne, for the construction of a fine home. Of most importance, the elegance of the akima Pinšiwa Awiiki expressed the political and economic status of the Myaamia and their *akima* to the encroaching settlers from the United States. The akima Pinšiwa Awiiki was completed in 1827.

Although the fine house undoubtedly contributed to garnering respect and credibility among the US settlers, its rural location provided distance from Fort Wayne for Pinšiwa and the Myaamia people. Several accounts of pioneer life in Fort Wayne mention the high regard that the settlers held for Pinšiwa, both as a political leader and as a businessman. The business and political leaders of Fort Wayne considered it an honor to be invited to the *akima’s* table. Pinšiwa was much respected, was considered to be a prominent member of the community, and was certainly

---
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among the wealthiest residents of the Fort Wayne area, yet he was not among the inner circle of community leaders. Even today, most local Fort Wayne residents remember Pinšiwa as “Richardville” an Indian Chief, who lived in a fine house that still stands in the community. But, it is as a Myaamia akima that Pinšiwa established his significance as a highly gifted American Indian leader.

The akima Pinšiwa Awiiki was a grand home when compared to other housing in Fort Wayne at the time. Allen County, which was the first county formed in northeastern Indiana, had been established only three years prior to the construction of the akima Pinšiwa Awiiki. Fort Wayne would not be incorporated as a town until 1829. For the most part, the few Euro-American settlers in the county lived in hewn-log structures. The majority of the commercial structures within Fort Wayne were hewn-log structures as well. In contrast, the akima Pinšiwa Awiiki was a substantial two-story brick home of Euro-American design with fine details in the emerging Greek Revival mode. While the limestone used in the walls of the foundation was gathered locally and may have been commonly used for foundations, waapahsena (limestone) has a symbolic meaning to the Myaamia people.

The pioneer town fathers of Fort Wayne, new settlers from New England and Pennsylvania, as well as important travelers passing through, found the enjoyment of the akima’s hospitality a remarkable pleasure. Accounts of the original furnishings of the akima Pinšiwa Awiiki may be reflective of Euro-American influence and Pinšiwa’s Métis heritage, as well as his wealth. Contemporary accounts related the interior details of French wallpaper and drapes, Oriental carpets, chandeliers, and an elaborate gold clock on the parlor mantel. In 1847, Pinšiwa’s daughter, Kiinkwaatehkwa (also known as Maria Louise Richardville or LaBlonde) who had
inherited the house and furnishings from her father, wrote her own will, bequeathing the house, orchard, and barn to her son, and stated: “I also, will and bequeath to my said son, Kelakemokeah (George Ossem), the chairs in the parlor, being twelve in number, the fancy mantle clock in the parlor, one large bureau and one new common bureau, one shaving case, the same formerly owned by my father, one dining table, two bed steads, two beds and bedding, one large looking glass, and all other furniture that is usually kept in the two north rooms of my house, where I now live...”
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LaBlonde Richardville, *Will of LaBlonde Richardville* (June 1, 1847), Allen County Clerk’s Office, Probate Papers, Fort Wayne, Indiana.
The Myaamia treaty houses granted in the 1826 Paradise Springs Treaty have had a diverse history. The akima Pinšiwa Awiiki is the only one of the Myaamia treaty houses that is extant, and is a rare and well-preserved example of a treaty house in the United States.

**The final years of Pinšiwa as the Akima**

Although Pinšiwa continued to live in his house along the *mameewa siipiwi* (St. Mary’s River) in Fort Wayne, he negotiated the treaties of 1834 and 1838 at *wiipicahkionki* (the Forks of the Wabash), near modern-day Huntington, Indiana. This site was known for its flint (*wiipicahkionki* means “the flint place”), and had been a gathering place since ancient times. Pinšiwa moved the tribal headquarters to Wiipicahkionki in 1831 to provide better access to the villages and lands of the people who were concentrated on the *waapaahšiki siipiwi* (Wabash River) and its tributaries, including the *oonsalamooni siipiwi* (Salamonie River), *nimacihsinwi siipiwi* (Mississenewa River), and *kineepikomeekwa siipiwi* (Eel River). Wiipicahkionki was close to the Indian Agency and to Pinšiwa’s family and village which remained centered near his home along the *mameewa siipiwi* (St. Mary’s River). Pinšiwa also built a trading post at Wiipicahkionki during the 1830s.

A population explosion of settlers north of the *waapaahšiki siipiwi* (Wabash River) took place while the American Indian population suffered an equally dramatic decline during the 1830s. Also during the 1830s, the Myaamia treaty negotiations were conducted under the administration of a new President, Andrew Jackson, and a new US policy—the 1830 Removal Act. The Indian Removal Act made official the policy of removing American Indians from their homelands east of the Mississippi River and sending them west of the Mississippi. The removal sometimes
happened at gunpoint, and resulted in large-scale loss of life, especially when unscrupulous contractors transported the tribes to the west.

During the Black Hawk War in 1832, the Sac and Fox tribes returned to their ancestral homelands in northern Illinois and southern Wisconsin from across the Mississippi. This action resulted in panic among the Euro-American settlers. Squatters, who had illegally occupied Indian lands in northern Indiana, besieged the Indiana General Assembly for Indian removal. Aggressive traders pressed for more treaties with fat annuities, which would, in turn, increase their earnings.

The Indian Removal Act of 1830 and the Black Hawk War of 1832 influenced the Myaamia Treaty of 1834. In that treaty, the Myaamia ceded some of the land that had been allotted them in the 1818 and 1826 treaties. These lands included about twelve square miles of small reserves and a part of the Big Reserve from the 1818 Treaty, and 120 sections, or about 43,200 acres, from the 1826 Treaty. For those cessions, the Myaamia were to receive:

- $208,000
- For Pinšiwa, fee-simple patent for ten sections at the Forks of the Wabash that he had held by Indian patent (from the 1826 treaty)
- A skillful miller in lieu of the gunsmith promised in 1818
- US was to value the buildings and improvements on the ceded lands and provide an equal amount in building, clearing, and fencing at new locations for the leaders
- $1,500 reimbursement for horses stolen from Myaamia by United States citizens.
McCafferty, *Place-Names* 103.
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- Fee-simple titles for lands formerly granted by Indian patents to five leaders (in addition to Pinšiwa’s grant) –13 sections in all

- Hugh Hanna, a United States citizen, was to receive a 1/4 section (compensation for his purchase of an 1826 grant that was not approved)

- Indian titles for 20 individuals (a total of twenty-three and three-quarters sections).

A comparison between the Myaamia treaty and all of the other treaties that were signed in 1834 reveals a marked difference. Treaties were negotiated by the United States with the Chickasaw and the Potawatomi in 1834. Both tribes ceded all of their remaining lands and were relocated west of the Mississippi. During their relocation both tribes suffered horrific loss and death. By contrast, the Myaamia treaty of that same year drew criticism
in Indiana because it did not promise Myaamia removal. President Jackson refused to accept it for the same reason; the treaty would not be ratified until 1837. Pinšiwa again utilized a strategy of delay, and balanced cessions with annuities, which resulted in the preservation of some of the Myaamia homeland. Pinšiwa was also able to increase the amount of Myaamia land owned by fee-simple title, as opposed to the more customary Indian land patent. A fee-simple title was unqualified; it was the best land title obtainable, and it conveyed the highest bundle of rights to the land owner.

The Panic of 1837 caused traders between Fort Wayne and Logansport to escalate debt claims against the Myaamia. The annuity payments for land cessions resulted in the Myaamia’s purchase of goods on credit from the traders, who in turn claimed payment for the credit debt from the annuity prior to its dispersal to the tribe. Pinšiwa crafted a new, complicated compromise treaty in 1838 that dealt with some of this debt. The Myaamia ceded all tribal reserve land except their winter hunting grounds on the Big Reserve. In return, Mihtohseenia’s family, now led by his eldest son Mihšiinkweemiša (Burr Oak), and his village were to receive a grant of ten square miles. In addition, there was also to be thirty-one individual grants amounting to fifty sections, with provision for survey and for the distribution of the land by the akima Pinšiwa. The new payment was $335,680; $60,000 upon ratification, residue after debt payments to be paid in ten annual installments of $12,568 each. The arrangements for debt claims and payments were spelled out in detail. The US commissioner was to investigate all claims against the Myaamia since October 23, 1834, and pay those that “proved to his or their satisfaction, to be legal and just.”
After investigation and due payment, any unexpended balance from the $150,000 amount reserved for debt payment in the 1834 Treaty was to be added to the subsequent annuity in the 1838 Treaty. If that amount proved insufficient, unpaid debts were to be paid in three equal installments from annuities. No debts were to operate as liens on annuities or land. Again, buildings and improvements on ceded lands were to be appraised and residents reimbursed, and the residents were to be allowed to remain on the lands until this was accomplished. The United States was to survey and mark Myamia land within one year after ratification. In the treaties of 1834 and 1838, Pinšiwa was able to retain his home on the *mameewa siiipiwi* (St. Mary’s River)


118 Rafert, *Miami Indians of Indiana*, 98. Mihtohseenia (Metocina) died in 1832, and was the leader of the Missisinewa Miami along with Pinšiwa, Pacanne, Hibou (Owl) and Le Gris. Mihšiinkweemiša (Burr Oak) is also referred to as Meshingomesia, which has been reported earlier as Hibou’s Myamia name, see fn. 57.
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while the 1826 treaty houses of Peepakicia (Flat Belly), Palaanswa (Francis Godfroy) and Waapeehsipana (White Raccoon) were lost.

Pinšiwa negotiated the 1838 treaty to include language regarding a possible relocation of the tribe in the future. Article 10 of the treaty guaranteed to the Myaamia “forever, a country west of the Mississippi river to remove and settle on, when the tribe may be disposed to emigrate from their present country.” It further stated that the new lands would be in a region contiguous to that of the tribes that had previously relocated from Indiana and Ohio. The Myaamia were also guaranteed their protection by the United States government in the new lands. In Article 11 of the treaty the United States committed to defraying the expenses of “six chiefs or headmen, to explore the country to be assigned to the tribe.”

Article Thirteen of the treaty precluded another three-year delay in ratification as had occurred with the 1834 treaty. If the 1838 treaty were not ratified by the next session of Congress, it would be null and void. The treaty was signed by Commissioner Abel C. Pepper, who had also negotiated and signed the previous one, and by twenty-three Myaamia leaders.

In the 1838 Treaty, Pinšiwa established a precedent with the provision releasing himself and his family from future removal:

ARTICLE 14. And whereas John B. Richardville, the principal chief of said tribe, is very old and infirm, and not well able to endure the fatigue of a long journey, it is agreed that the United
States will pay to him and his family the proportion of the annuity of said tribe which their number shall indicate to be due to them, at Fort Wayne whenever the said tribe shall emigrate to the country to be assigned them west, as a future residence.

Article 14 provided the legal basis and mechanism that, along with fee-simple ownership of land, would allow many of the Myaamia to remain in Indiana. Pinšiwa’s children, grandchildren, and future descendants were given permission to reside permanently on their lands. This seemingly minor provision provided the legal opening needed. Like the precedent set by the 1818 grant of fee-simple title of lands to Pinšiwa, the 1838 treaty set the precedent for allowing permanent residency for some of the Myaamia upon their traditional lands.

The complicated debt claim arrangements of this treaty, however, occupied most of the akima’s time for the next two years. Commissioner Nathaniel West remarked that "I cannot refrain from bearing witness to the general honesty of this people; indeed, I hardly met with an instance of gross and barefaced denial of debt, unless the Indian knew he was right; then he was firm and decided and unwavering in his replies." West reduced 118 claims amounting to $142,439.25 to 98 claims for $84,010.40, which he approved. West lived at Pinšiwa’s trading post at wiipicahkanki while he reviewed the claims.

In 1840, Pinšiwa and his attorney, Allen Hamilton, prepared a new treaty at Pinšiwa’s residence in Fort Wayne. This treaty was not scheduled or authorized initially by the United States government. However, it was accepted by the other Myaamia leaders and US government agents. Pinšiwa proposed that for all their remaining tribal lands, the Myaamia would be paid $550,000 of which $300,000 was to be reserved for their debt payments. Upon ratification of the treaty, an additional $250,000 was to be paid in twenty equal annual
installments. One or more commissioner(s) was to investigate debt claims against every member of the tribe, regardless of the claimant's blood, accrued after November 6, 1838, or that may accrue before ratification. Also, inquiry was to be made into the "equity and legality of the original cause of indebtedness" based upon the evidence. The government-approved judgments were to be final. Of the reserved money, $250,000 was to cover debts contracted before November 28, 1840; $50,000 to debts contracted from November 18, 1840, until ratification, with preference given to debts contracted for "provisions and subsistence." Any balance remaining, after the debt payments were paid, was to be included in the next annuity.

A Treaty Council was then organized at Wiipicahkionki, “between Samuel Milroy and Allen Hamilton, acting (unofficially) as commissioners on the part of the United States, and the chiefs, warriors and headmen of the Miami tribe of Indians.” On November 28, 1840, the assembled leaders agreed “that the Miami tribe of Indians shall remove to the country assigned them west of the Mississippi.”
The 1840 Treaty excluded the families of Palaanswa (Francis Godfroy) and Mihšiinkweemiša (Burr Oak) and his sister and six brothers and their families from removal. This treaty, together with the 1838 Treaty that exempted Pinšiwa’s family, and an 1845 petition to Congress by the Šípaakana-Mahkoonساahkwa (Slocum) family, provided for about half of the Myaamia people to remain in Indiana. The 1840 Treaty stipulated that the Myaamia were to be paid $250 annually in lieu of the government-provided labor that had been stipulated in the 1826 treaty. The Kansas lands for the Myaamia were specified as 500,000 acres south of the Wea and Kaskaskia, east of the Potawatomi, and north of the "New York Indians" (Seneca). The Myaamia were to move to these lands within five years of the 1840 Treaty date. The United States was to pay all moving expenses and to furnish rations to the tribe for twelve months after their arrival in Kansas. The United States was also to supply $4,000 worth of "good merchantable pork and flour" to the tribe the second year; the amount to be deducted from their annuity for that year.

Negotiating expenses for the treaty were to be paid by the United States and the treaty would be null and void if not ratified by March 4, 1841. It was ratified. The 1840 Treaty was signed by twenty Myaamia leaders, and Commissioners Samuel Milroy and Allen Hamilton. This was the akima Pinšiwa’s final treaty.

Pinšiwa died on August 13, 1841, in his home near the mameewa siipiwi (St. Mary’s River) six years before about half of the 700 to 800 Indiana Myaamia were sent by canal boat west of the Mississippi. Upon his death, Pinšiwa's casket was ferried down the river to the French Catholic church in Fort Wayne, on the site of the current Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception. His remains lie under Cathedral Square. His daughters erected a memorial to him that now stands in the Catholic Cemetery in Fort Wayne. He left generous land grants to his children and grandchildren, as well as a lead safe in the akima Pinšiwa Awiiki containing approximately
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$200,000 in gold and silver. Pinšiwa’s wife Naatowehkwa, and sons Waapimankwa (Joseph) and Aughquamauda (John) preceded him in death.

His oldest daughter, Kiinkwaatehkwa (Maria Louisa, or LaBlonde) inherited his St. Mary’s home and estate. Kiinkwaatehkwa’s daughter, Maankoonsihkwa (Archangel) married Sahkonkwa (James Roridan Godfroy) in

“Regardless of the claimant’s blood,” meant that Myamia of mixed-blood were not to be excluded from having their debts settled.

124


126. Ibid., 2:531-534.

127. Ibid., 2:532.

128. Ibid.


until approximately 1908 when it was sold to non-Myaamia. After the home was sold, many Pinšiwa descendants continued and continue to live close to the akima Pinšiwa Awiki in the southwestern part of Fort Wayne.

Relatively little is known about the daily of life of Pinšiwa. Archeological information about his family, lifestyle, and standard of living can provide crucial information about how he was likely regarded by the European Americans with whom he interacted, as well as how he was perceived by other Myaamia. Further archeological investigations at the site may potentially shed additional light on the living arrangements of Pinšiwa and his family which would be valuable in interpretations at the property. Additionally, knowledge of the lifestyles of typical affluent European American settlers on the Indiana frontier in the early nineteenth century may provide some comparative information, however, the archeological collection from the akima Pinšiwa Awiki site, coupled with ethnographic information, oral histories, and the documentary record, can provide a unique perspective on localized products of power relationships and the construction of group or political identities under the broader topics of acculturation or ethnogenesis as archeologists study them.

Through persistence and hard bargaining, Pinšiwa was able to avoid the strategy of separation and isolation for the Myaamia. The use of multiple forms of ownership insured that Pinšiwa was able to balance the competing interests of traders and settlers to the advantage of the Myaamia. Traders desired access to the annuity money and settlers desired rich agricultural land. Similar to his ability to find a political and economic “middle ground,” Pinšiwa’s ability to balance these two competing interests brought him negotiating successes that eluded many of his American Indian contemporaries. The akima Pinšiwa Awiki and its associated archeological resources
stand on a small piece of land, and is all that remains of what had been a small part of the Myaamia traditional and historical homeland.

**Comparative Analysis with other Historic American Indian Sites and Treaty Houses**

The rarity of the akima Pinšiwa Awiiki can be determined by a comparison to all treaties enacted by the United States government with American Indians. The Oklahoma State University Library has compiled an important online resource that documents the Charles J. Kappler compilation of those treaties. Although houses were occasionally offered as part of treaty negotiations, the akima Pinšiwa Awiiki is a rare, well-preserved example of a treaty house.

Further, there are few known archeological properties associated with the life of Pinšiwa. The Kekionga area, Pinšiwa’s birthplace and home for much of his adult life, has been destroyed by residential and commercial development. Other Myaamia village sites near the confluence of the three rivers were likely destroyed when the area was developed by European American settlers during the nineteenth century and the further development that took place throughout the twentieth century. Today, the area is a part of central Fort Wayne. The Treaty Grounds at the Forks of the Wabash near Huntington was listed on the National Register in 1985 for its potential to yield important information about Myaamia occupation of the region, but not specifically about Pinšiwa. The site of the LaFontaine House has been disturbed by moving the house for highway construction.

---

131 *Indian Affairs: Laws and Treaties*, compiled and edited by Charles J. Kappler, is a historically significant, seven volume compilation of US treaties, laws, and executive orders pertaining to Native American Indian tribes. The volumes cover US government treaties with Native Americans from 1778-1883 (vol. 2) and US laws and executive orders concerning Native Americans from 1871-1970 (vols. 1, and 3-7). The work was first published in 1903-04 by the United States Government Printing Office. Enhanced by the editors' use of margin notations and a
comprehensive index, the information contained in Indian Affairs: Laws and Treaties is in high demand by Native peoples, researchers, journalists, attorneys, legislators, teachers, and others of both Native and non-Native origins. Volumes 1 through 7 are available on the web both as fully searchable digitized text and as page images. The contents may be accessed from the table of contents or index of each volume or through keyword searching.
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The akima Pinšiwa Awiiki is the only known archeological property with a direct connection to the productive life of Pinšiwa and is likely to produce significant archeological information about him.

Using the Kappler documents as the basis for analysis, a survey of all treaties made between the United States of America and American Indian tribes found only ten treaties where the United States agreed to build permanent residential structures for American Indians to encourage their continued occupation of traditional lands. Only five such treaties were negotiated during the Early Republic, and all of these involved Algonquian speaking peoples of the Great Lakes region. These treaties primarily occurred before passage of the 1830 Indian Removal Act.

Du Coigne House (1803) – Illinois

The earliest recorded incidence of a treaty house took place at the 1803 Treaty with the Kaskaskia, held at Vincennes, in which Indiana Territorial Governor William Henry Harrison negotiated a treaty with Kaskaskia Métis leader Joseph Du Coigne. Part of the treaty settlement included the construction of a stone house for Du Coigne in Illinois. It should be noted that the
Kaskaskia were closely affiliated with the Myaamia during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and shared a common language. Pinšiwa’s uncle, Pakaana, occasionally lived among the Kaskaskia, near Vincennes, and may have been present at the treaty negotiation. The Du Coigne House is not extant as it was demolished at some point prior to 1950. It was described as being of stone, and built in the French manner.

Mihšihkinaahkwa (Little Turtle) (1805) – Eel River, Indiana

The second record of the construction of a residence for an American Indian was also approved by William Henry Harrison during his tenure as Territorial Governor of Indiana. In 1805, Harrison wrote to President Jefferson that a house had been constructed for Mihšihkinaahkwa (Little Turtle) near his village. This was not done in consideration of any specific treaty. The letter said that “the government constructed a house for Little Turtle on Eel River, a mile or so upstream from turtletown.” The house is not extant.

Myaamia Treaty Houses (1826) – Fort Wayne area, Indiana

The nine houses to be built as part of the 1826 Paradise Springs Treaty included:

Pinšiwa (Jean-Baptist de Richardville) (1826) – St. Mary’s River, Fort Wayne, Indiana

The house was presumably constructed by William Rockhill; the cost was $600 of government funds, plus $1600 provided by Pinšiwa. The akima Pinšiwa Awiiki, which is the subject of this nomination, still stands in Fort Wayne and is the only known extant treaty house in the U.S.  

Toopia (Francis LaFontaine) (1826) – Northern Indiana

The treaty states that the house was constructed “On the waters of the Wabash near the mouth of Pipe Creek.” The contract of $500 was originally awarded to Joseph Coleman. The government
later paid an additional $100 toward the construction of a cellar. The house is not extant. Its demolition date is unknown.


Carter, Life and Times of Chief Little Turtle, 176.


Tipton, John Tipton Papers, 1:741-810.
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Palaanswa (Francois Godfroy) (1826) – Blackford County, Indiana

“Cyrus Taber—F. Godfroy—$537.” The house is not extant; it was dismantled following the treaty of 1834, and the bricks were used to build the Goldsmith Chandlee (Chandler) house in Pennville, Jay County, Indiana. The Goldsmith Chandler House still stands near Indiana Highway One (1).

Louison Godfroy (1826) – near Logansport, Indiana

“Wm. Caswell—Lewis Godfroy—$487.” Louison, whose Myaamia name may have been Winso, was a brother of Francois Godfroy. Tipton notes also document that the Louison Godfroy
house was constructed of brick and stood along Eel River Township Road No. One (1). The house is not extant. Demolition date unknown.

Peepakicia (Flat Belly) (1826) – in the area of Indian Village, Noble, Indiana

“Gillis McBean—Flat Belly—$562.” Flatbelly had been granted 36 sections of land and a house was to be constructed for him in Noble and Kosciusko Counties as part of the 1826 Treaty. The House is not extant. Noble County histories and other sources note that the house was destroyed shortly after Flatbelly ceded the 36-section reserve as part of the 1834 Miami Treaty. Sources differ on how the building was destroyed: tornado, disuse. One source notes that Flatbelly's house was located in the southeast corner of his village which is now called Indian Village in Noble County. Another source, Waldo Adams, first vice-president of the Kosciusko County Historical Society, relates that when Flatbelly died, the white settlers tore down the house and the bricks from his house were used for chimneys.

Meehcikilita (Le Gros) (1826) – Lagro, Indiana

“Jos: Holman—Lagros—$495.” It should be noted that Le Gros died prior to the posting of the request for bids for these houses and it is not known if Myaamia people ever occupied this structure. John Tipton had been named as heir to Le Gros’ estate, and may have had this home built for his own interests. The house is not extant. A commercial building located in modern Lagro, Indiana, is said to have been built from portions of the treaty house, but there is no visible evidence from the exterior view of the building.

Waapeehsipana (White Raccoon) (1826) – Whitley County, Indiana

“Holman—White Raccoon—$499.” An early history of Whitley County noted that the house was, “… located in the southwest corner of the (Jefferson twp., Whitley county) township, on the
north bank of the Wabash and Erie Canal, and originally consisted of a brick house with two rooms and a number of log cabins all erected by the government for the occupation of the Indians...Chief Raccoon, who occupied the brick house...brick house passed into hands of Jesse Vermilyea. He rented it to different parties.” The house is not extant. The entire site is now a gravel pit, and no historic buildings remain.

Waawiyaasita (1826) – near Camp Mack, Kosciusko County, Indiana

Tipton wrote to Lewis Cass that he had failed to correctly advertise for nine houses in the original bid documents, so he contracted privately with Stephen Coles to build a house for “wau, wee, I, see” for

136 Ibid.

137 Ibid.

138 Ibid.


140 Tipton, John Tipton Papers, 1:741-810.

141 Samuel P. Kaler and Richard H. Maring, History of Whitley County, Indiana (Indianapolis, IN: B. F. Bowen, 1907), 344.
$562, on the same reservation and like the one he had contracted to build for Flatbelly. Hugh Hanna then inspected the home, and found inferior bricks had been manufactured. He called for the house to be rebuilt of wood, and the house was built as two rooms, each sixteen feet square, with an eight-foot passage or “dogtrot” between them, and two chimneys. 142 The house was located near the modern “Camp Mack” in Kosciusko County. The house is not extant.

Wapimaankwa (“White Loon,” also known as Joseph Richardville, Pišiwa’s son) (1826) – near Peru, Indiana

His Myaamia name means “white loon” —“J. Hays—Near Mouth of Massiniway—$497.00.” As mentioned above, Tipton wrote to Cass that he contracted to add a cellar to “Joe Richerville’s” house, to bring the total cost up to $600. A house near Peru was erroneously associated with Jean Baptiste de Richardville during a marker program in the 1960s. It is possible that this home, now a two-story house with a large addition, contains a portion of the Wapimaankwa treaty house, but this cannot be verified. 143

The other recorded instances of houses being built as part of a treaty negotiation include:

Treaty with the Pottawatomie (1828)

“The sum of seven thousand five hundred dollars shall be expended for the said tribe, under the direction of the President of the United States, in clearing and fencing land, erecting houses, purchasing domestic animals and farming utensils, and in the support of labourers to work for them.” The treaty was negotiated by Lewis Cass and Pierre Menard. None of these houses are extant. 144
Treaty with the Eel River Myaamia (1828)

“The United States shall...build twelve log houses, ten on the five mile reservation, and two on the Wabash...” The treaty was negotiated by John Tipton. None of these houses are extant.

Treaty with the Choctaw (1830)

Also known as the Treaty of Dancing Rabbit Creek, the terms included:

“... for the benefit and advantage of the Choctaw people, and to improve their condition, their shall be educated under the direction of the President and at the expense of the U.S. forty Choctaw youths for twenty years...The U.S. agree also to erect a Council House for the nation at some convenient central point, after their people shall be settled; and a House for each Chief, also a Church for each of the three Districts, to be used also as school houses, until the Nation may conclude to build others; and for these purposes ten thousand dollars shall be appropriated...”

The Chief’s House (listed June 21, 1971) in Swink, Oklahoma, was built for Greenwood LaFlore, one of the listed chiefs in this treaty. Although Greenwood LaFlore never relocated to Oklahoma, this house was lived in by Thomas LaFlore, shortly after its construction in the mid-1830s. The nomination describes it as:

142 Tipton, John Tipton Papers, 1:741-810.
143 Ibid.
144 Kappler, Indian Affairs, 2:294.
145 Ibid.
Published specifications give us a good picture of what the "Chief's House" must have looked like in the late 1830s. The same specifications gave restorers a welcome blueprint to go by in their work. In between, of course, the double-house-with-dogtrot shrank to half its size (as the north wing was pulled down, its logs and chimney stones put to other purposes on the farm) and decayed badly from abuse and neglect. Government plans called for the house to be 52 x 20 feet, consisting of two rooms 20 feet square at each end and the traditional open passageway, or dogtrot (12 x 20 feet) between them, logs 15 inches "on the face, 11 six inches thick, were specified for the walls, with the inner surface straight edged. One and one-half inch thick planks, tongue-and-grooved, were required for the flooring and room ceilings. House-length porches, 10 feet wide, were called for. Sills were to be on a 12-inch center with flooring laid "athwart the porch." Porch roofs were to extend down over the main body of the house. The roof was to be of 18-inch singles with a five-inch show. A stairway leads to the two, low-ceilinged upper rooms, connected over the dogtrot by a hallway. Massive stone chimneys guarded either end of the house. Although the old house was pretty much a shambles when restoration work began in the 1960s, it now closely resembles the original. Inside restoration work and re-furnishing continue. One original mantel, a handsome hand-carved affair, has survived.

Treaty with the Menominee (1831)

"The following described tract of land, at present owned and occupied by the Menomonee Indians, shall be set apart, and designated for their future homes, upon which their improvements as an agricultural people are to be made ... And the United States will cause to be erected, houses
suited to their condition, on said lands, as soon as the Indians agree to occupy them, for which ten thousand dollars shall be appropriated.” The treaty was negotiated by John Eaton and Samuel Stambaugh. None of these houses are extant.

Treaty with the Myaamia (1834)
The status of several houses first built in accordance with the 1826 Paradise Springs [Myaamia] Treaty was cause for concern in the 1834 Treaty between the United States and the Myaamia. This treaty took away much of the Myaamia Indiana lands, including several sites that contained the 1826 treaty residences, but not the akima Pinšiwa Awiiki site. The 1834 treaty states: “The United States agrees to have the buildings and improvements on the lands ceded by the first article of this treaty valued. To cause a similar amount in value, laid out in building, clearing and fencing ground, for the use of the Indians, on such place or places as their chiefs may select, and that the Indians have peaceable possession of their houses and improvements, on the lands ceded in the first article of this treaty, until the improvements are made as provided for in this article.” The 1834 Treaty was negotiated by General William Marshall. It is unclear if any new houses were actually constructed, and if so, none are extant today.

Treaty with the Ottawa and Chippewa (1836) – Mackinac Island, Michigan (NHL, 1960)
A residential building called the “Indian Dormitory” was built on Mackinac Island as part of the treaty with the Ottawa and Chippewa in 1836. In this case, however, the structure was clearly not intended for use as a permanent residence: “It is stipulated to renew the present dilapidated shop at Michilimackinac, and to maintain a gunsmith, in addition to the present smith's establishment, and to build a dormitory for the Indians visiting the

148 Ibid.

149 Ibid., 426.

150 The Indian Dormitory is extant and is included as a contributing resource in the Mackinac Island NHL nomination.
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post, and appoint a person to keep it, and supply it with fire-wood.” The Indian Dormitory is extant and is included as a contributing resource in the Mackinac Island NHL nomination.

**Mid- to Late Nineteenth-Century Comparable Historic American Indian Houses**

Most of the later United States treaties with American Indians that included the construction of residential structures involved relocation to less valued lands along the margins of traditional tribal lands. Native American policy changed as well; relocation and the building of residences became a less popular option. During the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, American Indians responded in many ways to United States policies. Just as the akima Pinšiwa Awiiki reflects American Indian response to United States policies during the Early Republic, so, too, was the American Indian response during the second half of the nineteenth century reflected in a variety of other treaty terms.

After 1855, three treaties were negotiated for land in Washington and Oregon Territory, prompting what has been called the Yakima War. It is unclear whether the United States
government ever built the houses promised to each tribal chief. The 1863 Treaty with the Chippewa of the Mississippi and the Pillager and Lake Winnibigoshish Bands included an annuity and dwellings that were to be built for the chief of each band; it is unclear whether the leaders had to relocate in order to receive the dwellings. The treaty was signed by thirty-four chiefs, most of whom, presumably, would have received their own house. There is no documentation to substantiate the construction of either the Yakima or Chippewa houses.

**Non-Treaty Related Comparable Historic American Indian Historic Houses**

New Echota (1825-1838) – Gordon County, Georgia (NHL, 1971)

The New Echota site in Gordon County, Georgia, was officially designated by the Cherokee as the capital of the Cherokee Nation on November 12, 1825. In New Echota, the Cherokee constructed a legislative hall, a supreme court house, a newspaper office, and other commercial and residential buildings. Although the Cherokee sued the federal government to prevent their removal to the Oklahoma Indian Territory, the United States Supreme Court upheld the government’s policy established in the Indian Removal Act of 1830. In 1838, the removal of the Cherokee to Oklahoma resulted in great loss of life and is remembered as the “Trail of Tears.”

The Cherokee Capital, New Echota was abandoned for more than 100 years. In 1954, Gordon County donated a dilapidated frame house to the State of Georgia. The frame house had been the mission school and the home of Reverend Samuel A. Worcester, a New Englander who constructed the building in 1827. During a survey of the site, archaeologists Lewis Larsen and Joe Caldwell identified the footprints of other buildings original to the site. On March 13, 1957, in reaction to the findings at the New Echota site, the State of Georgia authorized the town to be rebuilt as a state park. Today, New Echota is a Georgia State Historic Site—its mission school has been restored, and other buildings have been reconstructed or relocated to the site.
Although the Mission School at New Echota was constructed in 1827, as was the Pinšiwa House, it was not built as part of a treaty settlement. The other buildings at New Echota have been reconstructed or moved to the site.

150 Ibid., 452.
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John Ross House (1830-1839) – Rossville, Walker County, Georgia (NHL, 1973)

John Ross became Principal Chief of the Cherokee Nation in 1827, and served in that capacity through the removal of the Cherokee from their traditional lands in 1839 until his death in Oklahoma in 1866. When the State of Georgia confiscated Cherokee lands in 1830, John Ross was forced from his plantation on the Coosa River, near Rome, Georgia. He then moved into a two-story timber house in Rossville, Georgia, that had been built in 1797 by his European-American grandfather, John McDonald. In 1839, Ross lost this house as well, as he led the Cherokee to their new lands west of the Mississippi River—on what is now called the “Trail of Tears.” The house was not built as part of a treaty settlement. Only altered slightly, the house has been moved several hundred yards from its original location.

