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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Nanticoke River watershed indigenous cultural landscape study area is home to well over 100 sites, landscapes, and waterways meaningful to the history and present-day lives of the Nanticoke people. This report provides background and evidence for the inclusion of many of these locations within a high-probability indigenous cultural landscape boundary—a focus area provided to the National Park Service Chesapeake Bay and the Captain John Smith Chesapeake National Historic Trail Advisory Council for the purposes of future conservation and interpretation as an indigenous cultural landscape, and to satisfy the Identification and Mapping portion of the Chesapeake Watershed Cooperative Ecosystems Studies Unit Cooperative Agreement between the National Park Service and the University of Maryland, College Park.

Herein we define indigenous cultural landscapes as areas that reflect “the contexts of the American Indian peoples in the Nanticoke River area and their interaction with the landscape.” The identification of indigenous cultural landscapes “includes both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife therein associated with historic lifestyle and settlement patterns and exhibiting the cultural or esthetic values of American Indian peoples,” which fall under the purview of the National Park Service and its partner organizations for the purposes of conservation and development of recreation and interpretation (National Park Service 2010:4.22). Using this definition, we provide nine indigenous cultural landscape criteria met by the area we define as being a high-probability area for an indigenous cultural landscape, and we describe the methodology used to obtain this information and represent the resulting landscape. Finally, this report provides and describes a series of maps leading to the high-probability indigenous cultural landscape boundary for internal use within the National Park Service.
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Introduction to the Study Area and Indigenous Cultural Landscape Concept

Defining the Study Area

The study area considered here encompasses those areas we have found to be significant to the Nanticoke people primarily of the Late Woodland time period (approximately 900CE - 1600CE) through the mid-20th century, as understood through historical documentation and present-day interviews with descendent communities, and as these areas are connected to the Captain John Smith Chesapeake National Historic Trail (Captain John Smith NHT). It is well documented that the Nanticoke people historically travelled beyond the boundaries of our study area, especially during post-contact migration periods, which led to the presence of Nanticoke groups settling in Pennsylvania (e.g., see Weslager 1943), across the Chesapeake to its western shore (Speck 1915: 27), and likely beyond. It is clear that an all-encompassing indigenous cultural landscape (ICL) study regarding the Nanticoke people should include a far greater scope of land and water than is considered here. For the purposes of the National Park Service’s (NPS) efforts, however, it is necessary to limit the scope of this project to those areas in close proximity to the Captain John Smith NHT. The study area thus includes much of the Nanticoke River watershed in Maryland and Delaware, portions of the Choptank River watershed in Maryland, and the region south of the Wicomico River in Maryland that extends to Deal Island (see Fig. 1).

The decision to focus on the Nanticoke River, among the many Chesapeake Bay tributaries included in the Captain John Smith NHT, was made after careful consideration of factors that might lead to a rich understanding of an ICL. These include: 1) known archaeological, ethnohistorical, and contemporary academic secondary source data connected to
the landscape, 2) presence of and use by descendent communities, 3) present-day landscape
evocative of what may have been encountered by Captain John Smith and used by the Nanticoke
people of the early 17th century, and 4) mutual interest in landscape conservation by partner
agencies (e.g., state and community organizations). We are fortunate to have the opportunity to
work in an area that meets each of these criteria.

Once agreeing upon a study area with our partners at the NPS, we considered that there
are at least two potential ways of investigating an ICL along a river such as the Nanticoke. The
first of these addresses those sites and landscapes of importance to, and which were locations of
high use by, the indigenous peoples of the region, either extant or which previously existed along
or in close proximity to the river. The second examines the sites and landscapes of importance to
the indigenous peoples who are most closely associated with this river, regardless of the
locations’ proximity to the Nanticoke River. In the end, our study combines these approaches,
looking beyond the edges of the Nanticoke River watershed to recognize the fuller story of the
lives of the Nanticoke peoples and their relatives\(^1\) in the Nanticoke River area, while keeping in
mind the scope of the Captain John Smith NHT. This approach comes with its challenges.