153
“Chieftains;” Major Ridge House (1797-1838) – Rome, Georgia (NHL, 1973)
The Cherokee leader, Major Ridge was born around 1771. Ridge led Cherokee troops in the
defense of the United States during the War of 1812, and earned his military title of “Major”
from General Andrew Jackson in 1814. Following the war, Ridge was politically active in
Cherokee Tribal politics and became Speaker of the Tribal Council. After living for a number of
years in a two-story dogtrot log cabin on the Oostanaula River near present day Rome, Georgia,
Ridge’s son John oversaw renovations to the cabin. When completed in 1828, the house was a
white clapboard plantation home. In 1832, the Ridge house was confiscated by the state of
Georgia and given to Rachel Ferguson. Ridge was one of the signers of the December 29, 1835,
Treaty of New Echota that sold Cherokee land to the United States in exchange for land in the
Oklahoma Indian Territory. Ridge and his family moved to Oklahoma in 1837. As a result of
inner conflict among the survivors of the Trail of Tears and the signers of the 1835 Treaty, Ridge
was killed in an ambush on June 22, 1839.

Later occupants of the Ridge House near Rome, Georgia, called the home “Chieftains” in honor
of its connection to Major Ridge. Following the ownership of a number of individuals and
groups, in 1969 the house was donated to the Junior Service League of Rome by the Celanese
Corporation. The Junior Service League has operated the house as a museum since 1971. The
group has also been active in rehabilitating the house to its 1837 appearance by removing all
non-Ridge period features and finishes. The house was not built as part of a treaty settlement.

Chief Plenty Coups (Alek-chea-ahoosh) Home (NHL, 1999)
In 1884, Alekcheaahoosh (Chief Plenty Coups) of the Crow Nation built a large timber home
near the western edge of the Crow Reservation, southwest of Billings, in Big Horn County,
Montana. The house is a one and a half story, L-shaped, log building that had additions
constructed in 1900 and again, in 1909. The design of the house represents a collaboration of the architectural vision of the Indian Agency, and Aleckcheaahoosh—tribal members and non-Indians worked on the construction. The 194.5-acre homestead site, which also includes a store, a spring, a burial ground, and other landscape features, is now a Montana State Park. There are several noncontributing park-related buildings and structures at the site. Designated an NHL in 1999, the nomination for the Chief Plenty Coups home notes: “The Homestead is important in the political history of the Crow Nation for it was here that one of its most influential leaders conferred, strategized, and planned responses to critical issues and shaped the future. The house was the de facto political capital of the Crow during the early years of the reservation.” The Chief Plenty Coups house was not constructed as part of a treaty settlement.


---
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Other Richardville Houses

The Chief Richardville House and Miami Treaty Grounds in Huntington, Indiana, were listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1985. It is also known as the “Indian House and Forks of the Wabash.” The house was most likely built by Toopia (Francis LaFontaine), who was
married to Pinšiwa’s daughter, Pakankiikhwa (Catherine) who occupied the house until 1847. Current family descendants, who have lived in the house, relate that Toopia built the house and that Pinšiwa had an office in one of the rooms on the second floor of the house. The present marker (Indiana Sesquicentennial Commission, ca. 1966) in front of the house incorrectly identifies the house as Richardville’s principal residence. Historical sources list the primary residence as the house in Fort Wayne. There is also a HABS report, File No. IN-157 [HABS IND 35-Hunt, 1-] related to the house in Huntington. The HABS report states that the building was constructed in 1833. Moreover, this house was not Pinšiwa’s primary residence during the significant events of his life, specifically the negotiation of the 1826 Paradise Springs Treaty. There is another “Richardville” house in Peru, Indiana, with an Indiana Sesquicentennial Commission marker; this house is near the location of a much smaller treaty house built for Joseph Richardville. Joseph Richardville’s house, according to the building specifications and building contract, was a single-story brick house, 16’ x 32’, with a cellar. A portion of the Peru house might have been built for Joseph Richardville, but extensive additions and enlargements have obliterated the earlier house, if it exists. The text of this marker erroneously reads: “Jean Baptiste Richardville (1761-1841) was principal chief of the Miami Tribe from 1812 to 1841. He signed six treaties with the United States ceding Miami land in Indiana. This house was built for him under one of the treaties.”

Conclusion

The akima Pinšiwa Awiiki is the only historic structural and archeological evidence that remains of the economic and political treaties that allowed some of the Myaamia and their akima, Pinšiwa, to remain within the expanding boundaries of the United States. The akima Pinšiwa
Awilki outstandingly represents a treaty-negotiated residence from the era of the Early Republic. This unique status makes the akima Pinšiwa Awilki a historic resource type which is extremely rare and significant in American Indian history and in the history of the United States. The public’s understanding of nineteenth-century Indian relations is often the simple sequence of battle-conquer-remove, and is often thought of as a process that occurred in a relatively short period of time. Pinšiwa’s life and accomplishments as akima provide a much deeper understanding of the complicated process of negotiation between American Indian tribes and the United States government during that time period. Pinšiwa devoted his life to negotiating treaties with the federal government for the purchase of Myaamia land so that many of the Myaamia could remain in their homeland. In a letter to Secretary of War John Eaton in 1831, John Tipton referred to the slow progress of negotiations with the Myaamia. He said, “The Miamies are reduced to a small number, but well organized in their kind of government, and with one of the most shrewd men in North America at their head.”

In his career as an assistant akima and later as leading akima of the Myaamia, Pinšiwa played an important role in negotiating treaties for the Myaamia and influencing United States Indian policy. The treaties negotiated by Pinšiwa ceded vast amounts of land to the United States. However, at a time when many tribes were forced to relinquish their lands and move west, Pinšiwa and the Myaamia arranged for about half of the Myaamia to

---


158 Ibid., 96.
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remain on their land in Indiana. Pinšiwa understood that legally recognized property ownership by an individual or group of Myaamia was the best method to prevent their relocation to the west. The treaties that Pinšiwa negotiated included land grants for himself, his family, and other Myaamia leaders and their families. In recognition of the land ownership status acquired by many of the Myaamia, the federal government did not enforce the removal of those tribal members to the west.

Although the akima Pinšiwa’s strategy allowed his descendants and many other Myaamia to stay in Indiana, the tribe was fractured by the relocation of many of their number to the west. 159 The Eastern Myaamia continue to live and work in Indiana, and have a strong, organized tribal presence in the state. Myaamia in the Fort Wayne area, including many of Pinšiwa’s direct descendants, are actively engaged in interpretation at the akima Pinšiwa Awiiki, which is open to the public. The United States government has continued to maintain a government to government relationship with the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma (Western Myaamia) while the Indiana Myaamia were forced to accept status as citizens of the United States and lost their tribal protection by federal law in 1897. 160 Although they continue to be an identifiable group, the Indiana Myaamia were denied tribal status by the US government in 1993. 161

160 Ibid., 173-174.

161 Ibid., 293. Despite the difference in federal recognition, the Eastern and Western Myaamia continue to collaborate on projects and programs, including recent projects to revive the language, e.g., the current Myaamia Project at the Miami University of Ohio.
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10. GEOGRAPHICAL DATA

Acreage of Property: less than 1 acre

UTM References: Zone Easting 16 654306.95

Verbal Boundary Description:

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

Northing

4543873.90

Legal description of real estate: Part of Richardville Reserve, West of the St. Mary’s River in Township 30 North, Range 12 East, Allen County, Indiana, described as follows: Commencing at the intersection of the east right-of-way line of Bluffton Road with the north right-of-way line of a proposed street (Peachewa Trail); thence south 80 degrees 08 minutes east, along said north right-of-way line, 193.4 feet; thence north 13 degrees 31 minutes 27 seconds east, 154.57 feet; thence north 03 degrees 45 minutes 00 seconds east; 184.64 feet to a pipe found on the south line of the Southwest Conservation Club, Inc.; thence north 80 degrees 41 minutes east, along said line, 162.6 feet to the point of beginning, being marked by a pin set; thence continuing north 80 degrees 41 minutes east, along said line 175.0 feet to a pin found; thence South 09 degrees 19 minutes east, 200.0 feet to a pin set; thence south 80 degrees 41 minutes west, parallel to the south line of the Southwest Conservation Club, Inc., 175.0 feet to a pin set; thence north 09
degrees 19 minutes west, 200.0 feet to the point of beginning, containing 0.80 acres of land, more or less.

**Boundary Justification:**

The boundary includes the akima Pinšiwa Awiiki (Chief Jean-Baptiste de Richardville House) and the land which immediately surrounds it, which is currently owned by the Fort Wayne-Allen County Historical Society. This open space retains integrity from the period of significance and is the area most likely to contain archeological evidence of past occupation. The land to the north is owned by the Southwest Conservation Club, Inc. which has been responsible for the restoration and preservation of the land between the akima Pinšiwa Awiiki and the St. Mary’s River. Although now concealed by second-growth forest, the site beyond the present boundary was disturbed by some limited quarrying of sand and gravel on the south and east sides of the house. The views from the akima Pinšiwa Awiiki to the commercial and residential development along Bluffton Road that lies west of the house are buffered by trees. At the time the house was built in 1827, it sat in the center of more than 3000 acres owned by Pinšiwa (Richardville). The growth of the City of Fort Wayne since that time has transformed the Richardville Reserve into an urban and suburban area.
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South elevation with detail of the east side porch. Photo by Angela M. Quinn, October 1, 2007
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Fort Wayne, Allen County, Indiana
Front Entrance looking toward the staircase and hallway. Photo by Angela M. Quinn, October 1, 2007
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Fort Wayne, Allen County, Indiana

Second Floor, East Bedchamber

Photo by Angela M. Quinn, October 1, 2007
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First Floor North Room of the Rear Wing looking toward exterior door and a window. Photo by Angela M. Quinn, October 1, 2007
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Historic photographs, maps, and plans courtesy of the Allen County – Fort Wayne Historical Society, Indiana State Library, and the Myaamia Project.

Some images resized, cropped and compressed for document space limitations. All historic images on GOLD CD-R are unaltered.
Figure 001: Samuel Hanna House. Built by Hugh Hanna circa 1825. Demolished in 1914. Photograph in the collection of the Allen County-Fort Wayne Historical Society.
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Figure 002: “1827 Plan of J.B. Richardville’s House”. John Tipton Papers, Indiana State Library. Side 1.
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Figure 003: “1827 Plan of J. B. Richardville’s House.” John Tipton Papers, Indiana State Library. Side 2.
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Figures
Figure 005: *Myaamionki*—traditional and modern lands of the Myaamia People, with names of Rivers and Lakes in Myaamia. Map developed by and used with the permission of the Myaamia Project, Miami University of Ohio.
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Figure 009: Indiana Detail of Indian Cessions. Library of Congress, American Memory Collection. Indian land cessions in the United States, comp. by Charles C. Royce, with introduction by Cyrus Thomas. Smithsonian

http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=gmd&action=browse&fileName=gmd370m/g3701m/g3701em/gct00002/ct_browse.db&recNum=12&itemLink=r

?ammem/gmd:@field(NUMBER+@band(g3701em+gct00002))&linkText=0&title2=Indian%20land%20cessions%20in%20the%20United%20States,%20comp.%20by%20Charles%20Royce,%20with%20introduction%20by%20Cyrus%20Thomas.&displayTyp=3&maxCols=3 (March 2, 2009).
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Figure 010: “Richardville Reserve, W. side of St. Mary’s River.” From Allen County Deed Records, 1870. Note that Pinšiwa’s descendants had divided the land into several parcels, and that the marshy prairie area to the north of the house was filled with water, created by a dam drawn near the center of the photograph.
APPENDIX E: Chief Richardville House National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Name of Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>historic name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other names/site number</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>street &amp; number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>city or town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zip code</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. State/Federal Agency Certification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended, I hereby certify that this ☒ nomination meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36CFR Part 80. In my opinion, the property ☒ meets ☐ does not meet the National Register criteria. I recommend that this property be considered significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature of certifying official/Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indiana Department of Natural Resources
State or Federal agency and bureau

In my opinion, the property ☐ meets ☒ does not meet the National Register criteria. ( ☐ See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

Signature of certifying official/Title
Date

State or Federal agency and bureau

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. National Park Service Certification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I hereby certify that the property is:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ entered in the National Register.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ See continuation sheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ determined eligible for the National Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ See continuation sheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ determined not eligible for the National Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ removed from the National Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ other, (explain:)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature of the Keeper
Date of Action
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United States Department of the Interior National Park Service
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OMB No 10024-0018

This form is for use in nominating or requesting determinations for individual properties and districts. See instructions in How to Complete the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form (National Register Bulletin 16A). Complete each item by marking "x" in the appropriate box or by entering the information requested. If an item does not apply to the property being documented, enter "N/A" for "not applicable." For functions, architectural classification, materials, and areas of significance, enter only categories and subcategories from the instructions. Place additional entries and narrative items on continuations sheets (NPS Form 10-900a). Use a typewriter, word processor, or computer to complete all items.

1. Name of Property

Historic name de Richardville, Chief Jean-Baptiste, Hnuse other names/site number

Richardville, Chief John TV House

2. Location

Street & number 5705 Rufflnti Road city/town Fort Wayne state Indiana

Code TN

3. State/Federal Agency Certification

N/A D not for publication N/A p vicinity

Signature of certifying Official/Title

Indiana Department of Natural Resources

State or Federal agency and bureau

In my opinion, the property D meets D does not meet the National Register criteria. (Q comments.)
4. National Park Service Certification

hereby certify that the property is:

42 entered in the National Register.

Q See continuationsheet. Q determined eligible for the National Register

Q determined not eligible for the National Register

Q removed from the National Register G other, (explain:) __________

sheet for additional

county

Alien
code QQ3

zip code

46809

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended, I hereby certify that this request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60.

In my opinion, the property

meets O does not meet the National Register criteria. I recommend that this property be considered significant (3 nationally D statistically/G locally. (G See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

nomination

Date of Action
de Richardville, Chief Jean-Raptiste, House

Name of Property

5. Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership of Property</th>
<th>Category of Property</th>
<th>Number of Resources within Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Check as many boxes as apply)</td>
<td>(Check only one box)</td>
<td>(Do not include previously listed resources in the count)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ private</td>
<td>☑ building</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ public-local</td>
<td>☐ district</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ public-State</td>
<td>☐ site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ public-Federal</td>
<td>☐ structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ object</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name of related multiple property listing

(Enter "N/A" if property is not part of a multiple property listing.)

N/A

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register

0

6. Function or Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic Functions</th>
<th>Current Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions)</td>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMESTIC: Single Dwelling</td>
<td>RECREATION/CULTURE: Museum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architectural Classification</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions)</td>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MID-19th c.: Greek Revival</td>
<td>foundation STONE: Limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER:</td>
<td>walls BRICK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STUCCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>roof WOOD: Shingle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other STONE: Limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WOOD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Narrative Description

(Describe the historic and current condition of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)

de Richardville, Chief Jean-Raptiste, House
Number of Resources within Property

(Do not include previously listed resources in the count Contributing Noncontributing

5. Classification Ownership of Property

(Check as many boxes as apply)

IX] private
D public-local
D public-State D public-Federal

Category of Property

(Check only one box)

[X] building D district D site
D structure D object

1 0 1 0

0 0 0 2 0

buildings sites structures objects Total

Name of related multiple property listing

(Enter "N/A" if property is not part of a multiple property listing.)

N/A

6. Function or Use Historic Functions

(Enter categories from instructions)

DOMRSTTC;________ Single Dwelling
Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register

7. Description

Architectural Classification

(Enter categories from instructions)

MTTVIOthc.-_________ OTTTFJR

Narrative Description

Materials

(Enter categories from instructions)

Greek Revival T-hnuse

foundation STONR: Limestone walls BRICK

STUCCO

roof WOOD- Shingle

other STONR: Limestone WOOD

(Describe the historic and current condition of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)

Current Functions

(Enter categories from instructions)

0

-Museum
5. Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership of Property</th>
<th>Category of Property</th>
<th>Number of Resources within Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Check as many boxes as apply)</td>
<td>(Check only one box)</td>
<td>(Do not include previously listed resources in the count)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ private</td>
<td>☑ building</td>
<td>Contributing: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ public-local</td>
<td>☑ district</td>
<td>buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ public-State</td>
<td>☑ site</td>
<td>sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ public-Federal</td>
<td>☑ structure</td>
<td>structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☑ object</td>
<td>objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Function or Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic Functions</th>
<th>Current Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions)</td>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMESTIC: Single Dwelling</td>
<td>RECREATION/CULTURE: Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architectural Classification</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions)</td>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MID-19th c.: Greek Revival</td>
<td>foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER: I-house</td>
<td>walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Narrative Description

(Describe the historic and current condition of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)
Name of Property________________

Alien County and State

**Number of Resources within Property**

(Do not include previously listed resources in the count Contributing Noncontributing

**5. Classification Ownership of Property**

(Check as many boxes as apply)

IX) private

D public-local

D public-State D public-Federal

**Category of Property**

(Check only one box)

IX! building D district D site

n structure D object

1 0 1 0

0 0 0 2 0

buildings sites structures objects Total

**Name of related multiple property listing**

(Enter "N/A" if property is not part of a multiple property listing.)

____________N/A____________

**Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register**

**6. Function or Use**
Historic Functions
(Enter categories from instructions)

DOMESTIC;

Single Dwelling

Current Functions
(Enter categories from instructions) RECREATION/CT JLTJRE:

Museum

7. Description

Architectural Classification
(Enter categories from instructions)

MTD-1Qthc.! OTHER:

Narrative Description

Greek Revival T-house

Materials
(Enter categories from instructions)

foundation walls

roof other

_SIQNE: Limestone

RRTCK STUCCO

WOOD: Shingle STONK: Limestone

(Describe the historic and current condition of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)

0
8. Statement of Significance

Applicable National Register Criteria
(Mark "X" in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for National Register listing.)

- A Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
- B Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.
- C Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.
- D Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Criteria Considerations
(Mark "X" in all the boxes that apply.)

- A owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes.
- B removed from its original location.
- C a birthplace or grave.
- D a cemetery.
- E a reconstructed building, object, or structure.
- F a commorative property.
- G less than 50 years of age or achieved significance within the past 50 years.

Areas of Significance
(Enter categories from instructions)

POLITICS/GOVERNMENT
ETHNIC HERITAGE: Native American
ETHNIC HERITAGE: European
COMMERCE
ARCHITECTURE
ARCHAEOLOGY: Historic-Aboriginal

Period of Significance
c.1818-1841

Significant Dates
1827

Significant Person
(Circle if Criterion B is marked above)
Richardville, Chief Jean B.

Cultural Affiliation
Miami

Architect/Builder
Hanna, Hugh
Ballard, A.G.

9. Major Bibliographic References

Bibliography
(Cite the books, articles, and other sources used in preparing this form on one or more continuation sheets.)

Primary location of additional data:
- State Historic Preservation Office
- Other State agency
- Federal agency
- Local government
- University
- Other

Name of repository:
Indiana State Library, Indiana University-Purdue
(Mark "x" in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for National Register listing.)

Alien, JNL County and State

**Areas of Significance**

(Enter categories from instructions)

PQH1CS/GQYERMNENI

ETHNIC HERITAGE- ETHNICLHERITAGE: £QMMERCK

ARCHITECTURE ARCHAEOLOGY;

**Period of Significance** c.1818-1841_____

**Significant Dates**

1827_____

**Significant Person**

(Complete if Criterion B is marked above)

.RichardvilTe,ChiefleanR____

**Cultural Affiliation**

Miami_____

**Architect/Builder**

Hanna, Hugh BallarfLAjCL

[X] A

[x] c

[X] D

Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.

Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.

Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Native American

European

Historic-Aboriginal

Criteria Considerations

(Mark “x” in all the boxes that apply.) Property is:

QA

DB

QC

DD

DE

DF QQ

owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes.

removed from its original location.

a birthplace or grave.

a cemetery.

a reconstructed building, object, or structure.
a commemorative property.

less than 50 years of age or achieved significance within the past 50 years.

**Narrative Statement of Significance**

(Explain the significance of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)

**9. Major Bibliographic References**

**Bibliography**

(Cite the books, articles, and other sources used in preparing this form on one or more continuation sheets.)

Previous documentation on file (NPS):

D preliminary determination of individual listing (36 CFR 67) has been requested

D previously listed in the National Register

D previously determined eligible by the National Register

D designated a National Historic Landmark

D recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey #

D recorded by Historic American Engineering Record #

**Primary location of additional data:**

IX] State Historic Preservation Office [X] Other State agency

D Federal agency

D Local government

[X] University

KI Other

Name of repository:

Indiana State Library, Indiana University-Purdue
10. Geographical Data

Acreage of Property ____.8 ac____

UTM References
(Place additional UTM references on a continuation sheet.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>43,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verbal Boundary Description
(Describe the boundaries of the property on a continuation sheet.)

Boundary Justification
(Explain why the boundaries were selected on a continuation sheet.)

11. Form Prepared By

name/title Richardville Committee/Lois Headings, Historian; Craig Leonard, HP Consultant

organization Allen County-Fort Wayne Historical Society ____________ date 10-28-96

street & number 302 E. Berry St. ____________ telephone 219.426.2882

city or town Fort Wayne ____________ state IN ____________ zip code 46802

Additional Documentation
Submit the following items with the completed form:

Continuation Sheets

Maps
A USGS map (7.5 or 15 minute series) indicating the property's location.
A Sketch map for historic districts and properties having large acreage or numerous resources.

Photographs
Representative black and white photographs of the property.

Additional items
(Check with the SHPO or FPO for any additional items)

Property Owner
(Complete this item at the request of SHPO or FPO.)

name Allen County-Fort Wayne Historical Society

street & number 302 E. Berry St. ____________ telephone 219.426.2882

 city or town Fort Wayne ____________ state IN ____________ zip code 46802

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement: This information is being collected for applications to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determine eligibility for listing, to list properties and to amend existing listings. Response to this request is required to obtain a benefit in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.).

Estimated Burden Statement: Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 18.1 hours per response including time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data, and completing and reviewing the form. Direct comments regarding this burden estimate or any aspect of this form to the Chief, Administrative Services Division, National Park Service, P.O. Box 3727, Washington, DC 20013-7127, and the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Projects (1024-0018), Washington, DC 20503.
10. Geographical Data

Acreage of Property .Sac UTM References

(Place additional UTM references on a continuation sheet.)

54 3|0|0 4(54365)0

Alien. JN_

Easting

Verbal Boundary Description

Northing

Zone

County and State

Easting

Northing

(Describe the boundaries of the property on a continuation sheet.)

Boundary Justification

(Explain why the boundaries were selected on a continuation sheet.)

11. Form Prepared By

name/title Richardville Cnmrmttee/T,nis Headings, Historian; Oaig Leonard^ HP Consultant

Organization Alien Cniinty-Fnrt Wayne Historical Society

street&number 302R.Berry St___________ city or town Fort Wayne

Additional Documentation

Submit the following items with the completed form:

Continuation Sheets Maps

date telephone
A USGS map (7.5 or 15 minute series) indicating the property's location.

A **Sketch map** for historic districts and properties having large acreage or numerous resources.

**Photographs**
Representative **black and white** photographs of the property.

**Additional items**

(Check with the SHPO or FPO for any additional items)

**PropertyOwner** ___________________________________________ (Complete this item at the request of SHPO or FPO.)

name Alien County-Fort Wayne Historical Society street & number 302 R-Rerry St.

city or town Fort Wayne state IN-

telephone

31Q 436-3887. zip code 46802

**PaperworkReductionActStatement:**

This information is being collected for application to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determine eligibility for listing, to list properties and to amend existing listings.

Response to this request is required to obtain a benefit in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.).

**EstimatedBurdenStatement:**

Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 18.1 hours per response including time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data, and completing and reviewing the form.

Direct comments regarding this burden estimate or any aspect of this form to the Chief, Administrative Services Division, National Park Service, P.O. Box 37127, Washington, DC 20013-7127; and the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Projects (1024-0018), Washington, DC 20503.

I I See continuation sheet
state

zip code

46802
The Chief Richardville House is located in what are now the southwestern suburbs of Fort Wayne, near the Wayne Dale area. While the immediate area of the house remains open space, the land to the west, along either side of Bluffton Road (Indiana 1), is lined with commercial and residential development (Photo 1). The house does not face Bluffton Road; instead it is oriented toward the banks of the St. Mary's River which is approximately one-half mile to the north-northeast. The site of the house is a low bluff that is near the geographical center of a tract of land that was given to Chief Richardville as part of the 1818 Treaty of St. Mary's; the hillock is one of the highest points in the area. Though the fields to the north of the house are now the grounds of the Southwest Conservation Club, the land to the south has been extensively quarried for sand and gravel. The quarrying came within about one hundred feet of the house on the east, south, and southwest; the steep slope has since become clad in trees and underbrush.

The Richardville House is a brick I-House with a two story side-gabled rectangular main block that has a one and a half story gabled rear wing attached to its southwest rear corner; the rear alcove thus formed originally had a porch roofed by an extension of the rake of the rear wing's roof; the porch has since been enclosed (Photos 2, 3). The five bay facade (Photo 4) faces north, overlooking a broad slope. The walls of the house are now clad in stucco that is flush with the faces of the cut stone lintels. The limestone rubble walls of the foundation are topped by a cut stone water table with vertical tooling on the main block's facade; elsewhere the stucco extends to the grade line. The walls of the entire house are topped by a plain wide frieze beneath plain projecting eaves with scroll-sawn rafter ends. Inspection of the roof framing during a 1992 re-roofing showed that the present roofline is the product of later alteration; the eave projections are made of a variety of reused materials. An idea of the house's original appearance is provided by an historic photograph of a similar house that stood in Fort Wayne until c.1914; it may have been built for Samuel Hanna by his brother Hugh, who was one of the contractors for the Richardville House. That building (Photo 5) had walls crowned by a wide frieze with returns on the facade and corbie-stepped parapet gables with engaged end wall chimneys on the ends of the main block. That structure also had a Greek Revival front door surround nearly identical to that of the Richardville House: it had a door flanked by engaged pilasters enframed behind a shouldered architrave casing with battered sides. On the Richardville House, the front door is set beneath a two-light transom and the door itself has a long light over two panels with raised moldings, the last probably a later alteration (Photo 6). While most of the windows of the Richardville House are double-hung units, the wide mullions of the six-over-one sash suggest that they date from the early twentieth century; only the transom sash over the front door has the type of thin mullion generally associated with early buildings in the area.
The Chief Richardville House is located in what are now the southwestern suburbs of Fort Wayne, near the Waynedale area. While the immediate area of the house remains open space, the land to the west, along either side of Bluffton Road (Indiana 1), is lined with commercial and residential development (Photo 1). The house does not face Bluffton Road; instead it is oriented toward the banks of the St. Mary's River which is approximately one-half mile to the northeast. The site of the house is a low bluff that is near the geographical center of a tract of land that was given to Chief Richardville as part of the 1818 Treaty of St. Mary's; the hillock is one of the highest points in the area. Though the fields to the north of the house are now
the grounds of the Southwest Conservation Club, the land to the south has been extensively quarried for sand and gravel. The quarrying came within about one hundred feet of the house on the east, south, and southwest; the steep slope has since become clad in trees and underbrush.

The Richardville House is a brick I-House with a two story side-gabled rectangular main block that has a one and a half story gabled rear wing attached to its southwest rear corner; the rear alcove thus formed originally had a porch roofed by an extension of the rake of the rear wing's roof; the porch has since been enclosed (Photos 2, 3). The five bay facade (Photo 4) faces north, overlooking a broad slope. The wallsof the house are now clad in stucco that is flush with the faces of the cut stone lintels. The limestone rubble wallsof the foundation are topped by a cut stone water table with vertical tooling on the main block's facade; elsewhere the stucco extends to the grade line. The walls of the entire house are topped by a plain wide frieze beneath plain projecting eaves with scroll-sawn rafter ends. Inspection of the roof framing during a 1992 re-roofing showed that the present roofline is the product of later alteration;
the eave projections are made of a variety of reused materials. An idea of the house’s original appearance is provided by an historic photograph of a similar house that stood in Fort Wayne until c.1914; it may have been built for Samuel Hanna by his brother Hugh, who was one of the contractors for the Richardville House. That building (Photo 5) had walls crowned by a wide frieze with returns on the facade and corbie-stepped parapet gables with engaged end wall chimneys on the end of the main block. That structure also had a Greek Revival front door surround nearly identical to that of the Richardville House: it had a door flanked by engaged pilasters enframed behind a shouldered architrave casing with battered sides. On the Richardville House, the front door is set beneath a two-light transom and the door itself has a long light over two panels with raised moldings, the last probably a later alteration (Photo 6). While most of the windows of the Richardville House are double-hung units, the wide mullions of the six-over-one sash suggest that they date from the early twentieth century; only the transom sash over the front
door has the type of thin mullion generally associated with early buildings in the area.
Architectural Description

A number of features probably were included in a remodeling done c.1915 by a later owner, Judge Samuel Alden. These include the six-over-one sash installed in most of the windows, the stuccoing of the exterior, and the enclosure of the rear porch alcove with a ribbon of high windows to create a sun room. Taken together, these features were likely intended to refashion the exterior in the manner of the popular Craftsman and Colonial Revival styles. Another feature that may also have been a part of that renovation was a one bay porch that until recently sheltered the front door; it had a classical architrave supported by two Tuscan piers. Lore to the effect that the facade once had a one story Victorian porch across its width has yet to be confirmed. An historic photograph in the possession of the present owner shows that the rear alcove porch was once supported by plain stop-chamfered square posts.

The interior of the Richardville House has a characteristic central hall I-House plan with one room on either side of the stair hall on each floor of the main block and the space in the rear wing unevenly divided into two rooms by a lateral partition. The four rooms of the main block were heated by gable-positioned hearths with interior chimneys. The house has plastered walls and ceilings and hardwood floors of oak and poplar. The Richardville House has an unfinished basement under the main block whose rubble walls have been reinforced with concrete; a crawl space extends under the rear wing. In addition to the front stairway in the main block, an enclosed stairs against the end (south) wall of the rear wing provides access to a loft.

The central hall (Photo 7) is dominated by the main stairs, which lands on the west side of the room. The starting newel has a series of simple urn-shaped profiles, and the base of the handrail forms a holiday atop the newel (Photo 8). Otherwise, the stair has a balustrade composed of tapered spindles standing on the open ends of the treads and supporting a delicate ogee-section handrail. Though portions are now painted, the entire stairs (excluding the oak treads) appears to be made of walnut. The handrail continues uninterrupted up the stairway and forms radiused corners that follow the return of the upper run of treads and the rectangular stairwell opening. In the hall, a door under the upper run of the stairs originally opened onto the back porch; it now provides access into a short hall that is alongside a modern half bath built into the porch.

The room to the east of the hall on the first floor was presumably the parlor. A hearth is centered on the east wall of the room, flanked by alcoves formed by the chimney's projection (Photo 9). Broad casings with shouldered architrave trim formed by a plain square bolection are used on the parlor casings, and the same motif is repeated in the design of the room’s mantelpiece. The tall baseboards are capped with a plain Doric torus. The windows are set into shallow reveals
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A number of features probably were included in a remodeling done c.1915 by a later owner, Judge Samuel Alden. These include the six-over-one sash installed in most of the windows, the stuccoing of the exterior, and the enclosure of the rearporchalcovewitharibbonofhighwindowstocreateasunroom. Taken together, these features were likely intended to refashion the exterior in the manner of the popular Craftsman and Colonial Revival styles. Another feature that may also have been a part of that renovation was a one bay porch that until recently sheltered the front door; it had a classical architrave supported by two Tuscanpiers. LoretotheeffectthatthefacadeoncehadonestoryVictorian porch across its width has yet to be confirmed. An historic
photograph in the possession of the present owner shows that the rear alcove porch was once supported by plain stop-chamfered square posts.

The interior of the Richardville House has a characteristic central hall I-House plan with one room on either side of the stair hall on each floor of the main block and the space in the rear wing unevenly divided into two rooms by a lateral partition.

The four rooms of the main block were heated by gable-positioned hearthswithinteriorchimneys.

The house has plastered walls and ceilings and hardwood floors of oak and poplar.

The Richardville House has an unfinished basement under the main block whose rubble walls have been reinforced with concrete; acrawlspace extends under the rear wing.

In addition to the front stairway in the main block, an enclosed stairs against the end (south) wall of the rear wing provides access to a loft.

The central hall (Photo 7) is dominated by the main stairs, which lands on the westsideoftheroom.

The starting newel has a series of simple urn-shaped profiles, and
the base of the handrail forms a holiday atop the newel (Photo 8). Otherwise, the stair has a balustrade composed of tapered spindles standing on the open ends of the treads and supporting a delicate ogee-section handrail. Though portions are now painted, the entire stairs (excluding the oak treads) appear to be made of walnut.

The handrail continues uninterrupted up the stairway and forms radiused corners that follow the return of the upper run of treads and the rectangular stairwell opening.

In the hall, a door under the upper run of the stairs originally opened onto the back porch; it now provides access into a short hall that is alongside a modern half bath built into the porch.

The room to the east of the hall on the first floor was presumably the parlor. A hearth is centered on the east wall of the room, flanked by alcoves formed by the chimney's projection (Photo 9). Broad casings with shouldered architrave trim formed by a plain square bolection are used on the parlor casings, and the same motif is repeated in the design of the room's mantelpiece. The tall baseboards are capped with a plain Doric torus. The windows are set into shallow reveals.
behind the casings and have paneled aprons beneath their sills (Photo 10). This same treatment, but with the use of shouldered profiles limited to the mantle only, is repeated in the presumed dining room on the west side of the first floor (Photo 11). The dining room also differs in that the fireplace is flanked on either side by cased openings that presently have cupboards surmounted by open shelving; the cupboard doors appear to have been made by cutting down original full-length doors. The masonry of the dining room fireplace is covered with a modern brick and tile veneer and the floor is a c.1950 replacement in maple.

The treatment of the fireplace wall seen in the dining room is repeated in the east chamber on the second floor, where the original full-length doors survive on shallow closets (Photo 12). The arrangement seen in the parlor is repeated in the west chamber, where a modern window has been added to the south of the mantle (Photo 13). Though the chambers continue the use of wide bolection casings, the windows are set above plain sills and aprons, and the use of shouldered profiles is everywhere omitted. The tall baseboards in these rooms have plain beveled tops.

The rear wing of the house appears to be the area most altered over time. At present, it has a room immediately behind the dining room and a smaller room beyond. The first space has two doors on its east wall; one opens into the modern rear hall and the other provides access to the former back porch. The room has a single window on its west wall, and a door into the dining room in the center of its north wall. The south wall of this room is a frame partition that has a cupboard-cum-bookcase built into it on the west side of a concealed chimney (Photo 14). A simple chair rail extends around the room, but at a height that puts it above the sill line of the window.

The smaller room in the rear wing has an enclosure for the back stairs against under the stairs are finished with four-panel doors of the type seen elsewhere in the house (Photo 15). A door on the east side of the room provides access to the enclosed back porch, opposite a window that is centered on the west wall of the room. A modern kitchen base counter is centered on the north side of the room, and a recess with shelving is located on the west end of that wall.

The knee-walled loft above the rear wing is also divided by a lateral partition that is directly above the corresponding wall on the first level. The middle of this partition has a wide opening in which the brick stack corbels to the north before piercing the ridge line of the roof (Photo 16). The loft otherwise has plastered walls and ceilings and a hardwood floor. The top of the back stairway lacks any balustrade. Access into the west chamber of the main wing is provided by steps at an opening that is likely to be a later alteration.
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behind the casings and have paneled aprons beneath their sills (Photo 10). This same treatment, but with the use of shouldered profiles limited to the mantle only, is repeated in the presumed dining room on the west side of the first floor (Photo 11). The dining room also differs in that the fireplace is flanked on either side by cased openings that presently have cupboards surmounted by open shelving; the cupboard doors appear to have been made by cutting down original full-length doors.

The masonry of the dining room fireplace is covered with a modern brick and tile veneer and the floor is a c.1950 replacement in maple.
The treatment of the fireplace wall seen in the dining room is repeated in the east chamber on the second floor, where the original full-length doors survive on shallow closets (Photo 12). The arrangement seen in the parlor is repeated in the west chamber, where a modern window has been added to the south of the mantle (Photo 13). Though the chambers continue the use of wide bolection casings, the windows are set above plain sills and aprons, and the use of shouldered profiles is everywhere omitted.

The tall baseboards in these rooms have plain beveled tops.

The rear wing of the house appears to be the area most altered over time. At present, it has a room immediately behind the dining room and a smaller room beyond. The first space has two doors on its east wall; one opens into the modern rear hall and the other provides access to the former back porch. The room has a single window on its west wall, and a door into the dining room in the center of its north wall. The south wall of this room is a frame partition that has a cupboard-cum-bookcase built into it on the west side of a concealed chimney.
A simple chair rail extends around the room, but at a height that puts it above the sill line of the window.

The smaller room in the rear wing has an enclosure for the back stairs against the southeast corner of the room. Both the base of the back stairs and a closet under the stairs are finished with four-panel doors of the type seen elsewhere in the house (Photo 15). A door on the east side of the room provides access to the enclosed back porch, opposite a window that is centered on the west wall of the room. A modern kitchen base counter is centered on the north side of the room, and a recess with shelving is located on the west end of that wall.

The knee-walled loft above the rear wing is also divided by a lateral partition that is directly above the corresponding wall on the first level. The middle of this partition has a wide opening in which the brick stack corbels to the north before piercing the ridge line of the roof (Photo 16). The loft otherwise has plastered walls and ceilings and a hardwood floor. The top of the back stairway lacks any balustrade.
Access into the west chamber of the main wing is provided by steps at an opening that is likely to be a later alteration.
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The extent to which the present house is the same structure that was built for Richardville in 1827 is illuminated by a document now in the Indiana State Library. The papers of John Tipton, the Indian Agent who was responsible for the construction of nine houses that were provided for prominent Miami according to the terms of the 1826 Treaty of Mississinewa, are located there. A sheet dated August 30, 1827, entitled “1827 Plan of J.B. Richardville’s House” combines the modern functions of architectural plans and specifications, as well as construction contract (see Attachment C). The sketch plans, shown on one side of the page surrounded by specifications, show a scheme that is a mirror-image of the present house as it exists today with respect to the placement of the rear wing. The rear wing itself is shown as a single room seventeen feet square with a hearth centered on its end (south) wall and no rear stairs. The reversal of the plan can probably be explained simply in terms of re-orienting the house to protect the back porch from the prevailing southwesterly winds; interpretation of the rest of the differences between the plan and the rear wing as it presently exists will require further investigation. At present, neither the lateral wall nor the crawlspace below provide any readily apparent evidence of a vanished kitchen hearth. Preliminary archeological investigation on the west side of the rear wing does suggest that the rear wing has been extended to the south. The outline of a lower roof on the rear wing’s gable shows the location of a wooden garage which was likely demolished in the 1960s.

Selective demolition of small areas of the exterior stucco reveals that the face of the brick was heavily abraded to enhance the stucco’s adhesion. The most intact exterior brick surface today is that above the front door surround, where the later porch had covered the face of the wall. This brickwork does bear out the 1827 specification, which calls for the masonry to be “pointed and pencilled,” i.e., given joints with rodded tooling. A much larger area of exposed (yet painted) brick, along with the stone foundation, is located on the gable wall of the rear wing. The 1827 specifications also called for both a paneled front door and paneled window shutters; rabbet marks for the shutter hinges can be found on the jambs of the windows. There is also a note to the effect that the “gutters” (perhaps a timber cornice?) were to be painted white, and the roof was to be red.

While the exterior of the Richardville House has been altered by the covering of the brickwork, alteration of the roofline, and enclosure of the back porch, it retains features such as its fine Greek Revival door surround. The house also maintains integrity as an early I-House and is the oldest documented house in northeast Indiana. The interior of the house is remarkably intact in terms of having retained most of the original plan, as well as the principal architectural elements: front door surround, stairway, and monumentally scaled woodwork and mantelpieces. Though the French carpets, wallpapers, and draperies that were
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The extent to which the present house is the same structure that was built for Richardville in 1827 is illuminated by a document now in the Indiana State Library. The papers of John Tipton, the Indian Agent who was responsible for the construction of nine houses that were provided for prominent Miami according to the terms of the 1826 Treaty of Mississinewa, are located there. A sheet dated August 30, 1827, entitled "1827 Plan of J.B. Richardville's House" combines the modern functions of architectural plans and specifications, as well as construction contract (see Attachment C). The sketch plans, shown on one side of the page surrounded by specifications, show a scheme that is a mirror-image of the present house as it exists today with respect to the placement of the rear wing. The rear wing itself is shown as a single room seventeen feet square with a hearth centered on its end (south) wall and no rear stairs. The
reversal of the plan can probably be explained simply in terms of re-orienting the house to protect the back porch from the prevailing southwesterly winds; interpretation of the rest of the differences between the plan and the rear wing as it presently exists will require further investigation. At present, neither the lateral wall nor the crawlspace below provide any readily apparent evidence of a vanished kitchenhearth.

Preliminary archeological investigation on the west side of the rear wing does suggest that the rear wing has been extended to the south. The outline of a lower roof on the rear wing's gable shows the location of a wooden garage which was likely demolished in the 1960s.

Selective demolition of small areas of the exterior stucco reveals that the face of the brick was heavily abraded to enhance the stucco's adhesion. The most intact exterior brick surface today is that above the front door surround, where the later porch had covered the face of the wall. This brickwork does bear out the 1827 specification, which calls for the masonry to be "pointed and pencilled," i.e., given joints with rodded tooling. A much larger area of exposed (yet painted) brick, along with the stone foundation, is located on the gable wall of the rear wing. The 1827 specifications also
called for both a paneled front door and paneled window shutters; rabbet marks for the shutter hinges can be found on the jambs of the windows. There is also a note to the effect that the "gutters" (perhaps a timber cornice?) were to be painted white, and the roof was to be red.

While the exterior of the Richardville House has been altered by the covering of the brickwork, alteration of the roofline, and enclosure of the back porch, it retains features such as its fine Greek Revival door surround. The house also maintains integrity as an early I-House and is the oldest documented house in northeast Indiana. The interior of the house is remarkably intact in terms of having retained most of the original plan, as well as the principal architectural elements: front door surround, stairway, and monumentally scaled woodwork and mantlepieces. Though the French carpets, wallpapers, and draperies that were
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Architectural Description

Described by visitors have long since vanished, enough remains of the original character of the house to provide compelling tangible evidence of Chief Richardville's presence in this place.

Archaeological Description

For two field seasons, 1992 and 1995, students of the Indiana Purdue University Fort Wayne Archaeological Field School, under the direction of Dr. Robert J. Jeske, participated in archaeological excavations at the Richardville site. The excavations provided historic data from the 20th, 19th, and late 18th centuries, as well as prehistoric materials from the Late Woodland (circa AD 500-1300) and Late Archaic (circa 3500-4500 years BP). The primary significance of the site is the cultural material which it has yielded and is likely to yield for the period which the site was occupied by Chief Jean Baptiste de Richardville. It will be possible to study the archaeology of the individual with material from this site, and perhaps other Richardville-affiliated properties in the region. The site has also provided important construction information about the house itself. The presence of prehistoric, contact period, and historic components at the site provides a unique opportunity to study culture contact and change.

The Richardville House site is located in the St. Marys River Valley. The St. Marys River flows northwest from headwaters in Auglaize County, Ohio to its confluence with the St. Joseph River in Fort Wayne, Indiana. The two rivers combine to form the Maumee River, which flows to Lake Erie. The St. Marys forms the south and western border of the Maumee River Basin and forms part of the boundary between the Tipton Till Plain and the Maumee Lacustrine Plain, or Black Swamp Natural Area.

Fort Wayne, which is located at the confluence of the rivers, sits on a continental divide. Rain that falls at Fort Wayne flows north and east to the Great Lakes. Rain that falls just two miles west of the confluence flows south and west to the Mississippi River, via the Little River, Wabash, and Ohio. The portage area between the Great Lakes and Mississippi drainages was known as the 9 mile portage, and was a critically important link in transportation during the early historic period. The Miami Indians referred to the area as the "Gateway." The location of the Richardville House is not accidentally on high ground overlooking the portage route.

The Richardville House archaeological site is composed of the remainder of the land included within the boundaries of this nomination. Because of the extensive sand and gravel quarry operation which thrived around the house, the ground drops off sharply on all but the north and northwest sides of the boundary. This parcel of land today, which is 0.8 acre, is primarily a lawn
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described by visitors have long since vanished, enough 
remains of the original character of the house to provide 
compelling tangible evidence of Chief Richardville's 
presence in this place.

Archaeological Description

For two field seasons, 1992 and 1995, students of the 
Indiana Purdue University Fort Wayne Archaeological Field 
School, under the direction of Dr. Robert J. Jeske, 
participated in archaeological excavations at the 
Richardville site. The excavations provided historic data 
from the 20th, 19th, and late 18th centuries, as well as 
prehistoric materials from the Late Woodland (circa AD 500-
1300) and Late Archaic (circa 3500-4500 years BP). The 
primary significance of the site is the cultural material
which it has yielded and is likely to yield for the period
which the site was occupied by Chief Jean Baptiste de Richardville.
It will be possible to study the archaeology of the
individual with material from this site,
and perhaps other Richardville-
affiliated properties in the region. The site has
also provided important construction information about the house it
self. The presence of prehistoric, contact period, and
historic components at the site provides a unique
opportunity to study culture contact and change.
The Richardville House site is located in the St. Marys River Valley.
The St. Marys River flows northwest from headwaters in
Auglaize County, Ohio to its confluence with the St. Joseph
River in Fort Wayne, Indiana. The two rivers combine to
form the Maumee River, which flows to Lake Erie. The St.
Marys forms the south and western border of the Maumee
River Basin and forms part of the boundary between the
Tipton Till Plain and the Maumee Lacustrine Plain, or Black
Swamp Natural Area.
Fort Wayne, which is located at the confluence of the
rivers, sits on a continental divide.
Rain that falls at Fort Wayne flows north and east to the Great Lakes. Rain that falls just two miles west of the confluence flows south and west to the Mississippi River, via the Little River, Wabash, and Ohio. The portage area between the Great Lakes and Mississippi drainages was known as the 9 mile portage, and was a critically important link in transportation during the early historic period.

The Miami Indians referred to the area as the "Gateway." The location of the Richardville House is not accidentally on high ground overlooking the portage route.

The Richardville House archaeological site is composed of the remainder of the land included within the boundaries of this nomination. Because of the extensive sand and gravel quarry operation which thrived around the house, the ground drops off sharply on all but the north and northwest sides of the boundary.

This parcel of land today, which is 0.8 acre, is primarily a lawn.
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with several mature Maple and Pine trees. The lawn slopes north from the front of the house to a concrete walk and steps. An asphalt drive and parking area is situated at the base of the slope, an extension of a drive from Bluffton Road. A deteriorated asphalt drive circles the house. This drive cuts through the hillside somewhat on the west side of the house, but the grade levels as the drive turns toward the rear (or south side) of the house and continues around the east side. Because of the disturbance by the quarry operation, it is likely that archaeological materials remain in greatest density relatively close to the house.

Excavations were undertaken at the Richardville House in 1992 and 1995 (see Attachment J). The 1992 artifacts have been analyzed. The 1995 artifacts are still undergoing analysis, with the exception of the stone tools and debris. For the most part, 1992 data will be used when discussing the artifacts from the site. A total of 15 two by two and 11 by 2 meter units were excavated at the site. Units were excavated in natural or cultural units until sterile levels were reached. All material was screened, except for samples taken for flotation analysis, which is not yet completed.

Initial excavations indicate that the northern portion of the house is somewhat disturbed by sewer, water pipe, and other recent construction. The western portion is relatively undisturbed. The eastern portion of the house is also disturbed, but provides some very interesting data about house construction and the site formation process. In 1995 the 20th century covered porch was removed. Coins dated between 1903 and 1956 found here suggest that the site has been heavily damaged by metal collectors. In the two test units under the porch area, over 50 coins were recovered. Only a dozen coins were recovered from the other 14 units at the site. Even with the understanding that coins may be more common at entranceways, the distribution strongly suggests that metal detectors have dug up around the house extensively.

Although distributed across the site, 93% of the prehistoric materials came from the western side of the house. A total of 525 chert flakes and debris pieces came from the 1/4 inch screens. Flakes are distributed primarily between 20 and 50 centimeters below ground surface. Materials include local cherts as well as Wyandotte cherts from southern Indiana and Flint Ridge and Mercer cherts from Ohio.

The stone tools include diagnostic points from the Late Archaic such as a brewerton eared and unnamed corner notched as well as a Late Archaic/early Woodland Meadowood point and a Late Archaic humpback triangular. In addition, there are three triangular points from the Late Woodland, including one nice humpback. A pair of unifacial endscrapers made from Mercer chert, probably dating to the Late Archaic, were recovered from the lower strata of the site.
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with several mature Maple and Pine trees. The lawn slopes north from the front of the house to a concrete walk and steps. An asphalt drive and parking area is situated at the base of the slope, an extension of a drive from Bluffton Road. A deteriorated asphalt drive circles the house. This drive cuts through the hillside somewhat on the west side of the house, but the grade levels as the drive turns toward the rear (or south side) of the house and continues around the east side. Because of the disturbance by the quarry operation, it is likely that archeological materials remain in greatest density relatively close to the house. Excavations were undertaken at the Richardville House in 1992 and 1995 (see Attachment J). The 1992 artifacts have been analyzed. The 1995 artifacts are
still undergoing analysis, with the exception of the stone tools and debris. For the most part, 1992 data will be used when discussing the artifacts from the site.

A total of 15 two-by-two and 11 by 2 meter units were excavated at the site. Units were excavated in natural or cultural units until sterile levels were reached. All material was screened, except for samples taken for flotation analysis, which is not yet completed.

Initial excavations indicate that the northern portion of the house is somewhat disturbed by sewer, water pipe, and other recent construction. The western portion is relatively undisturbed.

The eastern portion of the house is also disturbed, but provides some very interesting data about house construction and the site formation process.

In 1995 the 20th century covered porch was removed. Coins dated between 1903 and 1956 found here suggest that the site has been heavily damaged by metal collectors.

In the two test units under the porch area, over 50 coins were recovered.

Only a dozen coins were recovered from the other
14 units at the site.

Even with the understanding that coins may be more common at entranceways, the distribution strongly suggests that metal detectors have dug up around the house extensively.

Although distributed across the site, 93% of the prehistoric materials came from the western side of the house. A total of 525 chert flakes and debris pieces came from the 1/4 inch screens.

Flakes are distributed primarily between 20 and 50 centimeters below ground surface. Materials include local cherts as well as Wyandotte cherts from southern Indiana and Flint Ridge and Mercer cherts from Ohio.

The stone tools include diagnostic points from the Late Archaic such as a brewerton eared and unnamed corner notched as well as a Late Archaic/early Woodland Meadowood point and a Late Archaic humpback triangular.

In addition, there are three triangular points from the Late Woodland, including one nice humpback. A pair of unifacial endscrapers made from Mercer chert, probably dating to the Late Archaic, were recovered from the lower strata of the site.
Archaeological Description

Contact period materials of the 18th century recovered from the site include a knife made from a French gunflint and beads (which are perhaps prehistoric). Some 2200 sherds of historic ceramics were recovered in 1992, over 75% of which was whiteware. Over 90% of the whiteware is in the top 20cm of the site deposits. Decorated wares are more evenly distributed from top to bottom in the site strata. Most of the whiteware appears to be relatively late: two marks are possibly as early as 1830 to 1840, but with 6 other identified makers marks ranging from 1870 to 1900.

Approximately 1% of the assemblage was creamware, thought to date from 1760 to 1820, and is associated with either the house or the immediately prior occupation of the site.

Other decorated wares include annular wares, edge decorated wares, and transfer prints, including a Persia pattern (1819-1860) and Chintz I print dating to the 1840s. Hand painted polychrome materials from the 1830s to 1860 are found. In addition, a Wedgewood marble pattern and British flowers black transfer wares from 1834-1860 are found. The site also contains flow blue--192 sherds, including early floral patterns from the 1840s. Decal over black transfer material is found, but red and purple transfer wares of the 1870s to 1900 are curiously absent. Both porcelain and decorated porcelain are found in low numbers. Stonewares and earthen wares are probably relatively late and are found in low frequency.

Metal items recovered from the site include a straight razor, three pocket knife fragments, a relatively few bullet shells and percussion caps, three silver spoon fragments, a brass necklace clasp as well as a brass clasp for a jewelry box, a horseshoe and harness buckles, a mantle clock gear mechanism, and a ladies compact inscribed Garden Court--likely dating to c.1890.

Bone and shell materials were abundant, including over 2870 pieces of animal bone. Pig and cow are present, as are deer and dog. Three bone buttons and four shell buttons were found. The bone buttons are suspected to date to 1750-1830; the shell (not mother of pearl) buttons to 1830-1865.

Clay pipe stems and bowls are also present in several varieties. The earliest bowl fragment dates to c.1830.

Curiously absent from the assemblage of artifacts are materials from the late Victorian age. This period coincides with the time when the property was often involved with litigation, but it would seem unlikely that the house was abandoned or even intermittently occupied. In addition, very few women's articles were recovered, such as needles, pins, thimbles, and stays. Historical anecdotes
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Chief Jean B. Richardville House Alien County, IN

Archaeological Description

Contact period materials of the 18th century recovered from the site include a knife made from a French gunflint and beads (which are perhaps prehistoric). Some 2200 sherds of historic ceramics were recovered in 1992, over 75% of which was whiteware. Over 90% of the whiteware is in the top 20 cm of the site deposits.

Decorated wares are more evenly distributed from top to bottom in the site strata. Most of the whiteware appears to be relatively late: two marks are possibly as early as 1830 to 1840, but with 6 other identified makers marks ranging from 1870 to 1900.
Approximately 1% of the assemblage was creamware, thought to date from 1760 to 1820, and is associated with either the house or the immediately prior occupation of the site.

Other decorated wares include annular wares, edge decorated wares, and transfer prints, including a Persia pattern (1819-1860) and Chintz I print dating to the 1940s. Hand painted polychrome materials from the 1830s to 1860 are found. In addition, a Wedgewood marble pattern and British flowers black transfer wares from 1834-1860 are found. The site also contains flow blue-192 sherds, including early floral patterns from the 1840s. Decal over black transfer material is found, but red and purple transfer wares of the 1870s to 1900 are curiously absent.

Both porcelain and decorated porcelain are found in low numbers. Stonewares and earthen wares are probably relatively late and are found in low frequency.

Metal items recovered from the site include a straight razor, three pocket knife fragments, a relatively few bullet shells and percussion caps, three silver spoon fragments, a brass necklace clasp as well as a brass clasp for a jewelry box, a horseshoe and harness buckles, a mantle clock gear mechanism, and a ladies compact inscribed Garden Court—likely dating to c.1890.
Bone and shell materials were abundant, including over 2870 pieces of animal bone. Pig and cow are present, as are deer and dog. Three bone buttons and four shell buttons were found. The bone buttons are suspected to date to 1750-1830; the shell (not mother of pearl) buttons to 1830-1865.

Claypipe stems and bowls are also present in several varieties. The earliest bowl fragment dates to c.1830.

Curiously absent from the assemblage of artifacts are materials from the late Victorian age. This period coincides with the time when the property was often involved with litigation, but it would seem unlikely that the house was abandoned or even intermittently occupied.

In addition, very few women’s articles were recovered, such as needles, pins, thimbles, and stays.

Historical anecdotes
Archaeological Description

suggest that Natoqueah did not live in the house with Richardville, and the excavations lend credence to this notion. Further investigation is needed to resolve these issues.

Archaeological evidence has provided important information about the construction of the house, as well as information about its occupants. A massive limestone footing with a 15 inch diameter post remains at the front door of the house, suggesting a large porch early in the history of the house—perhaps a Greek Revival portico. Over 500 square nails have been recovered from the site, but only 25 were hand-wrought. Machine cut nails were common by 1830. Some of these nails are slate roofing nails, the only indication that the house may have once had a slate roof. There is a 3 to 2 ratio of square to round nails; the relative lack of round nails suggesting that the house has seen little modification since 1890.

The Richardville site has proven valuable in providing information about both the Richardville House and its occupants. The site holds great potential for further investigation through excavation of the immediate area of the house as well as the edges of the site beneath the asphalt drives. These areas hold potential for locating outbuilding foundations, privies, and perhaps even the residence of Natoqueah.
Chief Jean B. Richervilla House Alien County, IN

Archaeological Description

suggest that Natoequeah did not live in the house with Richardville, and the excavations lend credence to this notion. Further investigation is needed to resolve these issues.

Archaeological evidence has provided important information about the construction of the house, as well as information about its occupants. A massive limestone footing with a 15 inch diameter post remains at the front door of the house, suggesting a large porch early in the history of the house—perhaps a Greek Revival portico. Over 500 square nails have been recovered from the site, but only 25 were hand-wrought. Machine cut nails were common by 1830. Some of these nails are slate roofing nails, the only indication that the house may have once had a slate roof. There is a 3 to 2 ratio of square to round nails; the relative lack of round
nails suggesting that the house has seen little modification since 1890.

The Richardville site has proven valuable in providing information about both the Richardville House and its occupants. The site holds great potential for further investigation through excavation of the immediate area of the house as well as the edges of the site beneath the asphalt drives. These areas hold potential for locating outbuilding foundations, privies, and perhaps even the residence of Natoequeah.
Chief Jean B. Richardville House  
Allen County, IN

Description-National Significance

The 0.8 acre parcel delineated in the verbal boundary description and the building (Greek Revival I-House) described above under "Architectural Description" contribute to the national significance of the Chief Jean-Baptiste de Richardville House. A national level of significance for the archaeological site on the property is not claimed or addressed by this nomination.
Chief Jean B. Richardville House Alien County, IN

Description—National Significance

OMB No. 1024-0018

The 0.8 acre parcel delineated in the verbal boundary description and the building (Greek Revival I-House) described above under "Architectural Description" contribute to the national significance of the Chief Jean-Baptiste de Richardville House. A national level of significance for the archaeological site on the property is not claimed or addressed by this nomination.
The Chief Jean-Baptiste de Richardville House is significant under Criterion B for its association with Richardville, who was born during the period of French control of the Old Northwest and served as the chief of the Miami Indians during the critical time when treaties were negotiated with the United States government for their removal from Indiana. Richardville is also significant as a métis; half French and half Miami, he was the product of French settlement methods in the Old Northwest and used his ability to relate to both European and Native American cultures to his advantage. Richardville was not only a skilled leader and negotiator, but he also gained tremendous wealth as a trader. The Richardville House is also significant under Criterion C as an excellent example of a Greek Revival I-House, a now rare building form in Fort Wayne. The house is very unique in that its construction was subsidized by the 1826 Treaty of Mississinewa. It is believed to be the only treaty house east of the Mississippi River that is still intact and on its original site. An 1827 sheet with plans and specifications survives, making it the oldest documented building in the region. The property is also significant under Criterion D. Both the historical record and evidence at the site indicate that Richardville lived at this site from at least 1818. Archaeological fieldwork at the Richardville site has yielded significant information about the occupation of the site through time, as well as the construction of the house. Further excavation and study promises to provide key information about Richardville the individual—and about his family.

The primary significance of the Richardville House and site lies in the political life and background of Chief Richardville. His considerable political skills were due mainly to his being a métis, Richard White's typical "man in the Middle Ground" (The Middle Ground), who were crucial negotiators and brokers between the Native American and European cultures when their confrontation and resolution shaped 17th, 18th, and early 19th century American history. Richardville's life and times especially illuminate the history of the Old Northwest. This area has been conventionally portrayed as first, a battleground of European colonial powers and their manipulated Indian allies, and second, as an American military conquest of "savages" in a wilderness—for the justifiable purpose of expanding territory for civilized and civilizing settlers. New research on the influence of the métis shines new light on this picture. In particular, Richardville's life from his métis birth in 1761 to his final treaty negotiations at the Forks of the Wabash in 1840 shows in all its ambiguity and complexity this influence as White describes it, "the middle ground depended on Indian-White distinctions, but it also depended on the porousness of the boundaries between Indian and white" (White, 506). In addition to his political and leadership ability, Richardville was a well-trained and skillful trader, the basis for his becoming probably the most wealthy Native American in the country in his lifetime (Chaput, 114). This wealth illustrates Richardville's ability to use his role and skills to benefit both his tribe and himself.
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Chief Jean B. Richardville House Alien County, IN

Statement of Significance-Criterion B

The Chief Jean-Baptiste de Richardville House is significant under Criterion B for its association with Richardville, who was born during the period of French control of the Old Northwest and served as the chief of the Miami. Indians during the critical time when treaties were negotiated with the United States government for their removal from Indiana. Richardville is also significant as a *metis*; half French and half Miami, he was the product of French settlement methods in the Old Northwest and used his ability to relate to both European and Native American cultures to his advantage. Richardville was not only a skilled leader and negotiator, but he also gained tremendous wealth as a trader. The Richardville House is also significant under Criterion C as an excellent example
of a Greek Revival I-House, an now rare building for in Fort Wayne.

The house is very unique in that its construction was subsidized by the 1826 Treaty of Mississinewa.

It is believed to be the only treaty house east of the Mississippi River that is still intact and on its original site. An 1827 sheet with plans and specifications survives, making it the oldest documented building in the region.

The property is also significant under Criterion D.

Both the historical record and evidence at the site indicate that Richardville lived at this site from at least 1818. Archaeological fieldwork at the Richardville site has yielded significant information about the occupation of the site through time, as well as the construction of the house.

Further excavation and study promise to provide key information about Richardville the individual—and about his family.

The primary significance of the Richardville House and site lies in the political life and background of Chief Richardville. His considerable political skills were due mainly to his being a metis, Richard White's typical "man in the Middle Ground" (The Middle Ground), who were crucial negotiators and brokers between the Native American and
European cultures when their confrontation and resolution shaped 17th, 18th, and early 19th century American history. Richardville's life and times especially illuminate the history of the Old Northwest. This area has been conventionally portrayed as first, a battleground of European colonial powers and their manipulated Indian allies, and second, as an American military conquest of "savages" in a wilderness—for the justifiable purpose of expanding territory for civilized and civilizing settlers. New research on the influence of the métis shines new light on this picture. In particular, Richardville's life from his métis birth in 1761 to his final treaty negotiations at the Forks of the Wabash in 1840 shows in all its ambiguity and complexity this influence as White describes it, "the middle ground depended on Indian-White distinctions, but it also depended on the porousness of the boundaries between Indian and white" (White, 506). In addition to his political and leadership ability, Richardville was a well-trained and skillful trader, the basis for his becoming probably the most wealthy Native American in the country in his lifetime.
(Chaput, 114). This wealth illustrates Richardville's ability to use his role and skills to benefit both his tribe and himself.
Chief Jean B. Richerville House  
Allan County, IN

Statement of Significance

Jean-Baptiste de Richerville (whose Miami name was Pechews or "wildcat") was one of a large number of French-Indian métis who resulted from the Bourbon French-American policy of sending three groups of French to the colonies of New France and Louisiana: nobles, both grand and seigneur classes, for government and military matters, Catholic bishops and missionaries, and licensed traders. Both the traders and the gentry were encouraged to live among and intermarry with the local Indians. Accompanying priests were to convert, marry, and baptize (Hyma, 322).

When the French explorers and traders first penetrated northern Indiana, they encountered Miami and other Algonquin people of the Lake Country migrating west as the Iroquois wars of the 1650s swept through the area. However, by 1700, the Algonquins, led by Miami, forced the Iroquois to retreat from the Great Lakes region and the Miamis returned. The French then made trade contacts with the Indians and began building a series of forts and posts at strategic waterway junctions throughout the northwest to protect their colonial claims and trade from British challenge. They built two forts at the confluence of the St. Marys and St. Joseph Rivers that forms the Maumee River. The first was built in 1722 on the St. Marys, a short distance from the confluence, near the east end of the strategic portage to the Wabash and close by the village of Lalabiche, a settlement of traders and Miami. The second, Fort Miami, was built in 1750 on the right bank of the St. Joseph River just above the confluence and the center of a cluster of Miami villages and traders (Poinsette, Outpost, 12-13).

Richerville's father, Antoine-Joseph Drouet de Richerville (Variant spellings of Drouet used, Chaput, 106), was a lieutenant attached to the second French fort in the 1750s. As a Drouet, he was a member of the landed gentry of France and his title derived from the Richerville estate, one of the Drouet estates that dated back to 1201 (Robertson, "A Curious and Important Discovery," 46).

Richerville's mother had an equally distinguished heritage. Tacumwah (Maria Louisa) was the sister of the Principal Chief of the Miami, Pacan, and a Chiefess in her own right. Both were of the Atchatchakgouen band (Anson, 13 fn 28, 15-17; Carter, 23-24, map 7 following 222). The Miami people originally consisted of six bands (Atchatchakgouen, Pepikokia, Kilatika, Mengakongia, Wea, and Pianshesaw). By custom, all the other Miami showed greatest respect for the Atchatchakgouen, or the Crane People. Some scholars speculate that the respect given to this band was due to the likelihood that their ceremonial powers derived from the Mound Builders, whom they replaced (Carter, 14). Any evidence for this disappeared when either the 1790 expedition of General Josiah Harmar destroyed the chests of Miami historical reminders in the burning of Rekionga (Carter, 12), or in the 1809 burning of the Council House near Fort Wayne.
Chief Jean B. Richardville House Alien County, IN

Statement of Significance

Jean-Baptiste de Richardville (whose Miami name was Pechewa or "wildcat") was one of a large number of French-Indian métis who resulted from the Bourbon French-American policy of sending three groups of French to the colonies of New France and Louisiana: nobles, both grand and ecuyer classes, for government and military matters, Catholic bishops and missionaries, and licensed traders. Both the traders and the gentry were encouraged to live among and intermarry with the local Indians. Accompanying priests were to convert, marry, and baptize (Hyma, 322).

When the French explorers and traders first penetrated northern Indiana, they encountered Miami and other Algonquin people of the Lake Country migrating west as the Iroquois wars of the 1650s swept through the area. However,
by 1700, the Algonquins, led by Miamis, forced the Iroquois to retreat from the Great Lakes region and the Miamis returned. The French then made trade contact with the Indians and began building a series of forts and posts at strategic waterway junctions throughout the northwest to protect their colonial claims and trade from British challenge. They built two forts at the confluence of the St. Marys and St. Joseph Rivers that forms the Maumee River. The first was built in 1722 on the St. Marys, a short distance from the confluence, near the east end of the strategic portage to the Wabash and close by the village of Lalabiche, a settlement of traders and Miami. The second, Fort Miamie, was built in 1750 on the right bank of the St. Joseph River just above the confluence and the center of a cluster of Miami villages and traders (Poinsatte, Outpost. 12-13).

Richardville is father, Antoine-Joseph Drouet de Richerville (Variant spellings of Drouet used, Chaput, 106), was a lieutenant attached to the second French fort in the 1750s. As a Drouet, he was a member of the landed gentry of France and his title derived from the Richerville estate, one of the Drouet estates that dated back to 1201 (Robertson, "A Curious and Important Discovery," 46).
Richardville's mother had an equally distinguished heritage. Tacumwah (Maria Louisa) was the sister of the Principal Chief of the Miami, Paean, and a Chiefess in her own right. Both were of the Atchatchakangouen band (Anson, 13 fn 28, 15–17; Carter, 23–24, map 7 following 222). The Miami people originally consisted of six bands (Atchatchakangouen, Pepikokia, Kilatika, Mengakongia, Wea, and Piankeshaw). By custom, all the other Miami showed greatest respect for the Atchatchakangouen, or the Crane People. Some scholars speculate that the respect given to this band was due to the likelihood that their ceremonial powers derived from the Mound Builders, whom they replaced (Carter, 14). Any evidence for this disappeared when either the 1790 expedition of General Josiah Harmar destroyed the chests of Miami historical reminders in the burning of Kekionga (Carter, 12), or in the 1809 burning of the Council House near Fort Wayne.
The Crane People were known as "the walkers" because they did not restrict themselves to the courses of rivers via canoes, but chose also to create trails that cut more directly across prairie and wooded areas in all strategic directions, acquiring their wealth and prestige by charging tolls to those that sought passage by canoe. They flourished, therefore, at confluences and portages, making their headquarters at the confluence of the St. Marys and the St. Joseph Rivers, where these rivers form the Maumee River, to Lake Erie, and on both ends of the portage from the St. Marys River to the Wabash River at present-day Huntington, Indiana.

The union of Antoine-Joseph Drouet de Richerville and Tacumwah (Maria Louisia) brought together his vital government and trade connections in Canada with her Atchatchakanganouen trade and political connections for their son, born in 1761 in Miami town, Jean-Baptiste. (Jean-Baptiste was one of four children of this marriage; little is known of the other three.) The next step was to solidify their position by acquiring the Principal Chieftainship for him and to fit him for his Canadian role. For the latter, Antoine-Joseph arranged several visits to Canada for his son, Jean-Baptiste, as well as overseeing his Catholic education in Detroit. (Antoine-Joseph left Tacumwah and returned to Canada in the 1770s. In 1760, the British had accepted the surrender of the 1750 French Fort Miamie. Tacumwah later married an important trader named Charles Beaubien.)

The Chieftainship required a thoroughly Miami—even Atchatchakanganouen—formal, ceremonial procedure. The Miami were patrilineal in social structure but power was transferred matrilineally. Thus, Principal Chief Pacan's successor must be a son of one of his sisters. The sister must first wage a political campaign to win support for her son among their people, and then establish his election by his perform ing a public act of unusual courage, daring, and leadership. These public acts, documented for both Pacan and Richardville (Pechewa) are remarkably similar. Pacan in 1764 (while still a minor) rescued a white prisoner (Captain Thomas Morris) from death by a group of excited Miami (Morris, 8); and Richardville in about 1785 (about 24 years old) saved an unnamed white prisoner, who thanked him again when they met years later in Ohio (Brice, 314).

The French-British imperial struggle in the Northwest was on the fringe of their long, world-wide imperial war from 1689 to 1763, but for the French pays en haut from 1715, when Sieur de Vincennes led the returning Miami from Detroit to the headwaters of the Maumee (Anson, 34), the struggle would temporarily shatter Kekionga's unifying power among the Miami. Anson says that from 1747 until 1755, the "Miamis played, for the first time, a significant role in American history" (Anson, 42). A British blockade in the late 1740s of the St. Lawrence River disrupted the French fur trade. No furs could get out, but more crucial, no trade goods could get in. French Canadian officials then restricted their
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The Crane People were known as "the walkers" because they did not restrict themselves to the courses of rivers via canoes, but chose also to create trails that cut more directly across prairie and wooded areas in all strategic directions, acquiring their wealth and prestige by charging tolls to those that sought passage by canoe. They flourished, therefore, at confluences and portages, making their headquarters at the confluence of the St. Marys and the St. Joseph Rivers, where these rivers form the Maumee River, to Lake Erie, and on both ends of the portage from the St. Marys River to the Wabash River at present-day Huntington, Indiana.

The union of Antoine-Joseph Drouet de Richerville and Tacumwah (Maria Louisa) brought together his vital
government and trade connections in Canada with her 
Atchatchakangouen trade and political connections for their 
son, born in 1761 in Miamitown, Jean-Baptiste. (Jean-
Baptistewasoneoffourchildrenofthis marriage; little is 
known of the other three.) The next step was to solidify 
their position by acquiring the Principal Chieftainship for 
him and to fit him for his Canadian role. 
Forthelatter, Antoine-Joseph arranged several visits to Canada 
for his son, Jean-Baptiste, as well as overseeing his 
Catholic education in Detroit. (Antoine-
Josephleft Tacumwah and returned to Canada in the 1770s. In 1760, 
the British had accepted the surrender of the 1750 French 
Fort Miamie. Tacumwah later married an important trader 
named Charles Beaubien.) 
The Chieftainship required a thoroughly Miami—even 
Atchatchakangouen—formal, ceremonial procedure. 
The Miami were patrilineal in social structure but power was transferred 
matrilineally. Thus, Principal Chief Paean's successor must be a 
son of one of his sisters. The sister must first wage a 
political campaign to win support for her son among their 
people, and then establish his election by his performing a 
public act of unusual courage, daring, and leadership. These
public acts, documented for both Paean and Richardville (Pechewa) are remarkably similar. Paean in 1764 (while still a minor) rescued a white prisoner (Captain Thomas Morris) from death by a group of excited Miami (Morris, 8); and Richardville in about 1785 (about 24 years old) saved an unnamed white prisoner, who thanked him again when they met years later in Ohio (Brice, 314).

The French-British imperial struggle in the Northwest was on the fringe of their long, world-wide imperial war from 1689 to 1763, but for the French pays en haut from 1715, when Sieur de Vincennes led the returning Miami from Detroit to the headwaters of the Maumee (Anson, 34), the struggle would temporarily shatter Kekionga's unifying power among the Miami. Anson says that from 1747 until 1755, the "Miamis played, for the first time, a significant role in American history" (Anson, 42). A British blockade in the late 1740s of the St. Lawrence River disrupted the French fur trade. No furs could get out, but more crucial, no trade goods could get in. French Canadian officials then restricted their
licenses in order to ration trade goods. Being closer to Detroit, the Kekionga traders were favored to the resentment especially of those on the lower Wabash.

A chief of the Piankeshaw Miamis on the lower Wabash (La Demoiselle) recruited Miamis up to the Maumee to move to Ohio and build a fort at Pickawillany to trade with the British in defiance of the French for their trade restrictions. Kekionga Principal Chief Pied Froid, under pressure from a French delegation led by the officer who would build the second French fort at Kekionga, DeRaymond, refused to join, although most of his village defected to follow the Piankeshaw, as did Little Turtle's father. Pied Froid and his family remained in Kekionga, then adjacent to the first French fort. (Earlier, in 1747, word had reached the Miami that Detroit had been captured by pro-British Indians. Some Miami warriors burned the French fort and took eight prisoners while Pied Froid and the fort commandant were enroute to a conference in Montreal. At Detroit, still in French hands, they learned of the pillage at Kekionga. Pied Froid and a French force returned to find the fort only partially destroyed but in sad shape.) In 1752, however, a Canadian Indian force under a métis and two French aides utterly destroyed Pickawillany. Most Miami fled back to the Maumee and Wabash; Little Turtle's family took refuge in a Shawnee village. Richardville and Pacan would both ponder and learn from Pied Froid's travail during this time. (Pied Froid was Pacan's predecessor as Principal Chief.) Pied Froid's reluctance to commit his people to one power or the other and his caution would influence Pacan later. Immediately, Pied Froid's cautious course profited him little; the same year—1752—that the Piankeshaw and their Miami allies suffered their Pickawillany defeat, Kekionga (Pied Froid's village) was hit by a deadly smallpox epidemic that killed both Pied Froid and his son (Poinsette, Outpost, 10). Then, apparently, Kekionga moved to its later Spy Run location, across the St. Joseph River from the 1750 French fort, to which Richardville's father was posted.

From 1752 to 1764, when Richardville's uncle, Pacan, was chosen as Principal Chief, the position was either vacant or taken by a war chief named LeGris (known as The Elder LeGris to distinguish him from his son, who later became important along with Pacan and Little Turtle) who served in that function. Between Pacan's ascendance as Principal Chief in 1764, and when Richardville won the succession in 1785 and became his deputy, the British had formally taken over the French fort, but French Canadian traders maintained their trade in growing Kekionga/Miamitown and built their homes between the fort and the Younger LeGris' village to the south on the east bank of the St. Joseph River. Colonial war would again test the Miami leadership during the American Revolution from 1775 to 1783. The British had protected the Northwest as Indian territory, partly in response to Pontiac's challenge at the close of their war with France. They set up a Proclamation Line that was intended to stop American settlers from moving west of the Appalachian Mountains and for a time, even included the
licenses in order to ration trade goods. Being closer to Detroit, the Kekionga traders were favored to the resentment especially of those on the lower Wabash. A chief of the Piankeshaw Miamis on the lower Wabash (La Demoiselle) recruited Miamis up to the Maumee to move to Ohio and build a fort at Pickawillany to trade with the British in defiance of the French for their trade restrictions.

Kekionga Principal Chief Pied Froid, under pressure from a French delegation led by the officer who would build the second French fort at Kekionga, DeRaymond, refused to join, although most of his village defected to follow the Piankeshaw, as did Little Turtle's father. Pied Froid and his family remained in Kekionga,
then adjacent to the first French fort.

(Earlier, in 1747, word had reached the Miamis that Detroit had been captured by pro-British Indians. Some Miami warriors burned the French fort and took eight prisoners while Pied Froid and the fort commandant were enroute to a conference in Montreal. At Detroit, still in French hands, they learned of the pillage at Kekionga. Pied Froid and a French force returned to find the fort only partially destroyed but in sad shape.)

In 1752, however, a Canadian Indian force under a métis and two French aides utterly destroyed Pickawillany. Most Miami fled back to the Maumee and Wabash; Little Turtle's family took refuge in a Shawnee village.

Richardville and Paean would both ponder and learn from Pied Froid's travail during this time. (Pied Froid was Paean's predecessor as Principal Chief.) Pied Froid's reluctance to commit his people to one power or the other and his caution would influence Paean later.

Immediately, Pied Froid's cautious course profited him little: the same year—1752—that the Piankeshaw and their Miami allies suffered their Pickawillany defeat, Kekionga (Pied Froid's village) was hit by a deadly small pox epidemic.
that killed both Pied Froid and his son (Poinsatte, Outpost. 10). Then, apparently, Kekionga moved to its later Spy Run location, across the St. Joseph River from the 1750 French fort, to which Richardville's father was posted.

From 1752 to 1764, when Richardville's uncle, Paean, was chosen as Principal Chief, the position was either vacant or taken by a war chief named LeGris (known as The Elder LeGris to distinguish him from his son, who later became important along with Paean and Little Turtle) who served in that function. Between Paean's ascendance as Principal Chief in 1764, and when Richardville won the succession in 1785 and became his deputy, the British had formally taken over the French fort, but French Canadian traders maintained their trade in growing Kekionga/Miamitown and built their homes between the fort and the Younger LeGris's village to the south on the east bank of the St. Joseph River. Colonial war would again test the Miami leadership during the American Revolution from 1775 to 1783.

The British had protected the Northwest as Indian territory, partly in response to Pontiac's challenge at the close of their war with France. They set up a Proclamation Line that was
intended to stop American settlers from moving west of the Appalachian Mountains and for a time, even included the
Northwest to the Ohio River in Quebec. Just as the Miamis, along with other Indians, preferred the French policy over the British, they now preferred the British over the Americans, whose clear purpose was acquiring their lands.

During the 1770s and early 1780s, Pacan had led raids against—as he saw them—invading American settlers crossing the Ohio from Kentucky. He even led retaliatory raids into Kentucky. He would then usually return to Kekionga to lead his people to their winter hunting grounds. He was aided in his absences by either the elder or younger LeGris and by Little Turtle, who had returned to Kekionga from the Shawnee village where, in 1752, his family had taken refuge. One of the two LeGris must have accompanied Pacan as military leader or war chief on the raids, as a civil chief could not participate in fighting. He was usually accompanied by a special guard of eleven young warriors (Anson, 71). Unlike a war chief (sagamore), who won his position through battle skills, the position of civil chief (sachem) required him to protect his people and help them to prosper and maintain their customs. He was chief executive, diplomat, judge, and, at least ceremonially, a medicine man.

As a chiefess, Tacumwah was especially valuable in maintaining order and trade activity while the men were away. She maintained the Richardville trade interests at the confluence and at the west end of the Wabash portage (Forks of the Wabash) (Roberts, 6). She was indispensable for the prospering fur trade through her French connections in Canada, however in this period British trade goods competed well with French and were often preferred because the Industrial Revolution in England could produce better, cheaper products.

The Americans in Philadelphia, as soon as their open rebellion began in 1775, were aware of British movements in the Ohio and Illinois country. In 1778, a savage border war raged along the Ohio River between Henry Hamilton for the British and George Rogers Clark for the Americans and their Indian allies. Again, Pacan and his Miami were tugged by both sides. Pacan's problems with the settlers and Kekionga's proximity to Detroit tended to sway his support toward the British. He and LeGris accompanied Henry Hamilton and his British forces down the Wabash to Vincennes, where several months earlier, Clark had taken over Vincennes, or Fort Sackville, by apprising the French inhabitants of the French-American Alliance signed in May, 1778. He had left a young captain in charge, who gave no resistance to Hamilton's force in November. By January, however, Pacan left, but apparently not LeGris, who was in the nearby woods when Clark descended from Kaskaskia and recaptured Vincennes. (Interestingly, Clark's life at Kaskaskia may have been saved by a French trader, Charles Beaubien, Tacumwah's second husband and stepfather of Richardville.)

In 1780, Charles Beaubien lost his Kekionga trading post in an attack on Kekionga.
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He was aided in his absences by either the elder or younger Le Gris and by Little Turtle, who had returned to Kekionga from the Shawnee village where, in 1752, his family had taken refuge. One of the two Le Gris must have accompanied
Paean as military leader or war chief on the raids, as a civil chief could not participate in fighting. He was usually accompanied by a special guard of eleven young warriors (Anson, 71). Unlike a war chief (sagamore), who won his position through battle skills, the position of civil chief (sachem) required him to protect his people and help them to prosper and maintain their customs. He was chief executive, diplomat, judge, and, at least ceremonially, a medicine man.

As a chiefess, Tacumwah was especially valuable in maintaining order and trade activity while the men were away. She maintained the Richardville trade interests at the confluence and at the west end of the Wabash portage (Forks of the Wabash) (Roberts, 6). She was indispensable for the prospering fur trade through her French connections in Canada, however in this period British trade goods competed well with French and were often preferred because the Industrial Revolution in England could produce better, cheaper products.

The Americans in Philadelphia, as soon as their open rebellion began in 1775, were aware of British movements in the Ohio and Illinois country.
In 1778, a savage border war raged along the Ohio River between Henry Hamilton for the British and George Rogers Clark for the Americans and their Indian allies. Again, Paean and his Miami were tugged by both sides. Paean's problems with the settlers and Kekionga's proximity to Detroit tended to sway his support toward the British. He and LeGris accompanied Henry Hamilton and his British forces down the Wabash to Vincennes, where several months earlier, Clark had taken over Vincennes, or Fort Sackville, by apprising the French inhabitants of the French-American Alliance signed in May, 1778. He had left a young captain in charge, who gave no resistance to Hamilton's force in November. By January, however, Paean left, but apparently not LeGris, who was in the nearby woods when Clark descended from Kaskaskia and recaptured Vincennes.

(Interestingly, Clark's life at Kaskaskia may have been saved by a French trader, Charles Beaubien, Tacumwah's second husband and stepfather of Richardville.)

In 1780, Charles Beaubien lost his Kekionga trading post in an attack on Kekionga.
Statement of Significance

by a French officer named La Balme, who had accompanied Lafayette to America as a result of the French-American alliance. Having his own plans to recapture Detroit for the French, he proceeded from Vincennes to Kekionga. After La Balme’s attack on the Kekionga trading post, Little Turtle gained his fame as a warrior and his position as head war chief by striking La Balme’s camp west of Kekionga, killing La Balme and many of his men, with only about half of La Balme’s force escaping (Carter, 73-74). Miami leadership was being re-established at Kekionga.

By 1785, Pacan, who had favored the British during the war, decided to examine the advantages of swinging to the Americans, along with the lower Wabash Miami. In the Northwest, the British were not withdrawing their contacts into Canada as the 1783 treaty prescribed. In two treaties (1785 and 1786) in the eastern Great Lakes area, the Americans got land cessions from Delaware, Ottawa, and Chippewa chiefs (although not fully represented) in north Ohio along the line that would be the basis of the later 1795 treaty. Only Shawnees and Miami were not parties to them. Even the Shawnees later gave in, leaving the Miami as the emergent natural leader of the growing confederacy to hold the remainder of the Northwest Indian lands protected formerly by both the French and the British. Pacan and his close advisors by this time were considering the best course to stay the growing pressure of American settlers and position his people favorably in the continuing struggle between the British and Americans in the Northwest.

In 1787, Pacan offered and was accepted to be a guide for the new Fort Vincennes commander, General Harmar, on a goodwill tour to Kaskaskia. Pacan later provided several services to the succeeding Vincennes commander, Major Hamtramck. Trusted and appreciated, Pacan in 1788 was sent by Hamtramck to a council with British Indian Affairs Commissioner McKee. Tragically, Hamtramck could not protect Pacan’s new village north of Vincennes. A band of Kentucky militia destroyed both Pacan’s new village and another before Hamtramck learned of it. Pacan heard the grim news at Terre Haute on his return journey and never proceeded on. An understanding between the Miami and Americans at this point might have halted the formation of the Miami Confederacy and the Miami town wars of the 1790s. Instead, a bitter Pacan turned implacably anti-American (Anson, 161; Carter, 76, 78).

In the course of his life to 1789, particularly, Richardville learned "the sophistication of the Miami" (Anson, 73) in wending their way among the political thickets in their relations with other surrounding Indian tribes, between the French and the English, and finally with American military leaders, government officials, and the growing numbers of American settlers crossing the Ohio River into Indian land. (The last became the force that could not be stemmed by the British or Americans and would overcome the last bastion of Indian diplomatic skill.)
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by a French officer named La Balme, who had accompanied Lafayette to America as a result of the French-American alliance. Having his own plans to recapture Detroit for the French, he proceeded from Vincennes to Kekionga. After La Balme's attack on the Kekionga trading post, Little Turtle gained his fame as a warrior and his position as head war chief by striking La Balme's camp west of Kekionga, killing La Balme and many of his men, with only about half of La Balme's force escaping (Carter, 73-74). Miami leadership was being re-established at Kekionga.

By 1785, Paean, who had favored the British during the war, decided to examine the advantages of swinging to the Americans, along with the lower Wabash Miami. In the Northwest, the British were not withdrawing their contacts
into Canada as the 1783 treaty proscribed. In two treaties (1785 and 1786) in the eastern Great Lakes area, the Americans got land cessions from Delaware, Ottawa, and Chippewa chiefs (although not fully represented) in north Ohio along the line that would be the basis of the later 1795 treaty. Only Shawnees and Miami were not parties to them. Even the Shawnees later gave in, leaving the Miami as the emergent natural leader of the growing confederacy to hold the remainder of the Northwest Indianlands protected formerly by both the French and the British. Paean and his close advisors by this time were considering the best course to stay the growing pressure of American settlers and position his people favorably in the continuing struggle between the British and Americans in the Northwest.

In 1787, Paean offered and was accepted to be a guide for the new Fort Vincennes commander, General Harmar, on a goodwill tour to Kaskaskia. Paean later provided several services to the succeeding Vincennes commander, Major Hamtramck. Trusted and appreciated, Paean in 1788 was sent by Hamtramck to a council with British Indian Affairs Commissioner McKee. Tragically, Hamtramck could not protect
Paean's new village north of Vincennes.
Aband of Kentucky militia destroyed both Paean's new village and another before Hamtramck learned of it. Paean heard the grim news at Terre Haute on his return journey and never proceeded on. An understanding between the Miami and Americans at this point might have halted the formation of the Miami Confederacy and the Miami town wars of the 1790s. Instead, a bitter Paean turned implacably anti-American (Anson, 161; Carter, 76, 78).

In the course of his life to 1789, particularly, Richardville learned "the sophistication of the Miami" (Anson, 73) in wending their way among the political thickets in their relations with other surrounding Indian tribes, between the French and the English, and finally with American military leaders, government officials, and the growing numbers of American settlers crossing the Ohio River into Indian land.

(The last became the force that could not be stemmed by the British or Americans and would overcome the last bastion of Indian diplomatic skill.)
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The best description we have of the "sophisticated" center of Kekionga/Miamitown which shaped the young Richardville, as well as the 29-year-old Richardville himself, is given in a journal kept by a young British partisan from Detroit, Henry Hay (Hay was half-British and half-French, his full name being Pierre Henry Hay), in the winter of 1789-1790 (Quaife). The journal provides an entertaining account of the life here among the French-English-metis community; one of feasting, hard drinking, card playing, interminable visiting, and the music of two fiddles and one flute for the dancing and frequent masses held in the home of a Frenchman (and with the services of a French priest) (Fort Wayne, Quaife, 19). There are also brief references to freemason membership and the formation of a society called the "Most Light Honorable Society of Monks" (Fort Wayne, Quaife, 54) shortened only days later to "Friars of St. Andrew."

While here, in February, 1790, Hay painted a portrait of metis Richardville, not so much as the young deputy chief, but as a French trader and man about town. Hay, John Kinzie, Richardville, and the Lassell brothers frequently dined and partied together, feasting, drinking, playing cards, and dancing. Richardville is a member of the Friars of St. Andrew; he entertains for dinner at his house and hosts a party for Nardi Grass. Richardville is flooded out of his house in LeGris' village and forced to move in with his mother, whose house in Pacan's village (Kekionga) is on high ground. Richardville, with Hay and the Lassell brothers (after a drinking party) take the ladies for a row down the river to the serenade of a "fiddle" (Lassell) and flute (Hay) (Fort Wayne, Quaife, 67).

Along with Hay's light-hearted account lie glimpses into Pacan's village and LeGris' Indian village where Little Turtle returns with raiding parties, where Pacan is absent at his wintering camp, where Tacumwah joins him when she is not at her trading post at the Forks of the Wabash or back at Pacan's village attending councils with her son, Richardville. Glimpses, too, occur of visiting parties of Shawnees, Delaware, and Potawatomis; of LeGris and Little Turtle, British agents, George Girty and Alexander Mc Kee; of a political intrigue with the Wea over a Kekionga French trader. What occurred was the culmination of the formidable Miami Confederacy under the triumvirate of Pacan, LeGris, and Little Turtle, which in 1786 wrested leadership from the Mohawk's chief, Joseph Brant, of a vast Indian alliance of seven Canadian tribes, segments of the Iroquois, and the tribes between the Great Lakes and the Ohio River (Anson, 105-6). This alliance was called Miami because, although Miami numbers were small compared to many of the others, Miami leadership had proven to be the most capable both militarily and diplomatically. Its center was Kekionga/Miamitown. Hay's journey here in 1789-90 as an agent of a Detroit merchant was also one with a side request to inform Major Patrick Murray, British Commandant at Detroit, of developments among the Indians and traders at Kekionga/Miamitown, as well as news of the American forces in the vicinity of Cincinnati (Fort Wayne, Quaife, 2-3).
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While here, in February, 1790, Hay painted a portrait of metis Richardville, not so much as the young deputy chief, but as a French trader and man about town. Hay, John Kinzie, Richardville, and the Lassell brothers frequently dined and partied together, feasting, drinking, playing cards, and dancing. Richardville is a member of the Friars of St. Andrew; he entertains for dinner at his house and hosts a party for Mardi Gras. Richardville is flooded out of his house in LeGris' village and forced to move in with his mother, whose house in Paean's village (Kekionga) is on high ground. Richardville, with Hay and the Lassell brothers (after a drinking party) take the ladies for a row down the river to the serenade of a "fiddle" (Lassell) and flute (Hay) (Fort Wayne, Quaife, 67).

Along with Hay's light-hearted account lie glimpses into Paean's village and LeGris' Indian village where Little Turtle returns with raiding parties, where Paean is absent at his wintering camp, where Tacumwah joins him when she is not at her trading post at the Forks of the Wabash or back
at Paean's village attending councils with her son, Richardville. Glimpses, too, occur of visiting parties of Shawnee, Delaware, and Potawatomi; of LeGris and Little Turtle, British agents, George Girty and Alexander McKee; of a political intrigue with the Wea over a Kekionga French trader. What occurred was the culmination of the formidable Miami Confederacy under the triumvirate of Paean, LeGris, and Little Turtle, which in 1786 wrenched leadership from the Mohawk's chief, Joseph Brant, of a vast Indian alliance of seven Canadian tribes, segments of the Iroquois, and the tribes between the Great Lakes and the Ohio River (Anson, 105-6). This alliance was called Miami because, although Miami numbers were small compared to many of the others, Miami leadership had proven to be the most capable both militarily and diplomatically.

Its center was Kekionga/Miamitown. Hay's journey here in 1789-90 as an agent of a Detroit merchant was also one with a side request to inform Major Patrick Murray, British Commandant at Detroit, of developments among the Indians and traders at Kekionga/Miamitown, as well as news of the American
forces in the vicinity of Cincinnati (Fort Wayne. Quaife, 2-3) .
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The following October (1790), Miamitown was burned by an American army under General Josiah Harmar, whose—-and Hamtramck's—earlier accord with Pacan had been scuttled by the avenging band of Kentucky militia. However, the inhabitants (traders and Miami) had already fled with their possessions north and west. The Confederacy had expected a much larger army and had stationed their forces around the area. Little Turtle was closest to Harmar's army, positioned to the northwest between the army and the evacuated Miami women and children. Little Turtle's remarkable judgement, planning, and daring cost Harmar 183 dead, victims of the force of Miami, Ottawa, and Iroquois. In one of his few military experiences, Richardville was one of the victorious Miami warriors (Carter, 95).

By the following summer (1791), the Confederacy had acquired more arms from Detroit. By November, St. Clair, with a second American army bent on building an American fort at Miamitown, was attacked at dawn by the forces of Little Turtle before he could leave Ohio. Little Turtle inflicted a very great loss on them.

But Little Turtle was convinced that the new general at Fort Washington, Anthony Wayne, was a different matter. He counseled for the peace pipe as Wayne made his careful, efficient way up through Ohio to Kekionga/Miamitown. Consequently, the Confederacy, which had held Little Turtle in great respect and given him its whole confidence, now suspected him of cowardice. The forces of the Confederacy at Fallen Timbers were led by two other war chiefs. Though able, they were no match for Wayne. The defeat of the Confederacy at the Battle of Fallen Timbers allowed Anthony Wayne to build his fort overlooking the villages of Pacan and LeGris in 1794.

PACAN, whose high civil position had been humiliated earlier at a conference with William Henry Harrison (who saw only the war chief as important), tried to assert the primacy of the Atchatchakangouen Miami and his own position by refusing to attend a treaty conference unless it was held at Keckiona. When Wayne determined on Greene Ville, Ohio, Richardville represented Pacan at the conference along with Little Turtle. Much has been written about Little Turtle's eloquence and intelligence at that meeting. However, Timothy Pickering, Secretary of War, who attended, wrote that the speeches that accompanied the treaty signing were unremarkable—"I may except the speech of Richardville, Miami Chief" (Chaput, 113).

The Greene Ville Treaty of 1795 breached the old line of Indian territory and opened the floodgates to white settlers. Southern Ohio (two thirds of the state) and a slice of southeast Indiana were ceded to the U.S., along the treaty line of 1785. All former French and British post cessions would now be American. Small cessions were made on strategic transportation sites, including tracts at the Fort Wayne confluence and on the long portage from Fort Wayne to Huntington. The
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treaty seriously diminished Miami military power and influence on the frontier
(see Attachments E and F). Never again would Miami/Kekionga leadership consider
war a means to solve their problems with the whites, but the pressure for more
land concessions in Indiana would again fracture Miami unity and severely strain
their leadership.

The relationships in the Fort Wayne-Wabash area among the whites, Miami and other
tribes, and metic chiefs and traders became truly Byzantine between 1795 and
1814. The situation resulted from both national and international developments.
In the 1787 Northwest Ordinance, the new U.S. government had arranged for the
survey and sale of government land in the Northwest Territory and an eventual
creation of states there. Land Acts were passed in 1796 and 1800 with more
specifications for government land sales to satisfy demands of settlers and to
produce government revenue. In 1791, a government factory system was created.
It established government trading posts (factories) to bring in revenue and curb
the sale of whiskey to Indians. By planning to offer better goods at cheaper
prices than private traders, it was designed to eliminate the business of
Canadian traders. In 1793, a system of Indian agents was established to oversee
Indian matters, mainly the distribution of annuities, under the Secretary of War.
The Indiana Territory was created in 1800 under the governorship of William Henry
Harrison with the capital at Vincennes.

After the Treaty of Greene Ville (1795), Little Turtle was twice invited to the
national capital in Philadelphia, where he was lionized and met with both
Presidents Washington and Adams. He took with him the man who would become the
most controversial figure in Miami history of the post-1795 period: his white,
Miami-adopted son-in-law, William Wells. (Wells' activities in 1793-94 are still
puzzling. Apparently, he convinced Little Turtle of the futility of continued
Miami warfare, not only with Anthony Wayne, but with the American's growing
military might in the Northwest in general. Little Turtle agreed to Wells'
becoming a spy and a scout for Wayne's forces, as Little Turtle himself tried to
turn the Confederacy from continuing their resistance to the Americans under
Wayne.) From 1795 to his death in 1812, Little Turtle was not only out of favor
with the other tribes of the old Confederacy and most of the Miami, but even
despised. More so was his son-in-law, Wells. Even Richardville disliked and
distrusted the latter.

Little Turtle and Wells, however, found favor in Philadelphia in 1796 and 1797
and in Washington in the 1800s. Wells was appointed Fort Wayne Indian agent in
1796 by Washington, although he served only from 1802 to 1809. When he and
Little Turtle visited Jefferson in 1802, he also requested the office of factor
(manager of the government factory) in Fort Wayne, but was rejected for a clerk
from Secretary of War Dearborn's office, John Johnston.
treaty seriously diminished Miami military power and influence on the frontier (see Attachments E and F). Never again would Miami/Kekionga leadership consider war a means to solve their problems with the whites, but the pressure for more land concessions in Indiana would again fracture Miami unity and severely strain their leadership. The relationships in the Fort Wayne-Wabash area among the whites, Miami and other tribes, and métis chiefs and traders became truly Byzantine between 1795 and 1814. The situation resulted from both national and international developments. In the 1787 Northwest Ordinance, the new U.S. government had arranged for the survey and sale of government land in the Northwest Territory and an eventual creation of states there. Land Acts were passed in 1796 and 1800 with more specifications for government land sales to satisfy demands of settlers and to
produce government revenue.

In 1791, a government factory system was created.

It established government trading posts (factories) to bring in revenue and curb the sale of whiskey to Indians. By planning to offer better goods at cheaper prices than private traders, it was designed to eliminate the business of Canadian traders.

In 1793, a system of Indian agents was established to oversee Indian matters, mainly the distribution of annuities, under the Secretary of War. The Indiana Territory was created in 1800 under the governorship of William Henry Harrison with the capital at Vincennes.

After the Treaty of Greene Ville (1795), Little Turtle was twice invited to the national capital in Philadelphia, where he was lionized and met with both Presidents Washington and Adams. He took with him the man who would become the most controversial figure in Miami history of the post-1795 period: his white, Miami-adopted son-in-law, William Wells. (Wells' activities in 1793-94 are still puzzling. Apparently, he convinced Little Turtle of the futility of continued Miami warfare, not only with Anthony Wayne, but with the American's growing military might in the Northwest in general. Little Turtle agreed to Wells'
becoming a spy and a scout for Wayne's forces, as Little Turtle himself tried to

turn the Confederacy from continuing their resistance to the Americans under Wayne.)

From 1795 to his death in 1812, Little Turtle was not only out of favor with the other tribes of the old Confederacy and most of the Miami, but even despised. More so was his son-in-law, Wells. Even Richardville disliked and distrusted the latter.

Little Turtle and Wells, however, found favor in Philadelphia in 1796 and 1797 and in Washington in the 1800s. Wells was appointed Fort Wayne Indian agent in 1796 by Washington, although he served only from 1802 to 1809. When he and Little Turtle visited Jefferson in 1802, he also requested the office of factor (manager of the government factory) in Fort Wayne, but was rejected for a clerk from Secretary of War Dearborn's office, John Johnston.
Conditions in Fort Wayne after 1800 became a tangled web of competing lines of authority between the Secretary of War's office, the governorships of Indiana and Michigan, and the Fort Wayne land agents, factors, and fort commandants. In Kekionga, the breach widened between the Pacan-Richardville leadership and that of Little Turtle and Wells (Anson, 149; Poinsette, Outpost, 31; 44-46, 50-55; Carter, 146). The gulf developing between the Kekionga Miamis and their brethren in the rest of Indiana deepened. This muck of conflicting goals, ambitions, competing traders, and power seekers was fertile ground for both William Henry Harrison and Tecumseh, the final antagonists in this period.

Harrison maneuvered the beleaguered Indians into a series of land concessions in 1803, 1805, and 1809. In the Treaty of Fort Wayne (1803), nine tribes agreed to cede one-and-a-half million acres of land around the Indiana territorial capital, Vincennes. (All French land titles were preserved and the Indians got 159 bushels of salt annually in lieu of the salt springs on the ceded land.) The Treaty of Grouseland (Harrison's Vincennes mansion) in 1805 ceded all Indian land in southern Indiana above the Ohio River. Between 1803 and 1809, the Miami had ceded some of the land to the Delaware, who had to now turn it over to the U.S. More significant for the Miami, this land—the area of so many raids by whites and Miami—had included traditional Miami hunting grounds. The cessions also cut into the lands of the Kaskaskia, Kickapoo, and Piankeshaw. (See Attachment G.)

Little Turtle and Wells had visited the new President in Washington, Thomas Jefferson, in 1802 to continue to plead for Miami favor there. They had a number of specific concerns: first, over the sale of whiskey to the Indians and its result in drunkenness, brawling, and ill health, as well as its being a block to their attempts to get Indians to adopt the American style of farming and acquire education, eventually assimilating into American society. They asked that the liquor traffic be controlled. They also wanted federal supervision of credit and annuity activities (payments in silver coin created problems), and they requested instruction for the Miami in metal craftsmanship by supplying a blacksmith and gunsmith to them (Anson, 190; Carter, 162). Jefferson was sympathetic, especially to their plans to make yeoman farmers of the Indians. He did reappoint Wells to be Indian agent at Fort Wayne and arranged for the fort company to build a council house for the Miami in the area of the fort as they had asked. The council house was built in 1804.

Between that 1802 Washington visit and another in 1808, which included Jean-Baptiste de Richardville, events had changed Jefferson's attitude toward the Indians and had brought a number of developments that would affect them. England and France's sporadic wars erupted again, this time under Napoleon. American trade was disrupted and the British from Canada were fomenting anti-American activities among the Indians. Unexpectedly, in 1803, Napoleon sold the Louisiana
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Conditions in Fort Wayne after 1800 became a tangled web of competing lines of authority between the Secretary of War's office, the governorships of Indiana and Michigan, and the Fort Wayne land agents, factors, and fort commandants. In Kekionga, the breach widened between the Pacan-Richardville leadership and that of Little Turtle and Wells (Anson, 149, 152 fn 25, 161; Poinsatte, Outpost. 31, 44-46, 50-55; Carter, 146). The gulf developing between the Kekionga Miamis and theirbrethrenintherestofIndianadeepened.

This murk of conflicting goals, ambitions, competing traders, and power seekers was fertile ground for both William Henry Harrison and Tecumseh, the final antagonists in this period.
Harrison maneuvered the beleaguered Indians into a series of land concessions in 1803, 1805, and 1809. In the Treaty of Fort Wayne (1803), nine tribes agreed to cede one-and-a-half million acres of land around the Indiana territorial capital, Vincennes. (All French land titles were preserved and the Indians got 159 bushels of salt annually in lieu of the salt springs on the ceded land.) The Treaty of Grouseland (Harrison's Vincennes mansion) in 1805 ceded all Indian land in southern Indiana above the Ohio River. Between 1803 and 1805, the Miami had ceded some of the land to the Delaware, who had to now turn it over to the U.S. More significant for the Miami, this land—the area of so many raids by whites and Miami—had included traditional Miami hunting grounds. The cessions also cut into the lands of the Kaskaskia, Kickapoo, and Piankeshaw. (See Attachment G.)

Little Turtle and Wells had visited the new President in Washington, Thomas Jefferson, in 1802 to continue to plead for Miami favor there. They had a number of specific concerns: first, over the sale of whiskey to the Indians and its result in drunkenness, brawling, and ill health, as well as its being
a block to their attempts to get Indians to adopt the American style of farming and acquire education, eventually assimilating into American society. They asked that the liquor traffic be controlled. They also wanted federal supervision of credit and annuity activities (payments in silver coin created problems), and they requested instruction for the Miami in metal craftsmanship by supplying a blacksmith and gunsmith to them (Anson, 190; Carter, 162). Jefferson was sympathetic, especially to their plan to make yeoman farmers of the Indians. He did reappoint Wells to be Indian agent at Fort Wayne and arranged for the fort company to build a council house for the Miami in the area of the fort as they had asked. The council house was built in 1804.

Between that 1802 Washington visit and another in 1808, which included Jean-Baptiste de Richardville, events had changed Jefferson's attitude toward the Indians and had brought a number of developments that would affect them. England and France's sporadic wars erupted again, this time under Napoleon. American trade was disrupted and the British from Canada were fomenting anti-American activities
among the Indians. Unexpectedly, in 1803, Napoleon sold the Louisiana
Territory to Jefferson, and in 1804 Jefferson sent out the Lewis and Clark expedition to investigate the new lands. They reported that nothing beyond the Mississippi River to the Oregon Territory was fit for white habitation, but was suited to Indiana. Jefferson saw the opportunity to remove Indians from the fertile old Northwest Territory before Jackson. It could have been on this visit that the Miami leaders, including Richardville, heard the tolling of the removal bell in loud, clear tones. Long before this, they had understood the value of their land and the white concept of property ownership.

Factor John Johnston in Fort Wayne had been stoking his anti-Wells vendetta, writing repeatedly to Harrison and the Secretary of War, about Wells' villainy, whipping up explosive grievances among whites and Indians alike (Poinsette, *Outpost*, 52-55). Returning from Washington in 1808 with nothing but experience to show for their efforts, the delegation faced another round of negotiations with Harrison. Politically ambitious, Harrison was sensitive to the demands of the settlers and the policy of the Washington government. He was well informed of Johnston's anti-Wells campaign. Harrison was less convinced that Wells' usefulness was over, but he badly underestimated the growing power of Richardville (as Pacan's age was telling), and made the mistake of openly insulting both Pacan and Richardville at the 1803 treaty conference by ignoring their political status among Miami (Anson, 146). Harrison's strategy in Indian dealings was clearly to foster divisions among tribes and Miami groups.

The causes of the devastating 1812 St. Mary's Treaty--Richardville's first as principal chief--lie in the period from 1805 to 1814. Tecumseh's brother, the Prophet, began his preaching after the 1803 and 1805 treaties; his message of a resurrection of traditional Indian culture (an all-Indian culture with all Indian lands held in common and closed to white contact) was the spiritual source of Tecumseh's program for another mighty Indian alliance supplied and supported by the British that would culminate in the War of 1812 (Edmunds, *Tecumseh*, 122-129, 162-169).

From 1805 to 1812, Pacan and Richardville tried to maneuver a way between the pro-American and anti-Tecumseh forces of Little Turtle and Wells and the bitterly anti-Little Turtle and Wells Miami and other tribes who tended to extend their antipathy to Kekionga and its leadership. Pacan's preoccupation was with Miami unity and prestige; he harbored no love for Americans and no trust in the British. Pacan and Richardville followed a torturous negotiating path (Anson, 148-166). The crucial event was the 1809 Treaty of Fort Wayne. A large group of Indians (Kekionga and El River Miami, Potawatomi, and Delaware) encamped in Fort Wayne for a treaty council during which they ceded nearly three million acres of their lands, partly as a result of titles disputed among themselves, in return for annuities of $700, $500, and salt. The Kekionga Miami did salvage definite
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Territory to Jefferson, and in 1804 Jefferson sent out the Lewis and Clark expedition to investigate the new lands. They reported that nothing beyond the Mississippi River to the Oregon Territory was fit for white habitation, but was suited to Indians.

Jefferson saw the opportunity to remove Indians from the fertile old Northwest Territory before Jackson. It could have been on this visit that the Miami leaders, including Richardville, heard the tolling of the removal bell in loud, clear tones. Long before this, they had understood the value of their land and the white concept of property ownership.

Factor John Johnston in Fort Wayne had been stoking his anti-Wells vendetta, writing repeatedly to Harrison and the
Secretary of War, about Wells' villainy, whipping up explosive grievances among whites and Indians alike (Poinsatte, Outpost. 52-55). Returning from Washington in 1808 with nothing but experience to show for their efforts, the delegation faced another round of negotiations with Harrison. Politically ambitious, Harrison was sensitive to the demands of the settlers and the policy of the Washington government. He was well informed of Johnston's anti-Wells campaign. Harrison was less convinced that Wells' usefulness was over, but he badly underestimated the growing power of Richardville (as Paean's age was telling), and made the mistake of openly insulting both Paean and Richardville at the 1803 treaty conference by ignoring their political status among Miami (Anson, 146). Harrison's strategy in Indian dealings was clearly to foster divisions among tribes and Miami groups. The causes of the devastating 1818 St. Mary's Treaty—Richardville is first as principal chief—lie in the period from 1805 to 1814. Tecumseh's brother, the Prophet, began his preaching after the 1803 and 1805 treaties; his message of a
resurrection of traditional Indian culture (an all-Indian culture with all Indian lands held in common and closed to white contact) was the spiritual source of Tecumseh's program for another mighty Indian alliance supplied and supported by the British that would culminate in the War of 1812 (Edmunds, Tecumseh. 122-129, 162-169).

From 1805 to 1812, Paean and Richardville tried to maneuver a way between the pro-American and anti-Tecumseh forces of Little Turtle and Wells and the bitterly anti-Little Turtle and Wells Miami and other tribes who tended to extend their antipathy to Kekionga and its leadership.

Paean's preoccupation was with Miami unity and prestige; he harbored no love for Americans and no trust in the British. Paean and Richardville followed a torturous negotiating path (Anson, 148-166). The crucial event was the 1809 Treaty of Fort Wayne. A large group of Indians (Kekionga and Eel River Miami, Potawatomi, and Delaware) encamped in Fort Wayne for a treaty council during which they ceded nearly three million acres of their lands, partly as a result of titles disputed among themselves, in return for annuities
of $700, $500, and salt. The Kekionga Miami did salvage definite
boundaries for their remaining lands, a move that would prove invaluable for the
treaties from 1818 to 1840. This treaty, especially the Kekionga passages,
propelled Tecumseh into a Moses-like leadership of the Indian alliance. It also
scuttled any hope that Pacan, Richardville, or Little Turtle might have had in
keeping Miami out of the war completely. A number of their warriors joined
Tecumseh. Kekionga was caught between the pro-American tribes in Ohio and the
overwhelming anti-American tribes in Indiana and beyond to the west and north.

Harrison, making his way up the Wabash and unwisely sending forces against the
Mississinewa Miami, tried to weld the whole Kekionga group to the American cause
declaried that the families and possessions of Pacan, Richardville, Little
Turtle, Godfrey, White Loon, and a Delaware chief (some neutral and some pro-
American) be protected (Anson, 169). He failed. Little Turtle died in 1812, and
Wells was killed at the siege of Fort Dearborn in the same year. Richardville
decided in 1812 to move his family to Detroit, where he had friends and
connections from the 1700s. (Whether Tecumseh and Pacan accompanied him is
unknown. Quite possibly they remained with friends and family scattered from the
Forks of the Wabash to the Mississinewa area.) Richardville's immediate family
consisted of his wife, Natoqueah (or Nat-ta-wa-quah), a daughter of White
Raccoon (Wap-pe-se-pah) and six children: three sons (John, Joseph, and blind
Miaqueah) and three daughters (Maria Louise or La Blonde, Susan, and Catherine).
He also had a half-sister, Josette Beaubien Robidoux, in the Fort Wayne area, in
addition to his full brother and two sisters, whose whereabouts are unknown. (It
is possible one or more of them lived in Detroit. When he and his family
returned to Fort Wayne sometime after 1813, he reputedly brought a niece, Madame
LaFalla, back with him.)

After Tecumseh's defeat by Harrison in Canada, an armistice council was held in
Detroit during which the Indians admitted their error in believing in British
victory and offered token military support to the Americans. The tribes signing
the armistice with the Miami (Kekionga, Wea, Eel River) were the Chippewa,
Ottawa, Potawatomi, and Kickapoo. Pacan signed with two other Miami chiefs;
Richardville with the Potawatomi.

At the Greene Ville treaty conference in 1814, 4,000 Indians attended (85 had
attended the 1795 conference). The Miami, however, were the last to arrive.
Pacan and Charley (Kitunga) of Eel River spoke for the Miami, protesting the
treaty's blaming all Miami for those few who fought with Tecumseh, and defending
their official policy of neutrality (Anson, 174). The American negotiators,
Harrison and Lewis Cass, equated neutrality with deceit. To them, those who did
not ally with the Americans aided the British. The price of the Miami defeat
would be exacted in later treaties from 1818 to 1840.
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boundaries for their remaining lands, a move that would prove invaluable for the treaties from 1818 to 1840. This treaty, especially the Kekionga passages, propelled Tecumseh into a Moses-like leadership of the Indian alliance. It also scuttled any hope that Paean, Richardville, or Little Turtle might have had in keeping Miamis out of the war completely. A number of their warriors joined Tecumseh.

Kekiongawa was caught between the pro-American tribes in Ohio and the overwhelming anti-American tribes in Indiana and beyond to the west and north.

Harrison, making his way up the Wabash and unwisely sending forces against the Mississinewa Miami, tried to weld the whole
Kekionga group to the American cause by declaring that the families and possessions of Paean, Richardville, Little Turtle, Godfrey, White Loon, and a Delaware chief (some neutral and some pro-American) be protected (Anson, 169). He failed. Little Turtle died in 1812, and Wells was killed at the siege of Fort Dearborn in the same year. Richardville decided in 1812 to move his family to Detroit, where he had friends and connections from the 1700s.

(Whether Tacumwah and Paean accompanied him is unknown. Quite possibly they remained with friends and family scattered from the Forks of the Wabash to the Mississinewa area.)

Richardville’s immediate family consisted of his wife, Natoequeah (or Nat-ta-wa-quah), a daughter of White Raccoon (Wap-pe-se-pah) and six children: three sons (John, Joseph, and blind Miaqueah) and three daughters (Maria Louise or La Blonde, Susan, and Catherine). He also had a half-sister, Josette Beaubien Robidoux, in the Fort Wayne area, in addition to his full brother and two sisters, whose whereabouts are unknown. (It is possible one or more of them lived in Detroit. When he and his family returned to Fort Wayne sometime after 1813, he reputedly brought a niece, Madame LaFalia, back with him.)

After Tecumseh’s defeat by Harrison in Canada, an armistice council was held in Detroit during which the Indians admitted
their error in believing in British victory and offered token military support to the Americans. The tribes signing the armistice with the Miami (Kekionga, Wea, Eel River) were the Chippewa, Ottawa, Potawatomi, and Kickapoo. Paean signed with two other Miami chiefs; Richardville with the Potawatomi.

At the Greene Ville treaty conference in 1814, 4,000 Indians attended (85 had attended the 1795 conference). The Miami, however, were the last to arrive. Paean and Charley (Kitunga) of Eel River spoke for the Miami, protesting the treaty's blaming all Miami for those few who fought with Tecumseh, and defending their official policy of neutrality (Anson, 174). The American negotiators, Harrison and Lewis Cass, equated neutrality with deceit. To them, those who did not ally with the Americans aided the British. The price of the Miami defeat would be exacted in later treaties from 1818 to 1840.
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This 1814 treaty of capitulation was signed by 113 chiefs. Only two Miami subchiefs refused to sign. It ended Miami military power and influence on the frontier. At the same time, Anson claims that "the greatest tribute to Miami adaptability and acumen must be the admission that in such circumstances they were able to maintain some of the political and cultural unity and identity and to secure from their white conquerors an unusual amount of financial security, as well as some degree of harmonious rapport" (Anson, 178). This would be the accomplishment of new leadership under Richardville. The 1814 treaty was the last one signed by Pacan. He died "soon after" according to Anson (178), but Carter notes that in spring 1816, "Pacan sent word to all the Miami that he was going to establish a village on the Eel River... but before his plan could be realized, Pacan died." (Carter, 241-42).

The man who became Principal Chief at this point was Jean-Baptiste de Richardville, a 55-year-old métis, educated, tri-lingual, at home with French, British, American, or Miami, experienced at negotiating and trading with them all, high and low. From his first treaty negotiations in 1818 as Principal Chief to his last in 1840, his expertise grew. In fact, the last treaty he drew up himself, together with lawyer Allen Hamilton (who would be one of the two executors of his will). They presented it as "a fait accompli" to the local Indian agents, who realized it would be approved by the U.S. Commissioner and the Secretary of War so long as it finally provided for eventual Miami emigration (Anson, 205).

The métis contribution to Richardville's accomplishments is evident in the vast difference between Pacan's pathetic last attempt in 1816 to reconstruct the old and the approach of Richardville, based on an information-gathering and important connections system at least as old as his experience in 1790 Miamitown/Kekionga. His widespread business contacts grew as his trading enterprises expanded and prospered despite, or perhaps because of, the government factories. (Contrary to government expectations, their goods were both inferior to and cost more than those of the private stores and, as a result, the latter's business improved.) Richardville knew well of the majority white desire to drive out or wipe out the Indians to get their fertile and productive land east of the Mississippi. (They often had resorted to ways of accomplishing this short of war: disease-infected blankets, whiskey, starvation—destruction of crops, and debt. The latter was suggested to Harrison by Jefferson, who saw it as a goal for the new factories in 1803. Jefferson advised Hamilton to encourage Indians—"the good and influential individuals among them"—to run into debt because "we observe that when these individuals get beyond what the individual can pay, they become willing to lose them off by a cession of lands." (Carter, 165 fn 25). Moreover, Richardville knew well the experience of other tribes who had been driven off their lands by force.
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This 1814 treaty of capitulation was signed by 113 chiefs. Only two Miami subchiefs refused to sign.

It intended Miami military power and influence on the frontier.

At the same time, Anson claims that "the greatest tribute to Miami adaptability and acumen must be the admission that in such circumstances they were able to maintain some of the political and cultural unity and identity and to secure from their white conquerors an unusual amount of financial security, as well as some degree of harmonious rapport" (Anson, 178). This would be the accomplishment of new leadership under Richardville.

The 1814 treaty was the last one signed by Paean. He died "soon after" according to Anson (178), but Carter notes that in spring 1816, "Paean sent word to all the Miami that he was
going to establish a village on the Eel River...But before his plan could be realized, Paean died." (Carter, 241-42).

The man who became Principal Chief at this point was Jean-Baptiste de Richardville, a 55-year-old métis, educated, trilingual, at home with French, British, American, or Miami, experienced at negotiating and trading with them all, high and low. From his first treaty negotiations in 1818 as Principal Chief to his last in 1840, his expertise grew. In fact, the last treaty he drew up himself, together with lawyer Alien Hamilton (who would be one of the two executors of his will). They presented it as "a fait accompli" to the local Indian agents, who realized it would be approved by the U.S. Commissioner and the Secretary of War so long as it finally provided for eventual Miami emigration (Anson, 205).

The métis contribution to Richardville's accomplishments is evident in the vast difference between Paean's pathetic last attempt in 1816 to reconstruct the old and the approach of Richardville, based on an information-gathering and important connections system at least as old as his experience in 1790 Miamitown/Kekionga. His widespread business contacts grew as his trading enterprises expanded and prospered despite, or perhaps because of, the government factories. (Contrary to government
expectations, their goods were both inferior to and cost more than those of the private stores and, as a result, the latter's business improved.) Richardville knew well of the majority white desire to drive out or wipe out the IndianstogettheirfertileandproductivelandeastoftheMississippi. (They oftenhadresortedtowaysofaccomplishingthisshortofwar: disease-infected blankets, whiskey, starvation—destruction of crops, and debt. The latter was suggested to Harrison by Jefferson, who saw it as a goal for the new factories in 1803. Jefferson advised Hamilton to encourage Indians—"the good and influential individuals among them"—to run into debt because "we observe that when these individuals get beyond what the individual can pay, they become willing to lop them off by a cession of lands." (Carter, 165 fn 25). Moreover, Richardville knew well the experience of other tribes who had been driven off their lands by force.
Negotiation by negotiation, plotting step by step with the other chiefs and leaders, persuading them into necessary agreement with the results, Richardville worked out a strategy of land ownership, money, goods, and services that would afford some security and sustenance for his Miami people. This strategy appears in his first treaty as Principal Chief, the 1818 Treaty of St. Mary’s. Richardville headed the 16 "chiefs and warriors" who were signatories. The U.S. commissioners were Indiana Territorial Governor Jonathan Jennings, Indiana Judge Benjamin Parke, and Territorial Governor of Michigan and Superintendent of Indian Affairs for the Northwest Territory, Lewis Cass. (Cass held the latter office from 1813 to 1817, when he became Secretary of War until 1836. It is likely that Richardville learned about Cass when he was in Detroit after 1812, and any information would prove useful, for Cass was a commissioner for the Miami treaties of 1814, 1818, and 1826. He would also appoint the commissioners for the 1834 treaty (Anson, 184).

The Treaty of St. Mary’s (Ohio) in 1818 spelled out the disastrous cost of the 1812-14 Miami attempt at neutrality, which was promised by the 1814 treaty. This treaty, which opened central Indiana for white settlement, marked not only an "American land grab" of unprecedented dimensions (Anson, 179), but also demonstrated Richardville’s grasp of American land ownership law and Indian policy. If tribal ownership was a dying cause, there was a retreat to village ownership. There was also the possibility of individual Indian grants or patents. For metis, white-blood claims allowed the possibility of the coveted fee-simple patent, full legal ownership under U.S. law.

Specifically, in the 1818 treaty, the Miami ceded undisputed title to the U.S. of about 4,300,000 acres and one half interest (with the Delaware) in about 3,860,000 acres. (For cessions made in 1818, 1826, 1834, 1838, and 1840, see Attachments F, G, H.) This was all the Miami land south of the Wabash River except tribal lands of the Big Reserve (along the Wabash from the mouth of the Salamonie River to the mouth of the Eel River and an equal distance south—35 plus square miles), five smaller reserves, and 21 village and individual grants. (The village grants could be sold without consent of the whole council; individual grants were Indian patents that could not be sold without "permission of the President," which meant an official of Indian affairs.) The major breakthrough was the grant in fee-simple to Principal Chief Richardville, due to his white blood and his importance, of 11 sections of land (over 7,000 acres) of which five sections lay on the east and west banks of the St. Mary’s River south of Fort Wayne. (This land was likely already the site of Richardville’s residence and farm, and in 1827 his handsome brick residence.)

In return for their great 1818 land cession, the Miami were to receive perpetual annuities of $15,000 in addition to previous annuities in silver, a sawmill and a...
Negotiation by negotiation, plotting step by step with the other chiefs and leaders, persuading them into necessary agreement with the results, Richardville worked out a strategy of land ownership, money, goods, and services that would afford some security and sustenance for his Miami people. This strategy appears in his first treaty as Principal Chief, the 1818 Treaty of St. Mary's. Richardville headed the 16 "chiefs and warriors" who were signatories. The U.S. commissioners were Indiana Territorial Governor Jonathan Jennings, Indiana Judge Benjamin Parke, and Territorial Governor of Michigan and Superintendent of Indian Affairs for the Northwest Territory, Lewis Cass. (Cass held the latter office from 1813 to 1831, when he became Secretary of War until 1836.)
It is likely that Richardville learned about Cass when he was in Detroit after 1812, and any information would prove useful, for Cass was a commissioner for the Miami treaties of 1814, 1818, and 1826. He would also appoint the commissioners for the 1834 treaty (Anson, 184).

The Treaty of St. Mary's (Ohio) in 1818 spelled out the disastrous cost of the 1812-14 Miami attempt at neutrality, which was promised by the 1814 treaty. This treaty, which opened central Indiana for white settlement, marked not only an "American land grab" of unprecedented dimensions (Anson, 179), but also demonstrated Richardville's grasp of American land ownership law and Indian policy.

If tribal ownership was a dying cause, there was a retreat to village ownership.

There was also the possibility of individual Indian grants or patents. For Metis, white-blood claims allowed the possibility of the coveted fee-simple patent, full legal ownership under U.S. law.

Specifically, in the 1818 treaty, the Miami ceded undisputed title to the U.S. of about 4,300,000 acres and one half interest (with the Delaware) in about 3,860,000 acres. (For cessions made
This was all the Miami land south of the Wabash River except tribal lands of the Big Reserve (along the Wabash from the mouth of the Salamonie River to the mouth of the Eel River and an equal distance south—35 plus square miles), five smaller reserves, and 21 village and individual grants. (The village grants could be sold without consent of the whole council; individual grants were Indian patents that could not be sold without "permission of the President," which meant an official of Indian affairs.) The major breakthrough was the grant in fee-simple to Principal Chief Richardville, due to his white blood and his importance, of 11 sections of land (over 7,000 acres) of which five sections lay on the east and west banks of the St. Mary's River south of Fort Wayne. (This land was likely already the site of Richardville's residence and farm, and in 1827 his handsome brick residence.) In return for their great 1818 land cession, the Miami were to receive perpetual annuities of $15,000 in addition to previous annuities in silver, a sawmill and a
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gristmill (sites at chief's selection), agricultural implements (as the appropriate Indian agent deemed proper), and an annual delivery to them of 160 bushe of salt.

The turnover of Indian agents in Fort Wayne during this period must have been troublesome for Richardville. In 1818, the Fort Wayne agency was combined with that of Piqua, Ohio, under the contentious John Johnston. A subagent was named for Fort Wayne who lasted to only 1820, then was replaced by another who resigned three years later due to ill health. In 1823, John Tipton was appointed. Anson says that Tipton was the "most important figure in Indian affairs of Indiana for many years" (Anson, 185) and one who would gain increasing rapport with the Indian chiefs, especially Richardville, in the treaty-making period when their importance in government eyes grew. Tipton had great influence among the settlers and traders, as well as an understanding of Indian concerns and problems.

In 1822, a land office was opened in Fort Wayne and the town was platted in 1823. Richardville bought a lot for his own trading post in 1824 (Poinsette, Outpost, 97-9). After the 1818 treaty, traders flooded into the town, mostly French Canadians at first, to be on hand at the time of annuity payments. The fur trade by 1820 was dying. Traders sought silver coins and land, not furs. They also offered the tempting credit system. During the 1820s, more ambitious and unscrupulous traders, exploiting the growing Indian addiction to whiskey as a cure-all for despair and alienation, hawked their wares on Fort Wayne streets and even into Indian encampments (Poinsette, Outpost, 84). From the point of view of Chief Richardville, the situation was potentially more dangerous than any previous threat. By 1831, he would move the tribal headquarters and build a new trading post at the Forks of the Wabash near Huntington. The fire two-story hewn-log council house in Fort Wayne would be turned over to the town inhabitants.

The flight of the Miami from the confluence of the three rivers, however, had likely occurred many years earlier. Upon their return from Detroit after 1812, Richardville, his family, and his village had probably settled south of the Fort Wayne government reserve of 1795 on the St. Marys River. (This was the land he requested and received as his five-section reserve in 1818.) Richardville did live on the reserve before he built his 1827 house. An educated Philadelphian traveling in Indiana visited Richardville's "fine farm" on the St. Marys in 1821. He commented that Richardville (who himself was absent at the time in Detroit) "lives in quite a genteel style" (McCord, 115). In 1825, a visiting circuit court judge wrote about a horse race he attended "at Chief Richardville's" on the St. Marys (Roberts, 11). Moreover, the 1821 visitor noted many log cabins in the vicinity, probably Richardville's village. This would not be the only group of
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gristmill (sites at chief's selection), agricultural implements (as the appropriate Indian agent deemed proper), and an annual delivery to them of 160 bushels of salt.

The turnover of Indian agents in Fort Wayne during this period must have been troublesome for Richardville.

In 1818, the Fort Wayne agency was combined with that of Piqua, Ohio, under the contentious John Johnston. A subagent was named for Fort Wayne who lasted to only 1820, then was replaced by another who resigned three years later due to ill health. In 1823, John Tipton was appointed. Anson says that Tipton was the "most important figure in Indian affairs of Indiana for many years" (Anson, 185) and one who would gain increasing rapport with the Indian chiefs,
especially Richardville, in the treaty-making period when their importance in government eyes grew.

Tipton had great influence among the settlers and traders, as well as an understanding of Indian concerns and problems.

In 1822, a land office was opened in Fort Wayne and the town was platted in 1823. Richardville bought a lot for his own trading post in 1824 (Poinsatte, Outpost, 97-8). After the 1818 treaty, traders flooded into the town, mostly French Canadians at first, to be on hand at the time of annuity payments. The fur trade by 1820 was dying. Traders sought silver coins and land, not furs. They also offered the tempting credit system. During the 1820s, more ambitious and unscrupulous traders, exploiting the growing Indian addiction to whiskey as a cure-all for despair and alienation, hawked their wares on Fort Wayne streets and even into Indian encampments (Poinsatte, Outpost, 84). From the point of view of Chief Richardville, the situation was potentially more dangerous than any previous threat.

By 1831, he would move the tribal headquarters and build a new trading post at the Forks of the Wabash near Huntington. The fine two-story hewn-log council house in Fort Wayne would be turned over to the town inhabitants.
The flight of the Miami from the confluence of the three rivers, however, had likely occurred many years earlier. Upon their return from Detroit after 1812, Richardville, his family, and his village had probably settled south of the Fort Wayne government reserve of 1795 on the St. Marys River. (This was the land he requested and received as his five-section reserve in 1818.) Richardville did live on the reserve before he built his 1827 house. An educated Philadelphian traveling in Indiana visited Richardville's "fine farm" on the St. Marys in 1821. He commented that Richardville (who himself was absent at the time in Detroit) "lives in quite a genteel style" (McCord, 115). In 1825, a visiting circuit court judge wrote about a horse race he attended "at Chief Richardville's" on the St. Marys (Roberts, 11). Moreover, the 1821 visitor noted many log cabins in the vicinity, probably Richardville's village. This would not be the only group of
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Miami whose welfare Richardville would be responsible for as a civil chief. Brice says that "the needy never called (on Richardville) in vain--his kind and charitable hand was never withheld from the distressed of his own people or from the stranger" (Brice, 319). The encomium is important because in this period of shifting land rights, the chiefs, particularly Richardville, who received individual grants, were bitterly criticized for aggrandizing themselves and their families at the expense of the rest of their people.

The 1820s was one of Richardville's most active periods. He was in his sixties. His children were grown and scattered from Fort Wayne to Logansport. Besides establishing rapport with the new Indian agent, John Tipton (who had arrived in Fort Wayne in 1823) and traveling to Detroit on business and information-gathering missions, Richardville, with Chief LeGros of the Mississinewa area, responded to a request from Lewis Cass, Superintendent of Indian Affairs. In 1822, Cass had visited Fort Wayne to gather anthropological information on the language and customs of Miami Indians, a particular interest of his. He then requested that Richardville and LeGros host a visit by G. C. Trowbridge, his secretary, who would continue his studies of the Miami (Trowbridge, Foreword, v-vi). In the winter of 1824-25, Trowbridge stayed with LeGros, who was known to have a very comfortable home and to entertain well. Both LeGros and Richardville supplied him with the information published in his Meeamee Traditions (Trowbridge, vi).

Rumors of Indian removal to beyond the Mississippi were rampant by this time. Richardville requested that he and LeGros be permitted to visit Washington. Partly in return for their cooperation with Trowbridge, they got their request and in 1825-26, they journeyed to Washington accompanied by John Tipton and John Conner (Tipton Papers, I: 500, 517-20). The group must have learned that Jackson was certain to win the Presidency in 1828 and removal could not be far off. They must also have learned of the push for Clay's "American System," a measure of economic nationalism intended to protect Eastern industries in return for tariff revenue for internal improvements. The Erie Canal had been finished in 1825, and the movement in northern Indiana for an Erie-Wabash canal was a passionate issue for the settlers (Poinsette, Canal Era, 12).

By 1826, the Potawatomi had ceded most of their land in northern Indiana. At the council held at Paradise Springs, a site where the Mississinewa flows into the Wabash, in 1826, Richardville and other Miami chiefs (his principal counselors and friends were Chiefs LeGros and Francis Godfroy) were concerned with saving the isolated Miami villages in Potawatomi territory. The 1826 Treaty of Mississinewa reflected this concern, as well as that of the hungry settlers and the inevitable canal, and the Indians' only counter-card, the traders. (Indian annuities trade was still the traders' life-blood.)
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Miami whose welfare Richardville would be responsible for as a civil chief.

Brice says that "the needy never called (on Richardville) in vain—his kind and charitable hand was never withheld from the distressed of his own people or from the stranger" (Brice, 315). The encomium is important because in this period of shifting land rights, the chiefs, particularly Richardville, who received individual grants, were bitterly criticized for aggrandizing themselves and their families at the expense of the rest of their people.

The 1820s was one of Richardville's most active periods. He was in his sixties.

His children were grown and scattered from Fort Wayne to Logansport. Besides establishing rapport with the new Indian agent,
John Tipton (who had arrived in Fort Wayne in 1823) and traveling to Detroit on business and information-gathering missions, Richardville, with Chief LeGros of the Mississinewa area, responded to a request from Lewis Cass, Superintendent of Indian Affairs. In 1822, Cass had visited Fort Wayne to gather anthropological information on the language and customs of Miami Indians, a particular interest of his. He then requested that Richardville and LeGros host a visit by C. C. Trowbridge, his secretary, who would continue his studies of the Miami (Trowbridge, Foreword, v–vi). In the winter of 1824-25, Trowbridge stayed with LeGros, who was known to have a very comfortable home and to entertain well. Both LeGros and Richardville supplied him with the information published in his Meearmeear Traditions (Trowbridge, vi).

Rumors of Indian removal to beyond the Mississippi were rampant by this time. Richardville requested that he and LeGros be permitted to visit Washington. Partly in return for their cooperation with Trowbridge, they got their
request and in 1825-26, they journeyed to Washington accompanied by John Tipton and John Conner (Tipton Papers, I: 500, 517-20). The group must have learned that Jackson was certain to win the Presidency in 1828 and removal could not be far off. They must also have learned of the push for Clay's "American System," a measure of economic nationalism intended to protect Eastern industries in return for tariff revenue for internal improvements. The Erie Canal had been finished in 1825, and the movement in northern Indiana for an Erie-Wabash canal was a passionate issue for the settlers (Poinsatte, Canal Era. 12).

By 1826, the Potawatomi had ceded most of their land in northern Indiana. At the council held at Paradise Springs, a site where the Mississinewa flows into the Wabash, in 1826, Richardville and other Miami chiefs (his principal counselors and friends were Chiefs LeGros and Francis Godfrey) were concerned with saving the isolated Miami villages in Potawatomiterritory. The 1826 Treaty of Mississinewa reflected this concern, as well as that of the hungry settlers and the inevitable canal, and the Indians' only counter-
card, the traders. (Indian annuities trade was still the traders' life-blood.)
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In the 1826 treaty, the Miami ceded to the U.S. their claims to all their land north and west of the Wabash and Miami Rivers with the exception of six village reservations, the small Mississinewa tribal reserve, and two individual reservations. They also allowed a provision that Indiana "may lay out a canal or a road through any of these reservations, and (appropriate) for the use of a canal, six chains (396 feet) along the same" (Kappler, Article 2, 278). For "part consideration for the cession herein made" (Kappler, Article 4, 178), the Miami negotiators got the following:

1. Goods to the value of $31,040.53 for the Miami; if treaty not ratified, that amount to come out of their annuity by the Miami tribe
2. Following summer, goods to the value of $26,259.47
3. An 1827 annuity of $25,000 and $10,000 in goods; an 1828 annuity of $25,500 and $5,000 in goods; and an annual annuity of $25,000 as long as the Miami exist as a tribe
4. One wagon and one yoke of oxen for each of nine chiefs and for the band at the Forks of the Wabash
5. A $600 house for each of nine chiefs, including Richardville
6. To the Miami tribe, 200 head of cattle (four to six years of age), 200 head of hogs
7. Annually to the Miami tribe, 2,000 pounds of iron, 1,000 pounds of steel, and 1,000 pounds of tobacco
8. Five laborers to work three months a year for small villages and three laborers to work for three months a year for the Mississinewa band
9. U.S. to pay claims against Miami for $7,727.47
10. $2,000 annually for support of "poor infirm" Miami and the education of their youth "as long as Congress may think proper" and "expended under the direction of the President" (Kappler, Article 6, 279)
11. Indian land patents to 17 named individuals (18 3/4 sections or 6.750 acres)
12. Certain Miami lands granted by 1818 treaty to be purchased at prices listed in an accompanying schedule by U.S. government
13. Miami tribe may hunt on ceded lands as long as they remain in U.S. government hands.

The treaty was signed by 38 chiefs and Commissioners Lewis Cass, James Ray, and John Tipton. The negotiating sessions had been long, and the terms spelled out to the cent in some instances, reflecting the trader instinct and practical business sense of Chief Richardville. The treaty was an expensive agreement for the U.S. government, and was not popular in Indiana or Washington, D.C., because little land was ceded and the cost was far higher than other treaties (Rafert, 93). John Tipton wrote that without the generous giveaway of goods and houses for the chiefs, there would have been no treaty at all (Tipton Papers, I: 603-
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In the 1826 treaty, the Miami ceded to the U.S. their claims to all their land north and west of the Wabash and Miami Rivers with the exception of six village reservations, the small Mississinewa tribal reserve, and two individual reservations.

They also allowed a provision that Indiana "may lay out a canal or a road through any of these reservations, and (appropriate) for the use of a canal, six chains (396 feet) along the same" (Kappler, Article 2, 278). For "part consideration for the cession herein made" (Kappler, Article 4, 178), the Miami negotiators got the following:

1. Goods to the value of $31,040.53 for the Miami; if treaty not ratified, that amount to come out of their annuity by the Miami tribe.
2. Following summer, goods to the value of $26,259.47

3. An 1827 annuity of $25,000 and $10,000 in goods; an 1828 annuity of $25,500 and $5,000 in goods; and an annual annuity of $25,000 as long as the Miami exist as a tribe

4. One wagon and one yoke of oxen for each of nine chiefs and for the band at the Forks of the Wabash

5. A $600 house for each of nine chiefs, including Richardville

6. To the Miami tribe, 200 head of cattle (four to six years of age), 200 head of hogs

7. Annually to the Miami tribe, 2,000 pounds of iron, 1,000 pounds of steel, and 1,000 pounds of tobacco

8. Five laborers to work three months a year for small villages and three
laborers to work for three months a year for the Mississinewa band

9. U.S. to pay claims against Miami for $7,727.47

10. $2,000 annually for support of "poor infirm" Miami and the education of their youth "as long as Congress may think proper" and "expended under the direction of the President" (Kappler, Article 6, 279)

11. Indian land patent to 17 named individuals (183/4 section or 6,750 acres)

12. Certain Miami lands granted by 1818 treaty to be purchased at prices listed in an accompanying schedule by U.S. government

13. Miami tribe may hunt on ceded lands as long as they remain in U.S. government hands.

The treaty was signed by 38 chiefs and Commissioners Lewis Cass, James Ray, and John Tipton. The negotiating sessions
had been long, and the terms spelled out to the cent in some instances, reflecting the trader instinct and practical business sense of Chief Richardville. The treaty was an expensive agreement for the U.S. government, and was not popular in Indiana or Washington, D.C., because little land was ceded and the cost was far higher than other treaties (Rafert, 93). John Tipton wrote that without the generous giveaway of goods and houses for the chiefs, there would have been no treaty at all (Tioton Papers, I: 603-
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605: Rafert, 93. (In saving their villages to the north, where Indian lands previously had been ceded by others besides the Potawatomi, the Miami also left them isolated and vulnerable as others would be later.)

In 1828, Tipton moved the Indian agency from Fort Wayne to Logansport, Indiana, despite screams in protest from the scrambling small traders and connivers in Fort Wayne (Poinsette, Canal Era, 16). (In 1831, Richardville moved Miami tribal headquarters and his own trading post to the Forks of the Wabash.) By this time, Richardville's children were grown with growing children of their own and resided along the Wabash from Fort Wayne to Logansport. (His sons, Joseph and John, had been educated at McCoy's School in Fort Wayne and in Detroit and his daughters by the Sisters of Providence in Terre Haute. Accounts of them vary from learned, intelligent, attractive, and courageous men and women (Tipton Papers, II: 289-290; Dr. Decker quote, Anson, 186; McCoy quote, Anson, 189) to worthless alcoholics (Ruminiscences, [Charles Kiser], np. The comments seem to reflect as much the commentator as the commented upon.)

The move of the tribal headquarters to the Forks gave it better access to the villages and lands of the people, placed it closer to the Indian agency, and removed it from the scandalous conditions in Fort Wayne (Poinsette, Canal Era, 18-25). The building of the Wabash-Erie Canal in the 1830s brought an influx of Irish and German immigrants into the area and raised the value of land to hitherto unthought of heights, which became evident in the 1834 treaty.

Two other events would greatly influence the 1834 treaty: the Indian Removal Act of 1830 and the Black Hawk War of 1832. Greedy and panicked, squatters were besieging the Indiana General Assembly for Indian removal. Aggressive traders were pressing for more treaties with fat annuities. At the same time, Richardville, if denied an exclusive license to trade at the Forks, could at least limit the traders to those he approved of.

The final three treaties (1834, 1838, and 1840) would all be negotiated at the Forks. In 1834, the Miami ceded some lands allotted them in the 1818 and 1826 treaties (12 square miles of small reserves and part of the Big Reserve from 1818; some 120 sections or about 43,200 acres from 1826). For those cessions, the Miami were to receive:

1. $208,000 ($58,000 within six months, $50,000 to be applied to debts of the tribe; remaining $100,000 in annual installments of $10,000 each)
2. Chief Richardville, fee-simple patent for ten sections at the Forks of the Wabash that he held by Indian patent (1826 tribal reserve)
3. A "skilful miller" in lieu of the gunsmith promised in 1818
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60S; Rafert, 93) . (In saving their villages to the north, where Indian lands previously had been ceded by others besides the Potawatomi, the Miami also left them isolated and vulnerable as others would be later.)

In 1828, Tipton moved the Indian agency from Fort Wayne to Logansport, Indiana, despite screams in protest from the scrambling small traders and connivers in Fort Wayne (Poinsatte, Canal Era, 16) . (In 1831, Richardville moved Miami tribal headquarters and his own trading post to the Forks of the Wabash.) By this time, Richardville's children were grown with growing children of their own and resided along the Wabash from Fort Wayne to Logansport.

(His sons, Joseph and John, had been educated at McCoy's School
in Fort Wayne and in Detroit and his daughters by the Sisters of Providence in Terre Haute, Accounts of them vary widely from learned, intelligent, attractive, and courageous men and women (Tipton Papers. II: 289-290; Dr. Decker quote, Anson, 196; McCoy quote, Anson, 189) to worthless alcoholics (Reminiscences. [Charles Kiser], np). The comments seem to reflect as much the commentator as the commented upon.

The move of the tribal headquarters to the Forks gave it better access to the villages and lands of the people, placed it closer to the Indian agency, and removed it from the scandalous conditions in Fort Wayne (Poinsatte, Canal Era. 18-25). The building of the Wabash-Erie Canal in the 1830s brought an influx of Irish and German immigrants into the area and raised the value of land to hitherto unthought of heights, which became evident in the 1834 treaty.

Two other events would greatly influence the 1834 treaty: the Indian Removal Act of 1830 and the Black Hawk War of 1832. Greedy and panicked, squatters were besieging the Indiana General Assembly for Indian removal. Aggressive traders
were pressing for more treaties with fat annuities. At the same time, Richardville, if denied an exclusive license to trade at the Forks, could at least limit the traders to those he approved of.

The final three treaties (1834, 1838, and 1840) would all be negotiated at the Forks. In 1834, the Miami ceded some lands allotted them in the 1818 and 1826 treaties (12 square miles of small reserves and part of the Big Reserve from 1818; some 120 sections or about 43,200 acres from 1826). For those cessions, the Miami were to receive:

1. $208,000 ($58,000 within six months, $50,000 to be applied to debts of the tribe; remaining $100,000 in annual installments of $10,000 each)

2. Chief Richardville, fee-simple patent for ten sections at the Forks of the Wabash that he held by Indian patent (1826 tribal reserve)

3. A "skillful miller" in lieu of the gunsmith promised in 1818
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4. U.S. to value buildings and improvements on above ceded lands and an equal amount in building, clearing, and fencing at places chiefs chose; meanwhile, right to possess houses and improvements on ceded lands until replacements completed
5. $1,500 reimbursement for horses stolen from Miami by whites
6. Fee-simple titles for lands formerly granted by Indian patents to five chiefs (besides Richardsonville's grant) --13 sections in all
7. Hugh Hanna, a 1/4 section (compensation for his purchase of an 1826 grant not approved)
8. Indian titles for 20 individuals (23 3/4 sections).

Anson calls the treaty a "good bargain" (Anson, 199-200), but it raised a gale of criticism in Indiana because it did not promise Miami removal. President Jackson refused to accept it for the same reason and it would not be ratified until 1837.

The Panic of 1837 caused traders between Fort Wayne and Logansport to escalate debt claims against the Miami (Anson, 200-201) and brought about a new, complicated compromise treaty in 1838. The Miami ceded all tribal reserve land except their winter hunting grounds on the Big Reserve. In return, the Metocina band was to receive a grant of ten square miles in addition to 31 individual grants (50 sections), with provision for survey and for their transmission to Chief Richardsonville for distribution. The new payment was $335,680 ($60,000 upon ratification, residue after debt payments to be paid in ten annual installments of $12,568 each). The arrangements for debt claims and payments were spelled out in detail. The U.S. commissioners or commissioner was to investigate all claims against the Miami since October 23, 1834, and pay such as are "proved to his or their satisfaction, to be legal and just" (Kappler, Article 5, 520). If after investigation and due payment, any unexpended balance from the $150,000 amount reserved for debt payment (in 1834 treaty) was to be added to the subsequent annuity. If that amount proved insufficient, unpaid debts were to be paid in three equal installments from annuities. No debts were to operate as liens on annuities or land. Again, buildings and improvements on ceded lands were to be appraised and corresponding value made at places chiefs would designate. Meanwhile, Miami could remain in occupation of present improvements until this was accomplished. The U.S. was to survey and mark tribe's land within one year after ratification.

As long as Congress "shall at its discretion make an appropriation [under the terms of the 1826 treaty] for the support of the infirm and the education of the youth of said tribe" (Kappler, Article 15, 521-2), half the appropriation was to be paid to the chiefs for distribution as they found "most beneficial." A few individual matters were provided for: payment of debt claims of $6,800 by Richardsonville and $2,612 by Francis Godfrey which had been disallowed by the
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U.S. to value buildings and improvements on above ceded lands and an equal amount in building, clearing, and fencing at places chiefs chose; meanwhile, right to possess houses and improvements on ceded lands until replacements completed

$1,500 reimbursement for horses stolen from Miami by whites

Fee-simple titles for lands formerly granted by Indian patents to five chiefs (besides Richardville's grant)—13 sections in all

Hugh Hanna, a 1/4 section (compensation for his purchase of
Indian titles for 20 individuals (23 3/4 sections).

Anson calls the treaty a "good bargain" (Anson, 199-200), but it raised a gale of criticism in Indiana because it did not promise Miami removal. President Jackson refused to accept it for the same reason and it would not be ratified until 1837.

The Panic of 1837 caused traders between Fort Wayne and Logansport to escalate debt claims against the Miami (Anson, 200-201) and brought about a new, complicated compromise treaty in 1838. The Miami ceded all tribal reserve land except their winter hunting grounds on the Big Reserve. In return, the Metocina band was to receive a grant of ten square miles in addition to 31 individual grants (50 sections), with provision for survey and for their transmission to Chief Richardville for distribution. The new payment was $335,680 ($60,000 upon ratification, residue after debt payments to be paid in ten annual installments of $12,568 each).
in detail. The U.S. commissioners or commissioner was to investigate all claims against the Miami since October 23, 1834, and pay such as are "proved to his or their satisfaction, to be legal and just" (Kappler, Article 5, 520). If after investigation and due payment, any unexpended balance from the $150,000 amount reserved for debt payment (in 1834 treaty) was to be added to the subsequent annuity. If that amount proved insufficient, unpaid debts were to be paid in three equal installments from annuities. No debts were to operate as liens on annuities or land. Again, buildings and improvements on ceded lands were to be appraised and corresponding value made at places chiefs would designate. Meanwhile, Miami could remain in occupation of present improvements until this was accomplished. The U.S. was to survey and mark tribe's land within one year after ratification.

As long as Congress "shall at its discretion make an appropriation [under the terms of the 1826 treaty] for the support of the infirm and the education of the youth of said tribe" (Kappler, Article 15, 521-2), half the appropriation was to be paid to the chiefs for distribution.
as they found "most beneficial." A few individual matters were provided for: payment of debt claims of $6,800 by Richardville and $2,612 by Francis Godfrey which had been disallowed by the
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Commissioners because they were members of the tribe; issuance of patents for two individual grants of six sections made in the 1826 treaty.

Articles 10 and 11 bowed to the inevitable Miami emigration beyond the Mississippi, but with provisos that showed that by the fall of 1838 Richardville and the other Miami negotiators knew of the disaster of the Potawatomi removal. (Poor planning and sheer skullduggery had ended in starvation and flight for most Potawatomi [Poinsette, Canal Era, 96; Anson, 200]). They also give evidence that the chiefs were well aware of previous emigrations and the dangers of being caught between encroaching whites and angry Plains Indians.

These articles specify what land and provisions the U.S. will give, with pledged "guarantee to them forever," to the Miami to remove and settle on "when the said tribe may be disposed to emigrate from their present country." It shall be "sufficient in extent," "suited to their wants and condition," and "in a region contiguous in the occupation of the tribes who emigrated from the states of Ohio and Indiana" (Kappler, 521). If and when the Miami would emigrate, the U.S. "shall protect the said tribe and the people thereof, in their rights and possessions," against any "injuries, encroachments and oppressions" (Kappler, 521). The U.S. will defray expenses for six "chiefs or headmen" selected by the Miami in general council to explore the country to be assigned.

Again, Richardville established a bridgehead with the provision that whenever the tribe emigrates, he, being too "old and infirm" to travel to the new lands, should be paid his proportion of the annuity in Indiana. Article 13 precludes another three-year delay in ratification as had occurred with the 1834 treaty: if the 1838 treaty were not ratified by the next session of Congress, it would be null and void. The treaty was signed by Commissioner Abel C. Pepper, who had also negotiated and signed the previous one, and by 23 Miami "chiefs, headmen and warriors."

The complicated debt claim arrangements of this treaty, however, occupied most of the chiefs' time for the next two years. Commissioner Nathaniel West remarked that "I cannot refrain from bearing witness to the general honesty of this people; indeed, I hardly met with an instance of gross and barefaced denial of debt, unless the Indian knew he was right; then he was firm and decided and unwavering in his replies" (quoted in Anson, 203). West reduced 118 claims amounting to $142,439.25 to 98 claims for $84,010.40, which he approved. For this long labor, he lived in a "cabin" at the Forks which was Richardville's "house at the Forks" (Anson, 203).

Richardville's health must have been failing noticeably by 1840, for in that year he and Allen Hamilton (his lawyer and later one of two executors of his will)
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Commissioners because they were members of the tribe; issuance of patents for two individual grants of six sections made in the 1826 treaty.

Articles 10 and 11 bowed to the inevitable Miami emigration beyond the Mississippi, but with provisos that showed that by the fall of 1838 Richardville and the other Miami negotiators knew of the disaster of the Potawatomi removal, (Poor planning and sheer skullduggery had ended in starvation and flight for most Potawatomi [Poinsatte, Canal Era. 96; Anson, 200]). They also give evidence that the chiefs were well aware of previous emigrations and the dangers of being caught between encroaching whites and angry Plains Indians.
These articles specify what land and provisions the U.S. will give, with pledged "guarantee to them forever," to the Miami to remove and settle on "when the said tribe may be disposed to emigrate from their present country."

It shall be "sufficient in extent," "suited to their wants and condition," and "in a region contiguous in the occupation of the tribes who emigrated from the states of Ohio and Indiana" (Kappler, 521). If and when the Miami would emigrate, the U.S. "shall protect the said tribe and the people thereof, in their rights and possessions," against any "injuries, encroachments and oppressions" (Kappler, 521). The U.S. will defray expenses for six "chiefs or headmen" selected by the Miami in general council to explore the country to be assigned. Again, Richardville established a bridgehead with the provision that whenever the tribe emigrates, he, being too "old and infirm" to travel to the new lands, should be paid his proportion of the annuity in Indiana. Article 13 precludes another three-year delay in ratification as had occurred with the 1834 treaty:

if the 1838 treaty were not ratified by the next session of Congress, it would be null and void. The treaty was signed
by Commissioner Abel C. Pepper, who had also negotiated and signed the previous one, and by 23 Miami "chiefs, headmen and warriors."

The complicated debt claim arrangements of this treaty, however, occupied most of the chiefs' time for the next two years. Commissioner Nathaniel West remarked that "I cannot refrain from bearing witness to the general honesty of this people; indeed, I hardly met with an instance of gross and barefaced denial of debt, unless the Indian knew he was right; then he was firm and decided and unwavering in his replies" (quoted in Anson, 203). West reduced 118 claims amounting to $142,439.25 to 98 claims for $84,010.40, which he approved. For this long labor, he lived in a "cabin" at the Forks which was Richardville's "house at the Forks" (Anson, 203).

Richardville's health must have been failing noticeably by 1840, for in that year he and Alien Hamilton (his lawyer and later one of two executors of his will)
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drew up the "unauthorized treaty" (described earlier) that was accepted by both
the chiefs and the government agents. "The chiefs, who had resisted all attempts
to force Miami emigration for 20 years, finally agreed among themselves, for
reasons which can only be conjectured, that emigration was now acceptable." And
"the agents realized that any treaty with unreasonable conditions would be a fait
accompli gaining the approval of the Commissioner and the Secretary of War if it
provided for Miami emigration. Events proved that the agents had calculated
correctly" (Anson, 204-5).

For all their remaining lands, the Miami would be paid $550,000 ($300,000 to be
reserved for their debt payments upon ratification; $250,000 to be paid in 20
equal annual installments). A commissioner or commissioners were to investigate
debt claims against every member of the tribe, regardless of the claimant's
blood, accrued after November 6, 1838, or that may accrue before ratification.
Also, inquiry should be made into the "equity and legality of the original cause
of indebtedness" based on evidence (Kappler, Article 3, 531-2). These
judgements, on government approval, would be final. Of the reserved money,
$250,000 was to cover debts contracted before November 28, 1840; $50,000 to debts
contracted from November 18, 1840, until ratification, with preference to debts
contracted for "provisions and subsistence." Any balance left after the debt
payments was to be included in the next annuity.

Specifically and on technical grounds, this treaty excluded the families of
Francis Godfroy and Meshingomesia and his brothers from emigration. This treaty,
together with the previous one, thus provided for about half of the Miami people
to remain in Indiana—most were chiefs' families and métis. By this final 1840
treaty, the Miami were to be paid $250 annually in lieu of the labor stipulated
in the 1826 treaty. The Kansas lands for the Miami were specified: 500,000
acres south of the Wea and Kaskaskia, east of the Potawatomi, and north of the
"New York Indians" (Seneca). The Miami were to move to these lands within five
years of this treaty date, the U.S. paying all moving expenses and furnishing
rations to the tribe for 12 months after arrival. The U.S. was also to supply
$4,000 worth of "good merchantable pork and flour" (Kappler, Article 8, 532) to
the tribe the second year, this amount to be deducted from their annuity for that
year.

Those who accused Richardville of avarice would be justified by his personal
provisions in the treaty: of the money reserved for debt payment, he was to be
paid $25,000 and as the executor for Francis Godfroy, deceased, $15,000; from the
ceded Big Reserve, he would get patents for seven sections of his choice and one
for Francis LaFontaine. The avarice, however, could have been that of Allen
Hamilton, who would eventually get most of these assets, and more, as the
executor of Richardville's estate (Perry, 4,6; Tipton Papers, I: 20-24, II: 24,
Chief Jean B. Richardville House Alien County, IN

Statement of Significance

drew up the "unauthorized treaty" (described earlier) that was accepted by both the chiefs and the government agents. "The chiefs, who had resisted all attempts to force Miami emigration for 20 years, finally agreed among themselves, for reasons which can only be conjectured, that emigration was now acceptable." And "the agents realized that any treaty with unreasonable conditions would be a fait accompli gaining the approval of the Commissioner and the Secretary of War if it provided for Miami emigration. Events proved that the agents had calculated correctly" (Anson, 204-5).

For all their remaining lands, the Miami would be paid $550,000 ($300,000 to be reserved for their debt payments
upon ratification; $250,000 to be paid in 20 equal annual installments). A commissioner or commissioners were to investigate debt claims against every member of the tribe, regardless of the claimant's blood, accrued after November 6, 1838, or that may accrue before ratification. Also, inquiry should be made into the "equity and legality of the original cause of indebtedness" based on evidence (Kappler, Article 3, 531-2). These judgements, on government approval, would be final. Of the reserved money, $250,000 was to cover debts contracted before November 28, 1840; $50,000 to debts contracted from November 18, 1840, until ratification, with preference to debts contracted for "provisions and subsistence." Any balance left after the debt payments was to be included in the next annuity. Specifically and on technical grounds, this treaty excluded the families of Francis Godfrey and Meschingomesia and his brothers from emigration. This treaty, together with the previous one, thus provided for about half of the Miami people to remain in Indiana—most were chiefs' families and metis. By this final 1840 treaty, the Miami were to be paid $250 annually in lieu of the labor stipulated in the 1826 treaty.
The Kansas lands for the Miami were specified: 500,000 acres south of the Wea and Kaskaskia, east of the Potawatomi, and north of the "New York Indians" (Seneca). The Miami were to move to these lands within five years of this treaty date, the U.S. paying all moving expenses and furnishing rations to the tribe for 12 months after arrival. The U.S. was also to supply $4,000 worth of "good merchantable pork and flour" (Kappler, Article 8, 532) to the tribe the second year, this amount to be deducted from their annuity for that year.

Those who accused Richardville of avarice would be justified by his personal provisions in the treaty: of the money reserved for debt payment, he was to be paid $25,000 and as the executor for Francis Godfrey, deceased, $15,000; from the ceded Big Reserve, he would get patents for seven sections of his choice and one for Francis LaFontaine. The avarice, however, could have been that of Alien Hamilton, who would eventually get most of these assets, and more, as the executor of Richardville's estate (Perry, 4, 6; Tioton Papers, I: 20-21, II: 24,
Finally, negotiating expenses for the treaty were to be paid by the U.S. and the treaty would be null and void if not ratified by March 4, 1841. (It was ratified.) It was signed by 20 Miami "chiefs, warriors, and headmen" and Commissioners Samuel Milroy and Allen Hamilton. This was Chief Richardville's last treaty.

Richardville died August 13, 1841, in his home near the St. Marys, six years before about half the 700 to 800 Indiana Miami were sent by canal boat to west of the Mississippi. Jean-Baptiste Drouet de Richerville, Pechawa, Chief Richardville, indeed had been a remarkable metis with a knowledge of four cultures and the memory of a Miami Golden Age, as well as of the agonizing decline of the Miami in the 19th century. His last portrait, at age 80, shows a grave man with ghosts in his eyes (see Attachment I).

Upon his death, Richardville's casket was ferried down the river to the French Catholic church in Fort Wayne (then on the site of the current Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception). His remains lie under Cathedral Square. His daughters erected a memorial to him which now stands in the Catholic Cemetery in Fort Wayne (Griswold, 223). He left generous land grants to his children and grandchildren (his wife and two sons had predeceased him), as well as a safe containing about $200,000 in gold and silver. His oldest daughter inherited his St. Marys home and estate (John B. Richardville Will). The family sold or were defrauded of almost all the land and eventually the house itself by the 20th century.

When half the Miami people were removed in 1847, first to Kansas, then to Oklahoma, they were accompanied to Kansas by Richardville's son-in-law and successor, Chief Francis LaFontaine, and later joined by his grandson, Thomas Richardville (son of John), educated in law at Notre Dame, who became a Miami leader and a renowned Oklahoma lawyer, adroitly handling the tribe's litigation with the government.

Richardville's tactics in his role as deputy chief and Principal Chief of the Miami highlight the significance, versatility, and usefulness of the metis, as well as his political instincts and his unique place in American history. In Hay's journal, we see Richardville as a Miami chief who fit hand-in-glove in the French-English-metis community of Miamitown, a pipeline of information for his people and an able businessman for his family. Again, during the interwar period when the metis community in Fort Wayne increased as did their importance in trade relations (Anson, 145), Richardville was in his own element. Even his flight to Detroit in 1912 was likely a strategic one. Lewis Cass was stationed there as governor of the Michigan Territory and Superintendent of Indian Affairs in the
Finally, negotiating expenses for the treaty were to be paid by the U.S. and the treaty would be null and void if not ratified by March 4, 1841. (It was ratified.) It was assigned by 20 Miami "chiefs, warriors, and headmen" and Commissioners Samuel Milroy and Alien Hamilton. This was Chief Richardville's last treaty.

Richardville died August 13, 1841, in his home near the St. Marys, six years before about half the 700 to 800 Indiana Miami were sent by canal boat to west of the Mississippi. Jean-Baptiste Drouet de Richerville, Pechewa, Chief Richardville, indeed had been a remarkable metis with a
knowledge of four cultures and the memory of a Miami Golden Age, as well as of the agonizing decline of the Miami in the 19th century. His last portrait, at age 80, shows a grave man with ghosts in his eyes (see Attachment I).

Upon his death, Richardville's casket was ferried down the river to the French Catholic church in Fort Wayne (then on the site of the current Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception). His remains lie under Cathedral Square. His daughters erected a memorial to him which now stands in the Catholic Cemetery in Fort Wayne (Griswold, 225). He left generous land grants to his children and grandchildren (his wife and two sons had predeceased him), as well as a safe containing about $200,000 in gold and silver. His oldest daughter inherited his St. Marys home and estate (John B. Richardville Will). The family sold or were defrauded of almost all the land and eventually the house itself by the 20th century.

When half the Miami people were removed in 1847, first to Kansas, then to Oklahoma, they were accompanied to Kansas by Richardville's son-in-law and successor, Chief Francis
LaFontaine, and later joined by his grandson, Thomas Richardville (son of John), educated in law at Notre Dame, who became a Miami leader and a renowned Oklahoma lawyer, adroitly handling the tribe's litigation with the government.

Richardville's tactics in his role as deputy chief and Principal Chief of the Miami highlight the significance, versatility, and usefulness of the métis, as well as his political instincts and his unique place in American history. In Hay's journal, we see Richardville as a Miami chief who fit hand-in-glove in the French-English-métis community of Miamitown, a pipeline of information for his people and an able businessman for his family. Again, during the interwar period when the métis community in Fort Wayne increased as did their importance in trade relations (Anson, 145), Richardville was in his own element. Even his flight to Detroit in 1812 was likely a strategic one. Lewis Cass was stationed there as governor of the Michigan Territory and Superintendent of Indian Affairs in the
Northwest Territory from 1813 to 1831 (Anson, 183-4). Richardville seemed to understand the nature and differences between Miami and European cultures better than any other chief. For example, Little Turtle's association with William Wells had pushed the Miami warrior/hunters toward farming American fashion. Richardville understood that, at a time when their status was being undermined, for Miami men to be asked to do what they considered "woman's work" spelled disaster. Little Turtle encouraged Baptists to set up missionary schools for Miami youth at Fort Wayne; Richardville pushed for schools in the Indian villages run by Catholics (Catholicism was one European institution compatible with Indian ways and beliefs).

As deputy chief, Richardville emphasized his European culture at the height of Miami power and self-esteem. As Principal Chief, he turned Miami. He wore Miami dress and used Miami language in negotiations, using interpreters. An educated man, he made his mark on the treaties along with the other chiefs (Kappler, 174, 280). He probably insisted on frequent Miami ceremonies. He was all too aware of the long plummeting of Miami hope and confidence. Too many were piling up credit bills, endangering land for the pleasures of the day, displaying more and more silver ornaments, venting their anger and frustration in drinking and brawling. He played his best cards at the Forks of the Wabash, where he built a number of log cabins for the chiefs and commissioners around a large area in which sat the council house. The negotiations drew a horde of journalists and a full account was written in a journal kept by Henry Hoover, Secretary to the Government Commissioners, which details Richardville's delaying tactics ("The Man in the Middle," 6-12). It also reveals the nature of the Principal Chieftainship. He required the full accord and support of the other Miami chiefs for every important decision because the office of Principal Chief was far from autocratic, a fact of overriding importance in overall evaluation of Richardville as a Principal Chief. Yet his influence was pervasive and his judgement central to every tribal decision. He was a leader from 1765 to 1841 and a master of intrigue. John Tipton called him "the ablest diplomat of whom I have any knowledge. If he had been born and educated in France, he would have been the equal of Talleyrand" (quoted in Poinsette, Canal Era, 96).

Richardville's contemporaries were sometimes derogatory--a few traders and officials decrying his cunning and deceit, finding his craft too subtle. But others found him laudably prudent, careful, and deliberate, a patient listener, even beloved and esteemed. Trader George W. Swing called him "this distinguished and extraordinary man" (Anson 213-4) and Hugh McCulloch, respected banker and Secretary of the Treasury for three Presidents, remarked that he was a man "of whom no one ever got the better in a trade" (Anson, 209).
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Northwest Territory from 1813 to 1831 (Anson, 183-4). Richardville seemed to understand the nature and differences between Miami and European cultures better than any other chief. For example, Little Turtle's association with William Wells had pushed the Miami warrior/hunters toward farming American fashion. Richardville understood that, at a time when their status was being undermined, for Miami men to be asked to do what they considered "woman's work" spelled disaster.

Little Turtle encouraged Baptists to set up missionary schools for Miami youth at Fort Wayne; Richardville pushed for schools in the Indian villages run by Catholics (Catholicism was one European institution compatible with Indian ways and beliefs).
As deputy chief, Richardville emphasized his European culture at the height of Miami power and self-esteem. As Principal Chief, he turned Miami. He wore Miami dress and used Miami language in negotiations, using interpreters. An educated man, he made his mark on the treaties along with the other chiefs (Kappler, 174, 280). He probably insisted on frequent Miami ceremonies. He was all too aware of the long plummeting of Miami hope and confidence. Too many were piling up credit bills, endangering land for the pleasures of the day, displaying more and more silver ornaments, venting their anger and frustration in drinking and brawling. He played his best cards at the Forks of the Wabash, where he built a number of log cabins for the chiefs and commissioners around a large area in which sat the council house. The negotiations drew a horde of journalists and a full account was written in a journal kept by Henry Hoover, Secretary to the Government Commissioners, which details Richardville's delaying tactics ("The Man in the Middle," 6-12). It also reveals the nature of the Principal Chieftainship. Here required the full accord and support of the other Miami chiefs for every important decision because the office of Principal Chief was far from autocratic, a fact of overriding importance in overall evaluation of Richardville as a Principal Chief.
Yethis influence was pervasive and his judgement central to every
tribal decision. He was a leader from 1785 to 1841 and a master of
intrigue. John Tipton called him "the ablest diplomat of whom I have any
knowledge. If he had been born and educated in France, he would have
been the equal of Talleyrand" (quoted in Poinsatte, Canal Era. 96).

Richardville's contemporaries were sometimes derogatory—a few
traders and officials decrying his cunning and deceit, finding
his craft too subtle. But others found him laudably prudent,
careful, and deliberate, a patient listener,
even beloved and esteemed.
Trader George W. Ewing called him "this distinguished and extraordinary
man" (Anson 213-4) and Hugh McCulloch, respected banker and
Secretary of the Treasury for three Presidents, remarked that he
was a man "of whom no one ever got the better in a trade"
(Anson, 209).
Chief Jean B. Richardville House
Allen County, IN

Statement of Significance-Criterion C

The Chief Richardville House is significant under National Register Criterion C as an excellent example of a Greek Revival I-House, a now rare building form in Fort Wayne. An 1827 sheet with plans and specifications survives, making it the oldest documented building in the region.

The above-mentioned 1826 Treaty of Mississinewa allotted Chief Richardville, along with eight other Miami chiefs, $600 each in Federal funds to build houses. The money disbursed to Richardville by Fort Wayne Indian Agent John Tipton (Tipton Papers, I: 743-49) would cover the construction of a comfortable two-room one story brick house of the period (Tipton Papers, I: 738-39), but with Tipton’s approval Chief Richardville personally added $1,600 (Tipton Papers, I: 810) to construct a fine brick Greek Revival I-House with two parlors down, two bedrooms up, a hallway with a curving stair, four fireplaces, and imported windows.

A document entitled “1827 Plan of J.B. Richardville’s House” (Unpublished Tipton Papers, Indiana State Library; see attached plan and specifications of house, Attachment C), includes a floorplan and specifications for the house nearly identical to how the house was built (see Section 7, page 4). This document provides unique insight into the business practices of the time, as it combines the modern functions of architectural plans and specifications, as well as construction contract. The document also illustrates the established position of the I-House in the 1820s as a housing form. A statement on the sheet reads “the within plan of a house for Jean B. Richardville has been submitted to us and we have given our obligations of this date for its erection & completion Fort Wayne Augt. 30 1827” (See reverse side of plan, Attachment C). This statement was signed by contractors A.G. Ballard and Hugh Hanna. It is likely that these two men did actually build the Richardville House. A house in the city of Fort Wayne which was likely owned by Hugh Hanna’s brother Samuel was remarkably similar (see Photo 5). The Richardville House is the only known surviving example of the work of these builders.

The Richardville House was a grand and elaborate home when compared to other housing in the area at the time. Allen County, which was the first county formed in northeastern Indiana, had been created only three years prior to construction of the Richardville House. Fort Wayne would not be incorporated as a town until 1829. The few white settlers in the county lived in hewn-log structures. The majority of the homes and commercial structures within Fort Wayne were hewn-log structures as well (Griswold, 246). In contrast, the local tribal chief owned a substantial two-story brick home with fine details in the stylish Greek Revival mode. The house’s front door surround is a well-formed Greek Revival example with the door topped by a two-light transom and flanked by engaged pilasters enframe behind a shouldered architrave casing with battered sides. Each of the comfortable rooms within the Richardville House boasted a fireplace and finely
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The Chief Richardville House is significant under National Register Criterion C

as an excellent example of a Greek Revival I-House, a now rare building form in Fort Wayne. An 1827 sheet with plans and specifications survives, making it the oldest documented building in the region.

The above-mentioned 1826 Treaty of Mississinewa allotted Chief Richardville, along with eight other Miami chiefs, $600 each in Federal funds to build houses. The money disbursed to Richardville by Fort Wayne Indian Agent John Tipton

(Tipton Papers. I: 743-49) would cover the construction of a comfortable two-room one story brick house of the period
(Tipton Papers. I: 738-39), but with Tipton1s approval
Chief Richardville personally added $1,600 (Tipton Papers. I: 810) to construct a fine brick Greek Revival I-House
with two parlors down, two bedrooms up, a hallway with a
curving stair, four fireplaces, and imported windows.

A document entitled "1827 Plan of J.B. Richardville's
House" (Unpublished Tipton Papers, Indiana State Library;
see attached plan and specifications of house, Attachment C), includes a floorplan and specifications for the house
nearly identical to how the house was built (see Section 7, page 4). This document provides unique insight into the
business practices of the time, as it combines the modern
functions of architectural plans and specifications, as
well as construction contract.

The document also illustrates the established position of the I-
House in the 1820s as a housing form. A statement on the
sheet reads "the within plan of a house for Jean B.
Richardville has been submitted to us and we have given our
obligations of this date for its erection & completion Fort
Wayne Augt. 30 1827" (See reverse side of plan, Attachment C). This statement was
signed by contractors A.G. Ballard and Hugh Hanna.
It is likely that these two men did actually build the
Richardville House. A house in the city of Fort Wayne which
was likely owned by Hugh Hanna's brother Samuel was
remarkably similar (see Photo 5). The Richardville House is
the only known surviving example of the work of these
builders.

The Richardville House was a grand and elaborate home when
compared to other housing in the area at the time. Alien
County, which was the first county formed in northeastern
Indiana, had been created only three years prior to
construction of the Richardville House.

Fort Wayne would not be incorporated as a town until 1829.

The few whitesettlers in the county lived in hewn-log structures.
The majority of the homes and commercial structures within
Fort Wayne were hewn-log structures as well (Griswold, 246). In contrast, the local tribal chief owned a
substantial two-story brick home with fine details in the
stylish Greek Revival mode.

The house's front doors surround is a well-formed Greek Revival example with the door topped by a two-light transom and flanked by engaged pilasters.
enframed behind a shouldered architrave casing with battered sides.

Each of the comfortable rooms within the Richardville House boasted a fireplace and finely
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crafted woodwork. The parlor featured broad Greek Revival door and window casings with shouldered architrave trim formed by a plain square bolection. The same motif was repeated in the mantelpiece, as well as the dining room mantlepiece.

Accounts of the original furnishings of the Richardville House reflected Richardville’s aristocratic French background, as well as his wealth. Contemporary accounts (cited in Perry, 7; also Edmundson, 229) related in amazed detail the fine French wallpaper and drapes, the Oriental carpets, chandeliers, lovely porcelain figurines, and an elaborate gold clock on the parlor mantels, all owned by "an Indian". The pioneer town fathers of Fort Wayne, new settlers from New England and Pennsylvania, as well as important travelers passing through, found the enjoyment of the Chief’s hospitality a remarkable pleasure (Richards, 10).

Because the date of the house is so clearly established, it is the oldest documented house in northeast Indiana. It is also an extremely early expression of the Greek Revival style on the Indiana frontier. In its setting near a river and its I-House form, the house is quite similar to the home of William Conner in Hamilton County, near Indianapolis (NRHP 2-8-80). Conner was a contemporary and at least an acquaintance of Chief Richardville, and is considered to have been the first white settler in central Indiana, arriving about 1800. Conner was also a highly successful trader and landowner--making his wealth among both Native Americans and white settlers. He and Richardville would have been familiar with each other, as Conner served as an interpreter in the negotiation sessions for the treaties of 1818 and 1826 (Kappler, 174, 280). Conner built his large brick I-House on a bluff overlooking the White River in 1823, only four years prior to the construction of the Richardville House. The Conner House, however, was designed purely in the Federal style in both exterior and interior details. The striking Greek Revival details present in the Richardville House are a bold contrast, and clearly illustrate both Richardville’s concern with fashion and the spread of the Greek Revival style to the frontier.

Although Greek Revival I-Houses were once common in the city, Fort Wayne’s only other surviving example is the William S. Edsall House (NRHP 10-8-76). Built in 1840 at 305 West Main Street, the house is located in downtown Fort Wayne. The Edsall House is also brick, but it is a later, slightly larger, example of the style. The house has been altered with Italianate brackets and other details (Fort Wayne Interim Report, 13, 140), making it differ greatly in appearance from the unaltered early Greek Revival details of the Richardville House. Fort Wayne has only two other examples of the Greek Revival style; the Angell-Hoffman House (c.1840) and the Peter Ohneck House (1850). Both of these houses are located in the West End Historic District (NRHP 11-15-84), and both are Gable-front.
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Graftedwoodwork.

The parlor featured broad Greek Revival door and window casings with shouldered architrave trim formed by a plain square bolection. The same motif was repeated in the mantlepiece, as well as the dining room mantlepiece.

Accounts of the original furnishings of the Richardville House reflected Richardville's aristocratic French background, as well as his wealth. Contemporary accounts (cited in Perry, 7; also Edmundson, 229) related in amazed detail the fine French wallpaper and drapes, the Oriental carpets, chandeliers, lovely porcelain figurines, and an elaborate gold clock on the parlor mantels, all owned by "an Indian". The pioneer town fathers of Fort Wayne, new settlers from New England and Pennsylvania, as well as
important travelers passing through, found the enjoyment of
the Chief's hospitality a remarkable pleasure

(Richards, 10).

Because the date of the house is so clearly established, it is
the oldest documented house in northeast Indiana.

It is also an extremely early expression
of the Greek Revival style on the Indiana frontier.

In its setting near a river and its I-House form, the house is quite
similar to the home of William Conner in Hamilton County, near
Indianapolis (NRHP 2-8-80). Conner was a contemporary and at
least an acquaintance of Chief Richardville, and is considered
to have been the first white settler in central Indiana,
arriving about 1800. Conner was also a highly successful trader
and landowner—making his wealth among both Native
Americans and whitesettlers.

He and Richardville would have been familiar with each other, as Conner
served as an interpreter in the negotiation sessions for the
treaties of 1818 and 1826 (Kappler, 174, 280). Conner built his
large brick

I-House on a bluff overlooking the White River in 1823, only
four years prior to the construction of the Richardville House.
The Conner House, however, was designed purely in the Federal
style in both exterior and interior details. The striking Greek
Revival details present in the Richardville House are a bold contrast, and clearly illustrate both Richardville's concern with fashion and the spread of the Greek Revival style to the frontier.

Although Greek Revival I-Houses were once common in the city, Fort Wayne's only other surviving example is the William S. Edsall House (NRHP 10-8-76). Built in 1840 at 305 West Main Street, the house is located in downtown Fort Wayne. The Edsall House is also brick, but it is a later, slightly larger, example of the style. The house has been altered with Italianate brackets and other details

(Fort Wayne Interim Report, 13, 140), making it differ greatly in appearance from the unaltered early Greek Revival details of the Richardville House. Fort Wayne has only two other examples of the Greek Revival style; the Angell-Hoffman House (c.1840) and the Peter Ohneck House (1850). Both of these houses are located in the West End Historic District (NRHP 11-15-84), and both are Gable-front
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expressions of the style (Fort Wayne Interim Report, 16, 121).

Another house near Huntington, Indiana, has a prior National Register listing as the "Chief Richardville House and Miami Treaty Grounds" (NRHP 9-16-85). Since the listing of this property, new information has shown that this historic name is likely in error. In the nomination for this frame, Greek Revival 2/3 I-House, the owner claimed that the house was built by and for Jean B. Richardville, Chief Richardville, as his residence after the move of the tribal headquarters to the Forks of the Wabash (NRHP 9-16-85; Randle, "Indian house"). No historical reference or documentation, however, indicates that this was the house of Richardville prior to 1949, when the owner of the house first claimed it (Randle, "Indian house"). Undoubtedly Chief Richardville stayed at the treaty grounds at the Forks frequently, however new information and further historical analysis, as well as the traditions of surviving Miami descendants of Richardville and LaFontaine, indicate that the Huntington house was probably built in 1843 or 1844, two or three years after Richardville's death (Leonard, "Historic Structure Report," np). The house at the Forks of the Wabash was likely built by and for Chief Richardville's son-in-law and successor, Chief Francis LaFontaine (Leonard, "Historic Structure Report"), and, therefore, should be correctly referred to as the Chief LaFontaine House.

Statement of Significance-Criterion D

The Richardville site, as nominated, is also significant under Criterion D. Archaeological fieldwork at the site by the Indiana Purdue University Fort Wayne Archaeological Field School, under the direction of, Dr. Robert J. Jeske in 1992 and 1995, has yielded significant information about the occupation of the site through time. The excavations provided historic data from the 20th, 19th, and late 18th centuries, as well as prehistoric materials from the Late Woodland (circa AD 500-1300) and Late Archaic (circa 3500-4500 years BP). (For a complete description of the archaeological fieldwork, see Jeske, "Preliminary Excavations at the Richardville Site: A Prehistoric and Historic Miami Home in Fort Wayne, Allen County, Indiana.")

The primary significance of the site is the cultural material which it has yielded and is likely to yield for the period which the site was occupied by Chief Jean Baptiste de Richardville. Further excavation and study promises to provide key information about Richardville the individual--and about his family. Artifacts at the site may provide information about the lifestyle and social structure of the Richardville family. Animal bone found at the site has provided clues about the livestock kept by Richardville, as well as the diet of the occupants of the property.
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Another house near Huntington, Indiana, has a prior National Register listing as the "Chief Richardville House and Miami Treaty Grounds" (NRHP 9-16-85). Since the listing of this property, new information has shown that this historic name is likely in error. In the nomination for this frame, Greek Revival 2/3-Storey House, the owner claimed that the house was built by and for Jean B. Richardville, Chief Richardville, as his residence after the move of the tribal headquarters to the Forks of the Wabash (NRHP 9-16-85; Randle, "Indian house"). No historical reference or documentation, however, indicates that this was the house of Richardville prior to 1949, when the owner of the house first claimed it (Randle, "Indian house"). Undoubtedly Chief Richardville stayed at the treaty grounds at the Forks
frequently, however new information and further historical analysis, as well as the traditions of surviving Miami descendants of Richardville and LaFontaine, indicate that the Huntington house was probably built in 1843 or 1844, two or three years after Richardville's death (Leonard, "Historic Structure Report," np). The house at the Forks of the Wabash was likely built by and for Chief Richardville's son-in-law and successor, Chief Francis LaFontaine (Leonard, "Historic Structure Report"), and, therefore, should be correctly referred to as the Chief LaFontaine House.

**Statement of Significance-Criterion D**

The Richardville site, as nominated, is also **significant under Criterion D**. Archaeological fieldwork at the site by the Indiana Purdue University Fort Wayne Archaeological Field School, under the direction of, Dr. Robert J. Jeske in 1992 and 1995, has yielded significant information about the occupation of the site through time. The excavations provided historic data from the 20th, 19th, and late 18th centuries, as well as prehistoric materials from the Late Woodland (circaAD500-1300) and Late Archaic (circa3500-4500 years BP). (For a complete description of the archaeological fieldwork, see Jeske, "Preliminary Excavations at the Richardville Site: A
Prehistoric and Historic Miami Home in Fort Wayne, Alien County, Indiana.

The primary significance of the site is the cultural material which it has yielded and is likely to yield for the period which the site was occupied by Chief Jean Baptiste de Richardville. Further excavation and study promises to provide key information about Richardville the individual—and about his family. Artifacts at the site may provide information about the lifestyle and social structure of the Richardville family. Animal bone found at the site has provided clues about the livestock kept by Richardville, as well as the diet of the occupants of the property.
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Archaeological study has provided information about the construction history of the Richardville House itself. Important clues have been unearthed which will assist in any effort to restore the house to the period of occupation by Chief Richardville. Further archaeological excavation promises the potential of locating building foundations of cabins and other support structures for the Richardville House.

The presence of prehistoric components at the site from the Late Woodland and the Late Archaic reinforces the importance of the Richardville site to Native Americans over time. This link to prehistoric cultures, along with contact period and historic components at the site, provides a unique opportunity to study culture contact and change (Jeske, 8). The use of the site by Native Americans for thousands of years prior to the occupation by Chief Richardville increases its interpretive potential.

An important consideration in evaluating site significance is the presence of good archaeological context. Although the Richardville site has been heavily disturbed at its boundaries by an extensive sand and gravel quarry operation, the area surrounding the house itself is relatively undisturbed. Numerous cultural deposits have been excavated near the house, and there is potential for further work in this area. Other areas of the site, primarily beneath the asphalt drive which circles the rear of the house, hold the potential for discovery of important features such as outbuilding foundations and fence posts.

There are few known archaeological sites associated with the life of Chief Jean-Baptiste de Richardville. The Keokuk area, Richardville’s birthplace and home for much of his adult life, has been virtually destroyed by residential and commercial development. This area, and other Miami village sites near the confluence of the three rivers, was developed by white settlers as early as the mid-nineteenth century and today is a vital part of central Fort Wayne. The Richardville House and site in Fort Wayne is the only known site with a direct connection to the productive life of Chief Richardville, as well as the only site which is likely to produce archaeology of the individual. The most significant secondary site is the Treaty Grounds at the Forks of the Wabash near Huntington. This site has been listed on the National Register in part for its potential for yielding “historic archaeological data important to our understanding of the historic Miami occupation of the region” (NRHP 9-16-85). There is not, however, any specific location on the Forks site which can be linked directly to Chief Richardville. The site of the Lafontaine House (previously thought to be Richardville’s House) has been disturbed by moving the house to make way for highway construction.

Although the historical record provides a well-documented picture of the role of
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Archaeological study has provided information about the construction history of the Richardville House itself. Important clues have been unearthed which will assist in any effort to restore the house to the period of occupation by Chief Richardville. Further archaeological excavation promises the potential of locating building foundations of cabins and other support structures for the Richardville House.

The presence of prehistoric components at the site from the Late Woodland and the Late Archaic reinforces the importance of the Richardville site to Native Americans over time. This link to prehistoric cultures, along with contact period and historic components at the site,
provides a unique opportunity to study culture contact and change (Jeske, 8). The use of the site by Native Americans for thousands of years prior to the occupation by Chief-Richardville increases its interpretive potential. An important consideration in evaluating site significance is the presence of good archaeological context. Although the Richardville site has been heavily disturbed at its boundaries by an extensive sand and gravel quarry operation, the area surrounding the house itself is relatively undisturbed. Numerous cultural deposits have been excavated near the house, and there is potential for further work in this area. Other areas of the site, primarily beneath the asphalt drive which circles the rear of the house, hold the potential for discovery of important features such as outbuilding foundations and fence posts. There are few known archaeological sites associated with the life of Chief Jean-BaptistedeRichardville. The Kekionga area, Richardville's birthplace and home for much of his adult life, has been virtually destroyed by residential and commercial development. This area, and other Miami village sites near the confluence of the three rivers, was developed by white settlers as early as the mid-
nineteenthcenturyandtodayisavitalpartofcentralFortWayne. The Richardville House and site in Fort Wayne is the only known site with a direct connection to the productive life of Chief Richardville, as well as the only site whichislikelytoproducearchaeologyoftheindividual. Themostsignificant secondary site is the Treaty Grounds at the Forks of the Wabash near Huntington. This site has been listed on the National Register in part for its potential for yielding "historic archaeological data important to our understanding of the historic Miami occupation of the region" (NRHP 9-16-85). There is not, however, any specific location on the Forks site which can be linked directly to Chief Richardville. The site of the LaFontaine House (previously thought to be Richardville's House) has been disturbed by moving the house to make way for highway construction.

Although the historical record provides a well-documented picture of the role of
Chief Richardville in the history of the Old Northwest, relatively little is known of the daily life of the individual. Information about his family, his lifestyle, and his standard of living will provide invaluable clues to how he was likely regarded by the European Americans with whom he interacted, as well as how he was perceived by his own Miami people. Our knowledge of the lifestyles of typical well-to-do white settlers on the Indiana frontier in the 1820s may provide some answers to these questions, however Chief Richardville was far from typical. His mixed cultural background was likely an influence on his daily way of life; an influence which we know little about. Any interpretation of the Richardville House would be much enhanced by developing our state of knowledge in these areas. The site also has potential for providing information about the enculturation of the Miami, and their lifeways during this critical period.

Historical accounts reveal that Chief Richardville occupied the site well before the construction of the present house. He and his family probably settled here upon his return from Detroit after 1812. The account of a traveler in Indiana in 1821 mentions visiting Richardville’s “fine farm” on the St. Marys (McCord, 115). This visitor also noted many log cabins in the vicinity. In 1825, a visiting circuit court judge wrote about a horse race he attended “at Chief Richardville’s” on the St. Marys (Roberts, 11). This already established occupation of the site is likely the reason why this land was specifically granted in fee simple ownership to Richardville in the 1818 Treaty of St. Mary’s, hence the period of significance of c.1818 to Richardville’s death in 1841.

Archaeological excavation has already recovered artifacts which support these dates, such as a contact period knife made from a French gunflint (Jeske, 5) and perhaps examples of creamware which date to 1760-1820 (Jeske, 7). Further excavation at the site promises to yield more artifacts which would support the historical accounts, as well as aid the interpretation of life at the Richardville site prior to construction of the 1827 house.

Other anecdotal historical accounts suggest that Richardville’s wife, Natoqueah, did not actually live with him in the house but in a cabin behind the house. The archaeological record is curiously short on women’s items such as needles, pins, thimbles, and stays. This suggests that these accounts are likely accurate (Jeske, 8). Further archaeological investigation at the site may potentially reveal evidence regarding the arrangement of Richardville’s family life. This information would prove invaluable in any future interpretation of the house and the site, particularly if foundations of a cabin or other outbuildings could be located.

Archaeological excavation has proven valuable in yet another category; in providing important information about the construction of the house, as well as the evolution of the Richardville House over time. A massive limestone footing
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Chief Richardville in the history of the Old Northwest, relatively little is known of the daily life of the individual. Information about his family, his lifestyle, and his standard of living will provide invaluable clues to how he was likely regarded by the European Americans which he interacted with, as well as how he was perceived by his own Miami people.

Our knowledge of the lifestyles of typical well-to-do white settlers on the Indiana frontier in the 1820s may provide some answers to these questions, however Chief Richardville was far from typical.

His mixed cultural background was likely an influence on his daily way of life; an influence which we know little about. Any
interpretation of the Richardville House would be much enhanced by developing our state of knowledge in these areas. The site also has potential for providing information about the enculturation of the Miami, and their lifeways during this critical period.

Historical accounts reveal that Chief Richardville occupied the site well before the construction of the present house. He and his family probably settled here upon his return from Detroit after 1812. The account of a traveler in Indiana in 1821 mentions visiting Richardville's "fine farm" on the St. Marys (McCord, 115).

This visitor also noted many log cabins in the vicinity. In 1825, a visiting circuit court judge wrote about a horse race he attended "at Chief Richardville's" on the St. Marys (Roberts, 11). This already established occupation of the site is likely the reason why this land was specifically granted in fee simple ownership to Richardville in the 1818 Treaty of St. Mary's, hence the period of significance of c. 1818 to Richardville's death in 1841. Archaeological excavation has already recovered artifacts which support these dates, such as a contact period knife made from a French gunflint (Jeske, 6) and perhaps examples of
creamware which date to 1760-1820 (Jeske, 7). Further excavation at the site promises to yield more artifacts which would support the historical accounts, as well as aid the interpretation of life at the Richardville site prior to construction of the 1827 house.

Other anecdotal historical accounts suggest that Richardville's wife, Natoequeah, did not actually live with him in the house but in a cabin behind the house. The archaeological record is curiously short on women's items such as needles, pins, thimbles, and stays. This suggests that these accounts are likely accurate (Jeske, 8). Further archaeological investigation at the site may potentially reveal evidence regarding the arrangement of Richardville's family life. This information would prove invaluable in any future interpretation of the house and the site, particularly if foundations of a cabin or other outbuildings could be located.

Archaeological excavation has proven valuable in yet another category in providing important information about the construction of the house, as well as the evolution of
the Richardville House over time. A massive limestone footing
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with a 15 inch diameter post remains at the front door of the house, suggesting a large porch early in the history of the house—perhaps a Greek Revival portico (Jeske, 5). Over 500 square nails have been recovered from the site, but only 25 were hand wrought. Machine cut nails were common by 1830. Some of these nails are slate roofing nails, the only indication that the house may have once had a slate roof (Jeske, 7). It is hoped that additional archaeological research will provide information that will be useful in further efforts to restore the house.

Archaeological investigation has revealed that the site has been used even in the Late Archaic (circa 3500-4500 BP) and the Late Woodland periods (circa AD 500-1300). A total of 525 chert flakes and debris pieces came from the 1/4 inch screens. Materials include local cherts as well as Wyandotte cherts from southern Indiana and Flint Ridge and Mercer cherts from Ohio (Jeske, 6). This new information indicates the importance of the "Gateway" portage between the Maumee and Wabash Rivers, and even the importance of the St. Marys River and its connections into Ohio, for Native Americans long before the Miami control of the area. This cultural material reinforces the Richardville site as a "crossroads" of vital transportation routes for centuries.

As indicated, the Richardville site is significant under National Register Criterion D for a number of reasons. As the only site known to have a direct link to Chief Richardville, the site may provide data about the individual (Jeske, 8), and the length of his occupation of the site. It may also provide data about the enculturation of the Miami. The site also represents a rare opportunity for insight into the lifestyle of a well-to-do metis. Archaeological evidence at the site has provided, and will continue to provide, vital information in the restoration and interpretation of the Richardville House. The presence of prehistoric, contact period, and historic components at the site provides a unique opportunity to study culture contact and change. Although the periphery of the site has been disturbed by the adjacent sand and gravel quarry, the site retains sufficient integrity to greatly enhance our knowledge of Jean-Baptiste de Richardville.
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with a 15 inch diameter post remains at the front door of the house, suggesting a large porch early in the history of the house—perhaps a Greek Revival portico (Jeske, 5). Over 500 square nails have been recovered from the site, but only 25 were handwrought. Machine cut nails were common by 1830. Some of these nails are slate roofing nails, the only indication that the house may have once had a slate roof (Jeske, 7). It is hoped that additional archaeological research will provide information that will be useful in further efforts to restore the house.

Archaeological investigation has revealed that the site has been used even in the Late Archaic (circa 3500-4500 BP) and the Late Woodland periods (circa AD 500-1300). A total of
525 chert flakes and debris pieces came from the 1/4 inch screens. Materials include local cherts as well as Wyandotte cherts from southern Indiana and Flint Ridge and Mercer cherts from Ohio (Jeske, 6). This new information indicates the importance of the "Gateway" portage between the Maumee and Wabash Rivers, and even the importance of the St. Marys River and its connections into Ohio, for Native Americans long before the Miami control of the area. This cultural material reinforces the Richardville site as a "crossroads" of vital transportation routes for centuries.

As indicated, the Richardville site is significant under National Register CriterionDforanumberofreasons. As the only site known to have a direct link to Chief Richardville, the site may provide data about the individual (Jeske, 8), and the length of his occupation of the site. It may also provide data about the enculturation of the Miami. The site also represents a rare opportunity for insight into the lifestyle of a well-to-dometis. Archaeological evidence at the site has provided, and will continue to provide, vital information in the restoration and interpretation of the Richardvil
leHouse. The presence of prehistoric, contact period, and historic components at the site provides a unique opportunity to study culture contact and change. Although the periphery of the site has been disturbed by the adjacent sand and gravel quarry, the site retains sufficient integrity to greatly enhance our knowledge of Jean- Baptiste de Richardville.
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Criterion: I  “That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to, and are identified with, or that outstandingly represent, the broad national patterns of United States history and from which an understanding and appreciation of those patterns may be gained.”

Theme: I. CULTURAL DEVELOPMENTS: INDIGENOUS AMERICAN POPULATIONS
Subtheme: D. Ethnohistory of Indigenous American Populations
Facet: 5. Becoming Native American
   a. Treaties and Laws Formally Defining Native American Statuses and Roles
   d. Native Responses to New Economic, Political, and Territorial Arrangements
   e. Native Statuses in New Stratification Systems
   g. Co-existing Political Bodies: Chiefdoms, Monarchies, and Nations within the Nation

Period of National Significance: c.1826-1841

Today, near the St. Marys River in southwest Fort Wayne, Indiana, stands the house built by Jean-Baptiste de Richardville, Principal Chief of the Miami, in 1827. He built it on some 3,000 acres granted to him by the U.S. Government in the 1818 Treaty of St. Mary's (see Attachments A and B) and with money the Government allotted to him as chief in the 1826 Treaty of Mississinewa. The Chief Richardville House meets National Historic Landmark Criterion I for being “...associated with events that have made a significant contribution to, and are identified with, or that outstandingly represent, the broad national patterns of United States history and from which an understanding and appreciation of those patterns may be gained.” Chief Richardville played a pivotal role in guiding the Miami through the critical period of negotiations with the United States government which resulted in the cession of their land and a new place for the Miami people within the broader American society. The house itself is very unique in that its construction was subsidized according to the terms of the 1826 treaty. This house is the only Indian treaty house of any kind known to survive in the state of Indiana, and is believed to be the only example of a treaty house anywhere east of the Mississippi River still intact and on its original site. A computer search of National Register properties nationwide using the key word “treaty” did not reveal any properties previously listed which may share a similar origin. (However, understandably this search technique has certain limitations.) This unique status makes the Richardville House a historic resource type which is extremely rare and significant in Native American history, as well as the history of the United States government’s negotiations with Native Americans.
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Criterion: 1 "That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to, and are identified with, or that outstandingly represent, the broad national patterns of United States history and from which an understanding and appreciation of those patterns may be gained."

Theme: CULTURAL DEVELOPMENTS: INDIGENOUS AMERICAN POPULATIONS

Subtheme: Ethnohistory of Indigenous American Populations

Facet: Nations within the Nation

National Significance: c.1826-1841

Today, near the St. Marys River in southwest Fort Wayne, Indiana, stands the house built by Jean-Baptiste de Richardville, Principal Chief of the Miami, in 1827. He built it on some 3,000 acres granted to him by the U.S.
Government in the 1818 Treaty of St. Mary's (see Attachments A and B) and with money the Government allotted to him as chief in the 1826 Treaty of Mississinewa. The Chief Richardville House meets National Historic Landmark Criterion 1 for being "...associated with events that have made a significant contribution to, and are identified with, or that outstandingly represent, the broad national patterns of United States history and from which an understanding and appreciation of those patterns may be gained." Chief Richardville played a pivotal role in guiding the Miami through the critical period of negotiations with the United States government which resulted in the cession of their land and a new place for the Miami people within the broader American society. The house itself is very unique in that its construction was subsidized according to the terms of the 1826 treaty.

This house is the only Indian treaty house of any kind known to survive in the state of Indiana, and is believed to be the only example of a treaty house anywhere east of the Mississippi River still intact and on its original site. A computer search of National Register properties nationwide using the
key word "treaty" did not reveal any properties previously listed which may share a similar origin.
(However, understandably this search technique has certain limitations.)

This unique status makes the Richardville House a historic resource type which is extremely rare and significant in Native American history, as well as the history of the United States government's negotiations with Native Americans.

Period of

i. Becoming Native American
a. Treaties and Laws Formally Defining Native American Statuses and Roles
d. Native Responses to New Economic, Political, and Territorial Arrangements
e. Native Statuses in New Stratification Systems
g. Co-existing Political Bodies: Chiefdoms, Monarchies, and
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National Significance

The National Historic Landmark Theme and Subtheme (as published in History and Prehistory in the National Park System and the National Historic Landmarks Program, 1987) which relate to the significance of the Chief Richardville House are "I. Cultural Developments," and "D. Ethnohistory," of "indigenous American populations." The specific facet of ethnohistory which applies is "5. Becoming Native American." Chief Jean-Baptiste de Richardville's place in the historical timeline is unique in that his life serves as a microcosm of the transitional experience of many indigenous tribes who became "Native American." From his birth within the strong, independent Miami nation to his death as tired Chief of the overwhelmed and manipulated Miami people, Richardville's life illustrates the experience of many tribes in the Old Northwest Territory. Chief Richardville, however, played an active leadership role in this transitional period. He was a vital advocate for the Miami people, and his efforts in negotiation of several treaties allowed many Miami to obtain individual ownership of land. This allowed a large number of Miami to remain in Indiana, even after about half were removed to Kansas, and later Oklahoma. The Richardville House is a well-preserved monument to both Chief Richardville's prestige among his own people and his ability to forestall the physical removal of the Miami from Indiana for decades beyond the timetables sought by Indian commissioners, territorial, and state governors. The Richardville House also serves as a powerful symbol of the ability of Chief Richardville to make the most of changes that were largely beyond his control, and find a new place within the larger American society for both himself and his people.

The Richardville House itself is tangible and impressive evidence of the chief's ability and skill in placing himself in the company of leaders and working within the American system of business for the profit of both himself and the Miami people, and indirectly for a number of Indian traders. As a treaty house, the Richardville House is physical evidence of the adaptation and compromise, on the parts of both Native Americans and European Americans, which was inherent in the process of removing the Native American population from the Old Northwest in preparation for white settlement. The Richardville House is also tangible evidence of the ability of the U.S. government (backed by influential Indian traders) to deal fairly, even lavishly, with Native American populations when they were well-represented in negotiations by capable leaders.

In his career as deputy chief, and later Principal Chief of the Miami, Richardville had an important role in negotiating treaties and influencing U.S. Indian policy which defined the status and roles of the Miami Indians. The treaties ceded vast amounts of land to the United States, however at a time when so many tribes simply relinquished their lands and were moved west, Richardville arranged for a remarkable number of Miami to stay in Indiana. Richardville's cultural background as a mestiz was surely a significant factor in his ability to
The National Historic Landmark Theme and Subtheme (as published in History and Prehistory in the National Park System and the National Historic Landmarks Program, 1987) which relate to the significance of the Chief Richardville House are UI. Cultural Developments," and "D. Ethnohistory," of "indigenous American populations." The specific facet of ethnohistory which applies is "5. Becoming Native American." Chief Jean-Baptiste de Richardville's place in the historical time line is unique in that his life serves as a microcosm of the transitional experience of many indigenous tribes who became "Native American." From his birth within the strong, independent Miami nation to his death as tired Chief of the overwhelmed and manipulated Miami people, Richardville's life
illustrates the experience of many tribes in the Old Northwest Territory. Chief Richardville, however, played an active leadership role in this transitional period. He was a vital advocate for the Miami people, and his efforts in negotiation of several treaties allowed many Miami to obtain individual ownership of land. This allowed a large number of Miami to remain in Indiana, even after about half were removed to Kansas, and later Oklahoma. The Richardville House is a well-preserved monument to both Chief Richardville's prestige among his own people and his ability to forestall the physical removal of the Miami from Indiana for decades beyond the timetables sought by Indian commissioners, territorial, and state governors. The Richardville House also serves as a powerful symbol of the ability of Chief Richardville to make the most of changes that were largely beyond his control, and find a new place within the larger American society for both himself and his people.

The Richardville House itself is tangible and impressive evidence of the chief's ability and skill in placing himself in the company of leaders and working within the
American system of business for the profit of both himself and the Miami people, and indirectly for a number of Indian traders. As a treaty house, the Richardville House is physical evidence of the adaptation and compromise, on the parts of both Native Americans and European Americans, which was inherent in the process of removing the Native American population from the Old Northwest in preparation for white settlement. The Richardville House is also tangible evidence of the ability of the U.S. government (backed by influential Indian traders) to deal fairly, even lavishly, with Native American populations when they were well-represented in negotiations by capable leaders.

In his career as deputy chief, and later Principal Chief of the Miami, Richardville had an important role in negotiating treaties and influencing U.S. Indian policy which defined the status and roles of the Miami Indians. The treaties ceded vast amounts of land to the United States, however at a time when so many tribes simply relinquished their lands and were moved west, Richardville arranged for a remarkable number of Miamis to stay in Indiana. Richardville's cultural background as a métis was surely a significant factor in his ability to
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relate to the European concept of property ownership and his realization early on
that legally recognized property ownership--by individuals--was the best method
to prevent wholesale relocation of the Miami. The treaties which Richardville
negotiated included land grants to himself, his family, and other Miami Chiefs
and leaders. The status which was provided by legal ownership of land was a
compelling reason for the United States government to allow these members of the
tribe to remain in Indiana, even after the Miami had made all efforts to stall
relocation of the remainder of the tribe. (Ironically, although Chief
Richardville's tactics allowed his descendants and many other Miami to stay in
Indiana, the tribe was fractured by the relocation of many of their number to the
west [Rafert, 116]. The United States continued to recognize the western Miami
as the legitimate tribal government while the Indiana Miami lost federal
recognition in 1897 [Rafert, 174]. Though still an identifiable group, the
Indiana Miami have struggled to regain their federal status, and have been denied
as recently as 1993 [Rafert, 293].)

Although the value of Miami tribal land gave Chief Richardville a strong
bargaining position in treaty negotiations, the Miami also had strong (yet
selfish) allies in the many Indian traders who would benefit from a delay in the
removal of the tribe, and the ownership of land by individual Miami. Primary
among this group of traders were brothers George W. and William G. Ewing (Rafert,
90), who came to Fort Wayne in 1822. At the arrival of the Ewings in Indiana,
the Indian trade was quickly moving away from the economically unstable purchase
of furs, to the more stable supply of goods for payment in annuities or credit.
The fur market was subject to severe fluctuations in prices, while annuities were
consistent--and paid in silver.

The Ewings and other traders sold goods to the Miami on credit, often to a point
beyond which even their annuity could pay. When the trader had maneuvered the
individual Indian into a debtor position, the Indian would easily exchange some
of his land for payment of his debt (Carter, 165 fn 25; Rafert, 93). The
likelihood of additional treaties with a rise in annuities was promising for
traders and land speculators such as the Ewings. The Ewings, who were quite
close to Indian agent John Tipton, likely urged negotiation of further treaties,
allowing higher annuities and the individual ownership of land for certain Miami.
This unlikely alliance with powerful traders and land speculators fostered an
environment where Chief Richardville was able to play government officials
desiring Miami removal against the greed of the traders for many years (Rafert,
89).

Although none of the treaties negotiated from 1826 to 1838 required removal of
the Miami, all were quite favorable to the Miami debt claims of traders such as
the Ewings. The 1840 treaty initiated Miami removal from Indiana, and is also
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relate to the European concept of property ownership and his realization early on that legally recognized property ownership—by individuals—was the best method to prevent wholesale relocation of the Miami. The treaties which Richardville negotiated included land grants to himself, his family, and other Miami Chiefs and leaders. The status which was provided by legal ownership of land was a compelling reason for the United States government to allow these members of the tribe to remain in Indiana, even after the Miami had made all efforts to stall relocation of the remainder of the tribe. (Ironically, although Chief Richardville's tactics allowed his descendants and many other Miami to stay in
Indiana, the tribe was fractured by the relocation of many of their number to the west [Rafert, 116]. The United States continued to recognize the western Miami as the legitimate tribal government while the Indiana Miami lost federal recognition in 1897 [Rafert, 174]. Though still an identifiable group, the Indiana Miami have struggled to regain their federal status, and have been denied as recently as 1993 [Rafert, 293].

Although the value of Miami tribal land gave Chief Richardville a strong bargaining position in treaty negotiations, the Miami also had strong (yet selfish) allies in the many Indian traders who would benefit from a delay in the removal of the tribe, and the ownership of land by individual Miami. Primary among this group of traders were brothers George W. and William G. Ewing (Rafert, 90), who came to Fort Wayne in 1822. At the arrival of the Ewings in Indiana, the Indian trade was quickly moving away from the economically unstable purchase of furs, to the more stable supply of goods for payment in annuities or credit. The fur market
was subject to severe fluctuations in prices, while annuities were consistent—and paid in silver.

The Ewings and other traders sold goods to the Miami on credit, often to a point beyond which even their annuity could pay. When the trader had maneuvered the individual Indian into a debtor position, the Indian would easily exchange some of his land for payment of his debt (Carter, 165 fn 25; Rafert, 93). The likelihood of additional treaties with a rise in annuities was promising for traders and land speculators such as the Ewings. The Ewings, who were quite close to Indian agent John Tipton, likely urged negotiation of further treaties, allowing higher annuities and the individual ownership of land for certain Miami. This unlikely alliance with powerful traders and land speculators fostered an environment where Chief Richardville was able to play government officials desiring Miami removal against the greed of the traders for many years (Rafert, 89).

Although none of the treaties negotiated from 1826 to 1838 required removal of the Miami, all were quite favorable to the Miami debt claims of traders such as the Ewings. The
1840 treaty initiated Miami removal from Indiana, and is also
the apex of treaties favorable to the traders, setting aside $300,000 for claims against the tribe. It was part of an elaborate scheme to rescue the Ewings from bankruptcy by a concerted effort to sell the Miami goods, primarily on credit, prior to the ratification of the treaty. In a period of roughly nine months from the summer of 1840 through February 25, 1841 the Ewings obtained bills of credit on the tribe for $253,052.29—over $5 million currently (Rafert, 99-100). Later, William G. Ewing bragged that, "The only means to succeed was by a large profuse and general indebtedness of the tribe, made by the knowledge and concurrence of many officers of the Indian Department" (Trennert, 84).

Through the negotiation of treaties with the United States government, Chief Richardville obtained a significant amount of money, goods, and services for the benefit of himself, individual members of the tribe, and for the Miami as a whole. Several treaties established annuity payments which tribe members received in return for the tribe's cession of land. Chief Richardville knew, however, that cash alone would not be sufficient to assist tribe members in maintaining their ownership of land against the pressure of white traders. He negotiated several provisions in treaties for goods and services which would support the ownership of land and assist in land development. The 1818 Treaty of St. Mary's provided a sawmill and a gristmill along with agricultural implements. The 1826 Treaty of Mississinewa provided over fifty-thousand dollars in goods; ten wagons with ten yokes of oxen, nine houses, 200 head of cattle, 200 head of hogs, 2,000 pounds of iron and 1,000 pounds of steel and tobacco annually, eight part-time laborers, and $2,000 annually for support of the "poor infirm" and the education of youth. The 1834 treaty was to supply a "skillful miller" to replace a gunsmith promised in 1818. It is unclear just how many of these promises were fulfilled by the United States government, but when viewed as a group they clearly illustrate Chief Richardville's tactic to remain in Indiana by obtaining land as well as the cash and resources to retain ownership of that land. A possible byproduct of these treaty terms was training and experience for some Miami in methods of agriculture and pioneer industry.

As a treaty house, and as a stylish frontier expression of wealth, the Chief Richardville House is a unique example of Native American response to new economic and political arrangements. The 1826 Treaty of Mississinewa provided funding to build a $600 house for each of nine Miami chiefs, including Richardville. These houses for the tribal leadership, along with the specific supplies and livestock provided for in the treaty, gave notice that the Miami had no intention of being removed from their land, although white settlement was quickly approaching. Richardville and the other Miami chiefs knew that land was their most valuable economic asset, and their ownership and control of it was a vital political asset. These houses, particularly the substantial Richardville House, were effective symbols of the power which the Miami leaders held in their
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the apex of treaties favorable to the traders, setting aside $300,000 for claims against the tribe.

It was part of a elaborate scheme to rescue the Ewings from bankruptcy by a concerted effort to sell the Miami goods, primarily on credit, prior to the ratification of the treaty.

In a period of roughly nine months from the summer of 1840 through February 25, 1841 the Ewings obtained bills of credit on the tribe for $253,052.29—over $5 million currently (Rafert, 99-100). Later, William G. Ewing bragged that, "The only means to succeed was by a large profuse and general indebtedness of the tribe, made by the knowledge and concurrence of many officers of the Indian Department" (Trennert, 84).
Through the negotiation of treaties with the United States government, Chief Richardville obtained a significant amount of money, goods, and services for the benefit of himself, individual members of the tribe, and for the Miami as a whole.

Several treaties established annuity payments which tribe members received in return for the tribe's cession of land. Chief Richardville knew, however, that cash alone would not be sufficient to assist tribe members in maintaining their ownership of land against the pressure of white traders. He negotiated several provisions in treaties for goods and services which would support the ownership of land and assist in land development.

The 1818 Treaty of St. Mary's provided a sawmill and a gristmill along with agricultural implements. The 1826 Treaty of Mississinewa provided over fifty-thousand dollars in goods; ten wagons with ten yokes of oxen, nine houses, 200 head of cattle, 200 head of hogs, 2,000 pounds of iron and 1,000 pounds of steel and tobacco annually, eight part-time laborers, and $2,000 annually for support of the "poor infirm" and the education of youth.

The 1834 treaty was to supply a "skillful miller" to replace
agunsmithpromisedin1818.

It is unclear just how many of these promises were fulfilled by the United States government, but when viewed as a group they clearly illustrate Chief Richardville's tactic to remain in Indiana by obtaining land as well as the cash and resources to retain ownership of that land. A possible byproduct of these treaty terms was training and experience for some Miami in methods of agriculture and pioneer industry.

As a treaty house, and as a stylish frontier expression of wealth, the Chief Richardville House is a unique example of Native American response to new economic and political arrangements.

The 1826 Treaty of Mississinewa provided funding to build a $600 house for each of nine Miami chiefs, including Richardville. These houses for the tribal leadership, along with the specific supplies and livestock provided for in the treaty, gave notice that the Miami had no intention of being removed from their land, although white settlement was quickly approaching.

Richardville and the other Miami chiefs knew that land was their most valuable economic asset, and their ownership and
control of it was a vital political asset. These houses, particularly the substantial Richardville House, were effective symbols of the power which the Miami leaders held in their
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land, and were a tool to reinforce their ownership of the land. The supplies and livestock were undoubtedly crucial for each chief to develop homesteads and farms which further developed the Miami-owned land and supported the people of the tribe. These tactics proved successful, as none of the Miami tribal leadership was subsequently required to leave the state of Indiana (Rafert, 108-110).

Chief Richardville made a bolder statement with his personal home by adding $1,500 of his own funds in order to build a larger and more stylish house than provided for in the treaty. Richardville had built a substantial fortune, not only from negotiating favorable treaty terms for himself, but also from his many years as a successful trader. At a time when he was flush with cash, it was fitting that Richardville should take advantage of the availability of skilled American builders in rapidly growing Fort Wayne for the construction of a fine home. The Richardville House expressed the chief’s position among the Miami people and (perhaps more importantly) made his status clear to the encroaching Americans. (This house, however, was not likely Richardville’s first house with “European” style or form. His earlier house(s) in Kekionga were likely log houses, perhaps similar in form to rural, post-in-ground French Colonial houses documented in Vincennes, IN and Ste. Genevieve, MO.)

The Richardville House is as much a symbol of the respect and social status which Richardville strived for in his rapidly changing environment, as a symbol of economic and political power. The quality of the house and its furnishings placed Chief Richardville’s lifestyle at a level above nearly all of the American settlers in the area. This display of wealth sent a clear message to the settlers that Richardville was not the stereotypical “savage” who should be avoided. The fine house undoubtedly assisted in building respect and credibility for the chief among the Americans, yet its rural location allowed him to keep a safe distance from Fort Wayne for himself and his people. Several accounts of pioneer life in Fort Wayne mention the high regard which the settlers held for Chief Richardville, both as a political leader and as a businessman (Polinsatte, Canal Era, Tipton quote, 96; Anson, McCulloch quote, 209). The business and political leaders of Fort Wayne considered it an honor to be invited to the chief’s table. Richardville was much respected, was considered to be a prominent member of the community, and was certainly among the most wealthy residents of the Fort Wayne area, yet he was not among the inner circle of community leaders. Richardville’s place in Fort Wayne’s pioneer social structure was high, but on the fringe; in much the same way that his home stood near Fort Wayne, but at a safe distance.

The Chief Richardville House is, lastly, tangible proof of the economic and political arrangements, compromises, and deals which allowed the Miami nation and its principal chief to co-exist with the expanding boundaries of the United
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land, and were a tool to reinforce their ownership of the land. The supplies and livestock were undoubtably crucial for each chief to develop homesteads and farms which further developed the Miami-owned land and supported the people of the tribe. These tactics proved successful, as none of the Miami tribal leadership was subsequently required to leave the state of Indiana (Rafert, 108-110).

Chief Richardville made a bolder statement with his personal home by adding $1,600 of his own funds in order to build a larger and more stylish house than provided for in the treaty. Richardville had built a substantial fortune, not only from negotiating favorable treaty terms for himself, but also from his many years as a successful
trader. At a time when he was flush with cash, it was fitting that Richardville should take advantage of the availability of skilled American builders in rapidly growing Fort Wayne for the construction of a fine home. The Richardville House expressed the chief's position among the Miami people and (perhaps more importantly) made his status clear to the encroaching Americans.

(This house, however, was not likely Richardville's first house with "European" style or form. His earlier house(s) in Kekionga were likely log houses, perhaps similar in form to rural, post-in-ground French Colonial houses documented in Vincennes, IN and Ste. Genevieve, MO.)

The Richardville House is as much a symbol of the respect and social status which Richardville strived for in his rapidly changing environment, as a symbol of economic and political power. The quality of the house and its furnishings placed Chief Richardville's lifestyle at a level above nearly all of the American settlers in the area.

This display of wealth sent a clear message to the settlers that Richardville was not the stereotypical "savage" who should be avoided.
The fine house undoubtedly assisted in building respect and credibility for the chief among the Americans, yet its rural location allowed him to keep a safe distance from Fort Wayne for himself and his people. Several accounts of pioneer life in Fort Wayne mention the high regard which the settlers held for Chief Richardville, both as a political leader and as a businessman (Poinsatte, Canal Era, Tipton quote, 96; Anson, McCulloch quote, 209). The business and political leaders of Fort Wayne considered it an honor to be invited to the chief's table. Richardville was much respected, was considered to be a prominent member of the community, and was certainly among the most wealthy residents of the Fort Wayne area, yet he was not among the inner circle of community leaders. Richardville's place in Fort Wayne's pioneer social structure was high, but on the fringe; in much the same way that his home stood near Fort Wayne, but at a safe distance.

The Chief Richardville House is, lastly, tangible proof of the economic and political arrangements, compromises, and deals which allowed the Miami nation and its principal
chief to co-exist with the expanding boundaries of the United
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States. The American public’s image of nineteenth century Indian relations is often the simple sequence of battle-conquer-remove, often thought of as a process which occurred in a relatively short period of time. Chief Richardville’s life and accomplishments provide a much deeper understanding to the complicated process of negotiation with Native American tribes in this period. Both Richardville and representatives of the U.S. government, with influence from the Ewings and other Indian traders, worked over 23 years to come to a fair agreement for the purchase of Miami land, the accommodation of many Miami, and the eventual removal of only about half of the Miami people to the west (Rafert, 101, 112-113). In a letter to Secretary of War John Eaton in 1831, John Tipton referred to the slow progress of negotiations with the Miami Nation. He said, “The Micmacs are reduced to a small number, but well organized in their kind of government, and with one of the most shrewd men in North America at their head” (Rafert, 96). As a treaty house, the Richardville House was a diplomatic gift from the United States to the leader and “chief of state” of the Miami Nation. It is a unique product of this long process of give-and-take between the Miami Nation and the United States government.

Like the Miami tribe of Indiana, which has remained in its homeland quietly surviving and adapting to change for hundreds of years, so has this house survived on its hilltop for the 155 years since the death of Chief Jean-Baptiste de Richardville. Although it does exhibit alterations and adaption to change, the Richardville House clearly retains integrity from its association with Richardville and deserves federal recognition for its national significance. The Chief Richardville House is worthy of National Historic Landmark status under several sub-facets of “Becoming Native American,” a facet within the sub-theme “Ethnohistory” of “Cultural Developments: Indigenous American Populations.” Within this theme the Chief Richardville House is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to, and are identified with, the broad national patterns of United States history and from which an understanding and appreciation of those patterns may be gained. The Chief Richardville House and site is associated with national events from c.1818 until the chief’s death August 13, 1841. This period represents Richardville’s occupation of the site and the house, and is simultaneous with his significant role in treaty negotiations between Native Americans and the United States. The year 1827 is significant for the construction of the house.
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States.

The American public's image of nineteenth-century Indian relations is often the simple sequence of battle-conquer-remove, often thought of as a process which occurred in a relatively short period of time. Chief Richardville's life and accomplishments provide a much deeper understanding to the complicated process of negotiation with Native American tribes in this period. Both Richardville and representatives of the U.S. government, with influence from the Ewings and other Indian traders, worked over 23 years to come to a fair agreement for the purchase of Miami land, the accommodation of many Miami, and the eventual removal of only about half of the
Miami people to the west (Rafert, 101, 112-113). In a letter to Secretary of War John Eaton in 1831, John Tipton referred to the slow progress of negotiations with the Miami Nation. He said, "The Miamies are reduced to a small number,—but well organized in their kind of government, and with one of the most shrewd men in North America at their head"

(Rafert, 96). As a treaty house, the Richardville House was a diplomatic gift from the United States to the leader and "chief of state" of the Miami Nation. It is a unique product of this long process of give-and-take between the Miami Nation and the United States government.

Like the Miami tribe of Indiana, which has remained in its homeland quietly surviving and adapting to change for hundreds of years, so has this house survived on its hilltop for the 155 years since the death of Chief Jean-Baptiste deRichardville.

Although it does exhibit alterations and adaptation to change, the Richardville House clearly retains integrity from its association with Richardville and deserves federal recognition for its national significance. The Chief Richardville House is worthy of National Historic Landmark
status under several sub-facets of "Becoming Native American" a facet within the sub-theme "Ethnohistory" of "Cultural Developments: Indigenous American Populations."

Within this theme the Chief Richardville House is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to, and are identified with, the broad national patterns of United States history and from which an understanding and appreciation of those patterns may be gained.

The Chief Richardville House and site is associated with national events from c.1818 until the chief's death August 13, 1841. This period represents Richardville's occupation of the site and the house, and is simultaneous with his significant role in treaty negotiations between Native Americans and the United States. The year 1827 is significant for the construction of the house.
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Legal description of real estate: Part of Richardville Reserve, West of the St. Mary’s River in Township 30 North, Range 12 East, Allen County, Indiana, described as follows: Commencing at the intersection of the East right-of-way line of Bluffton Road with the North right-of-way line of a proposed street (Peachawa Trail); thence South 80 degrees 08 minutes East, along said North right-of-way line, 193.4 feet; thence North 13 degrees 31 minutes 27 seconds East, 154.57 feet; thence North 03 degrees 45 minutes 00 seconds East, 184.64 feet to a pipe found on the South line of the Southwest Conservation Club, Inc.; thence North 80 degrees 41 minutes East, along said line 162.6 feet to the **point of beginning**, being marked by a pin set; thence continuing North 80 degrees 41 minutes East, along said line, 175.0 feet to a pin found; thence South 09 degrees 19 minutes East, 200.0 feet to a pin set; thence South 80 degrees 41 minutes West, parallel to the South line of the Southwest Conservation Club, Inc., 175.0 feet to a pin set; thence North 09 degrees 19 minutes West, 200.0 feet to the **point of beginning**, containing 0.80 acres of land, more or less (see Attachment K).

Boundary Justification

The boundary includes the Chief Richardville House and the land which immediately surrounds it, which is currently owned by the Fort Wayne-Allen County Historical Society. This open space retains integrity from the period of significance and is the area most likely to contain archeological evidence of past occupation. The site beyond this boundary has been heavily disturbed by a sand and gravel quarry on the south and east, and by commercial and residential development along Bluffton Road. Although the house, when built, was located in the center of a tract of over 3000 acres owned by Richardville, the growth of the city of Fort Wayne has transformed the Richardville Reserve into an urban and suburban area.
Legal description of real estate: Part of Richardville Reserve, West of the St. Mary's River in Township 30 North, Range 12 East, Alien County, Indiana, described as follows: Commencing at the intersection of the East right-of-way line of Bluffton Road with the North right-of-way line of a proposed street (Peachewa Trail); thence South 80 degrees 08 minutes East, along said North right-of-way line, 193.4 feet; thence North 13 degrees 31 minutes 27 seconds East, 154.57 feet; thence North 03 degrees 45 minutes 00 seconds East, 184.64 feet to a pipe found on the South line of the Southwest Conservation Club, Inc.; thence North 80 degrees 41 minutes East, along said line 162.6 feet to the point of beginning, being marked by a pin set; thence continuing North 80 degrees 41 minutes
East, along said line, 175.0 feet to a pin found; thence South 09 degrees 19 minutes East, 200.0 feet to a pin set; thence South 80 degrees 41 minutes West, parallel to the South line of the Southwest Conservation Club, Inc., 175.0 feet to a pin set; thence North 09 degrees 19 minutes West, 200.0 feet to the point of beginning, containing 0.80 acres of land, more or less (see Attachment K) .

**Boundary Justification**

The boundary includes the Chief Richardville House and the land which immediately surrounds it, which is currently owned by the Fort Wayne-Allen County Historical Society. This openspace retains integrity from the period of significance and is the area most likely to contain archeological evidence of past occupation.

The site beyond this boundary has been heavily disturbed by a sand and gravel quarry on the south and east, and by commercial and residential development along Bluffton Road. Although the house, when built, was located in the center of a tract of over 3000 acres owned by Richardville, the growth of the city of Fort Wayne has transformed the Richardville Reserve into an urban and suburban area.
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Allen County, IN

Photographs

All photographs used in this nomination were taken in April, 1996 by
Randy Elliot. The location of the negatives is as follows:

Allen County-Fort Wayne Historical Society
303 East Berry Street
Fort Wayne, Indiana 46802

Photographs

1. General view, looking southeast, of the Richardville House as
   seen from Bluffton Road.
2. General view, looking southeast, of the house.
3. General view, looking northwest, of the house.
4. General view, looking south, of the facade.
5. Historic view, c.1914, looking north in what is today the 100
   block of West Jefferson Blvd., Fort Wayne, showing a house which
   closely resembles the Richardville House. From the collection of
   the Allen County-Fort Wayne Historical Society.
6. Detail view, looking south, of the front door surround.
7. General view, looking south, into the first floor hall.
8. Detail view, looking northwest, of the base of the front
   stairway.
9. General view, looking southeast, in the parlor.
10. General view, looking north, in the parlor.
11. General view, looking southwest, in the dining room.
12. General view, looking southeast, in the east chamber.
13. General view, looking southwest, in the west chamber.
14. General view, looking south, in the first room of the rear wing.
15. General view, looking southwest, in the back room of the rear
    wing.
16. General view, looking southwest, in the loft over the rear wing.
Photographs
All photographs used in this nomination were taken in April, 1996 by Randy Elliot.
The location of the negatives is as follows:
Alien County-Fort Wayne Historical Society 303 East Berry Street
Fort Wayne, Indiana 46802

Photographs
1. General view, looking southeast, of the Richardville House as seen from Bluffton Road.
2. General view, looking southeast, of the house.
3. General view, looking northwest, of the house.
4. General view, looking south, of the facade.
5. Historic view, c.1914, looking north in what is today the 100 block of West Jefferson Blvd., Fort Wayne, showing a house which closely resembles the Richardville House. From the collection of the Alien County-Fort Wayne Historical Society.

6. Detail view, looking south, of the front door surround.

7. General view, looking south, into the first floor hall.

8. Detail view, looking northwest, of the base of the front stairway.

9. General view, looking southeast, in the parlor.

10. General view, looking north, in the parlor.

11. General view, looking southwest, in the dining room.

12. General view, looking southeast, in the east chamber.

13. General view, looking southwest, in the west chamber.
14. General view, looking south, in the first room of the rear wing.

15. General view, looking southwest, in the back room of the rear wing.

16. General view, looking southwest, in the loft over the rear wing.
I hereby certify that the annexed copy of patent is a true and literal exemplification from the record in this office.

The record of the patent in this case was omitted to be signed, as required by law, but Section 2470 Revised Statutes of the United States provides that literal exemplifications of any records which have been or may be granted shall be deemed of the same validity in all proceedings, whether at law or in equity, wherein such exemplifications are made use of in evidence, as if the names of the officers signing and countersigning the same had been fully inserted in the record.
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The within plan of a house for
them & Richard Hill has been submitted
to us and we have given our objections
of the date for its erection & completion,

[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
Document entitled "1827 Plan of J.B. Richardville's House," in John Tipton papers, Manuscript Division, Indiana State Library

on obverse:
"The within plan of a house for
Jean B. Richardville has been submitted
to us and we have given our obligations
of this date for its erection & completion
Fort Wayne Augst. 30 1827

Attest
J B Duret
A G Ballard(?)
R Hanna"

on reverse:
at top right corner:
"The following plan of a house submitted for which building and finishing
in a complete work(s) like manner 1 year will be allowed. $200 paid when
the brick is burned, $200 when the house is covered, $100 when the carpenters
work is done and the ballance on receiving the keys of the house. every arch
must have an iron bar under it. The plastering all finished bent work().
locks, latches, hinges and bolts must be formed by the builder and a closet
on each side of 3 fire place in 3 room"

at lower right corner:
"foundation 3 feet high 18 inch wall
first story 9 " 13 ""
2 " do 8 " 7 "
kitchen 1 story of 8 feet?"
small room studded partition in passage (shown at center of second floor)
porch in ft (front?) of kitchen as wide as the passage"

at top left corner:
"All sash door and window frames must be primed with a coat of white) lead
a oil as it goes into the wall - and troughs, or gutters painted white,
roof red a plane chimney fixed to each fire place"

at lower left corner:
"2 small grated windows in front & 1 back in the foundation below the floor.
The house Brick work, painted and pencilled, door in first story panned work,
window shutters to same story, same, the wood work painted wherever
painting is usual or necessary."

transcribed by Craig Leonard
March 3, 1996
Document entitled "1827 Plan of J.B. Richardville's House," in John Tipton papers, Manuscript Division, Indiana State Library

on obverse:

"The within plan of a house for
Jean B. Richardville has been submitted to us and we have given our obligations of this date for its erection & completion Fort Wayne Augt. 30 1827
Attest A G Ballard(?) J B Duret H Hanna"

on reverse:

at top right corner:

"The following plan of a house submitted for which building and finishing
in a complete work(e)rlie manner 1 year will be allowed. $200 paid when
the brick is burned, $200 when the house is covered, $100 when the carpenters work is done. and the ballance on receiving the keys of the house, every arch must have an iron bar under it. The plastering all finished best work(.) locks, latches, hinges and bolts must be formed by the builder and a closet on each side of 3 fire place in 3 room"
at lower right corner:

"foundation 3 feet high 18 inch wall
firststory9 " " 13 "
2 do8""7"

kitchen 1 story of 8 feet7 " "
small room studded partition in passage (shown at center of second floor)

porch in ft (front?) of kitchen as wide as the passage"

at top left corner:

"All sash door and window frames must be primed with a coat of w(hite) lead & oil as it goes into the wall - and troughs, or gutters painted white, roof red a plane chimney fixed to each fire place"

at lower left corner:

"2 small grated windows in front & 1 back in the foundation below the floor. The house Brick work, painted and pencilled, door in first story panneld work, window shutters to same story, same, the wood work painted wherever painting is usual or necessary."

transcribed by Craig Leonard March 3, 1996
Map 7. *The Miami Domain*. This map shows the extent of the Miami Domain as outlined by Little Turtle in 1795. Also shown is the portage connecting the Maumee-Wabash Line of travel and the encroachment of other Indian tribes upon the Miami Domain.

Map 7. *The Miami Domain*. This map shows the extent of the Miami Domain as outlined by Little Turtle in 1795. Also shown is the portage connecting the Maumee-Wabash Line of travel and the encroachment of other Indian tribes upon the Miami Domain.

Ceded to the United States by the Piasawatomies, [by various treaties before 1836], the Iroquois [ceded up all claim to this land at] the Treaty at Wabash 1824.

OHIO INDIAN LANDS CEDED TO THE UNITED STATES By THE TREATY OF GREENE VPLLE, 1795

The New Purchase

area iy of St. Marv'j

KeKiontto, Fo

-(ceded to the E.U.S.)
by the treaty of Crerenville - 1778

The Mississinewa

JHo'jii the last Miami

east o' the Mississippi;

Ceded to the beforetheWarriors at treaties of Grousel, near Vincennes in 1805, and at Fort Wayne 1807 by the Minis. Eel Rivers, Weas, Piarkeashaws,

The Greene Ville cession of lands in the Old Northwest included all the area in the present state of Ohio south and east of the treaty line running from Lake Erie to the Ohio River. The Indian Lands in Ohio were further reduced by seven other tracts: (1) at Fort Loramie (present Fort Lorario); (2) near Citty's town (present St. Marys); (3) at the head of navigable water of (he Auplaize River (albout 9 miles northwest of present Wapa-koneta); (4) at Fort Defiance (present Defiance); (5) at the British Fort Miami (present Maumee); (6) at the mouth of the Mauroee River (present Toledo); and (7) at the lower rapids of the Sandusky River (present Frenont).

Source: Dwight L. Smith, Wayne's Peace with the Indians of the Old Northwest, 1795, Fort Wayne, Indiana: Fort Wayne Public Library, 1955. This pamphlet is based on a thesis from Indiana University.


Indian Treaties
1. G. R. dark's Grant. 1783 2. Greenville, 1795
3. Fort Wayne. 1803
4. Vincennes, 1804
5. Grouseland, 1805
6. Fort Wayne, 1809
7. Fort Wayne, 1809
8. Maumee, 1817
11. Mississinewa, 1826 12. Mississinewa, 1826
17. Wabash. 1840

Louisiana Territory

A June 7, 1803, at Fort Wayne, with the Delaware, Shawnee, Potawatomi, Miami, Eel River, Wea, Kickapoo, Piankashaw, and Kaskaskia.
B August 13, 1803, at Vincennes, with the Kaskaskia.
C August 18 and 27, 1804, at Vincennes, with the Delaware and Piankashaw.
D November 3, 1804, at St. Louis, with the Sauk and Fox.
E August 21, 1805, at Grouseland, with the Delaware, Potawatomi, Miami, Eel River, and Wea.
F December 30, 1805, at Vincennes, with the Piankashaw.
G November 17, 1807, at Detroit, with the Ottawa, Chippewa, Wyandot, and Potawatomi.
H September 30, 1809, at Fort Wayne, with the Delaware, Potawatomi, Miami, Eel River, and Wea.
I December 9, 1809, at Vincennes, with the Kickapoo.

Map 8. *American Treaties of Land Acquisition, 1803-9*. All but one of treaties was concluded by William Henry Harrison, governor of the Indiana territory. The exception was a treaty concluded by William Hull, governor of Michigan Territory.

Boundaries of present day counties shown by dashed lines

MIAmI INdIAn REsERVATIONS

Key to Map

R—Reserved  C—Ceded

J6-J7 C. Aug. 1, 1795
J6 C. Aug. 1, 1795
J8-89 R. to Miami, Oct. 21, 1826; C
Oct. 23, 1834
23, 1834
J99 R. to Miami, Oct. 23, 1826; patented to Richlandville, Oct. 23, 1834

251-53 R. to Miami, Oct. 6, 1818; C
Nov. 6, 1834
255 R. to Miami, Oct. 23, 1826; C Nov.
6, 1834
276 R. to Miami, Nov. 6, 1836; patented
to Mettingen, Nov. 28, 1840
288 R. to Miami, Oct. 6, 1818; C Nov.
29, 1840

From: Charles R. Poinsette, Fort Wayne During
the Canals Era, 1833-1855.
Indiana Historical Bureau, 1969, 97.
16-17 C Aug. 3, 1795

192-95 R to Miami, Oct. 23, 1826; C

Oct. 23, 1834

196-98 R to Miami, Oct. 6, 1818; C Oct.

23, 1834

199 R to Miami, Oct. 23, 1826; patented to Richardville, Oct. 23, 1834

C-Ceded

251-54 R to Miami. Oct. 6, 1818; C Nov. 6. 1838

255 R to Miami, Oct. 23, 1826; C Nov. 6, 1838

256 R to Miami, Nov. 6, 1838; patented to Meshingomesia, Nov. 28, 1840 258 R to Miami, Oct. 6, 1818; C Nov.

H

28, 1840

5.b. Chief Richardville at about age 80, painting in possession of Charlene Winner, Ft. Wayne, Indiana.

of Richardville in 1827, along with the portraits of many other Miami chiefs. Half-Cree French, Richardville was Paean’s nephew and his successor as head chief of the *Miami proper. Reproduced by permission of the Indiana Historical Society. Negative

Figure 19. Jean Baptiste Richerville (Richardville). J. O. Lewis painted this portrait
Location of 1992 and 1995 excavation units at the Richardville Site (12-A1-1887)

N

04 Meters

1992 Unit

1995 Unit House
The undersigned Land Surveyor, registered under the laws of Indiana, hereby certifies that he has made a survey of the real estate described and shown below.

Measurements were made and monuments set in conformity with the records on file in the office of the Recorder of Allen County, Indiana, and to the best of my knowledge accurately shown. Any encroachments or discrepancies are shown below.

Legal description of real estate: SEE ATTACHED SHEET.
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