Initially in our project, we were inclined to attempt to demarcate the Nanticoke River
watershed ICL with boundaries solely in the Nanticoke watershed. There existed a tendency to
separate or otherwise demarcate spaces according to major or connector trails of the Captain
John Smith NHT, particular tributaries, or other mapped conventions. This makes sense from a
managerial perspective. However, there is an arbitrariness to this from an historical perspective.
It is important to consider the ways in which this landscape has been used historically, to

---

\(^1\) We include in the description “Nanticoke peoples” descendent groups of the Nanticoke tribe,
such as the Nause-Waiwash Band of Indians. We count among the Nanticoke relatives the
Lenape Indians of Delaware, who, along with the Nanticoke Lenni Lenape Indian Nation in New
Jersey, comprise the Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape Tribal Nation. See http://nanticoke-
enapetribalnation.org/about/
develop a picture of the ICL. Traditional use reveals a pattern of settlement that does not necessarily follow major rivers alone, but joins major rivers with tributaries and paths, creating an ICL that reveals a variety of settlement and use patterns, oftentimes spreading between major rivers such as the Nanticoke and the Choptank. These historical uses, landscapes, waterscapes, and settlement patterns—and how we chose to represent them—will be discussed further in the following chapters. In the end we decided to include the movement patterns (e.g., as represented by paths and waterways used by the Nanticoke) and other cultural features that spanned the landscape between the Nanticoke and Choptank Rivers, among others, in order to more accurately depict the life-ways and settlement of the Nanticoke people.
Defining “Indigenous Cultural Landscape”

We realize the importance of clearly defining “indigenous cultural landscape” to developing a picture of what an ICL will look like. A fuller explanation of the ICL concept and its potential and historical uses is provided in the “Indigenous Cultural Landscapes Study for the Captain John Smith Chesapeake National Historic Trail,” on file at the NPS Chesapeake Bay Office. Here we describe ICL as used in this study.

The 2010 Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and Environmental Assessment: Captain John Smith Chesapeake National Historic Trail (CMP) defines ICLs as reflecting “the context of the American Indian peoples in the Chesapeake Bay and their interaction with the landscape.” The concept “includes both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife therein associated with the historic lifestyle and settlement patterns and exhibiting the cultural or aesthetic values of American Indian peoples” (National Park Service 2010: 4.22). As such, a Nanticoke River watershed ICL reflects the context of American Indian peoples from the early 17th century to the present, in and nearby the Nanticoke River watershed. Further, the NPS Chesapeake Bay ICL team has expressed an interest in focusing on landscapes evocative of the historical Nanticoke River watershed, and so our study focuses heavily on areas with high concentrations of vegetation, scenic viewsheds, and land that might be benefitted by conservation.

It is important to note that some of the locations associated with the historic lifestyle and settlement patterns of the Nanticoke peoples are presently in developed areas such as Cambridge, Maryland and Laurel, Delaware. The historical significance of these places as relevant ICLs is not diminished by the presence of modern development. Nevertheless, it is beyond the scope of
the present study to focus attention on highly developed areas when the purposes associated with
the Captain John Smith NHT, as indicated in the CMP and discussed with the NPS Chesapeake
Bay ICL team, include conservation, as well as providing for recreational experiences on the
land and water, but would seem not to include developed areas² (National Park Service
2010:1.23).

Figure 2 Looking west over the Nanticoke River, near the mouth. Photo by Kristin Sullivan

² We do note that, while interest has been expressed by the NPS Chesapeake Bay ICL team in
focusing on evocative landscapes that lend themselves to conservation, recreational experiences
can be had in urban places as well. These spaces may be well utilized in the interpretation of
ICLs that are no longer immediately evident in the present day landscape.
**Introduction to the Nanticoke Indian Peoples, Relatives, and Landscapes**

Much has been written on the Nanticoke people, underscoring their indelible mark on the landscape that continues into the present, despite a history of European oppression. We refer the reader to the “Annotated Bibliography of Indigenous Peoples and Places in the Nanticoke River Watershed and Surrounding Areas” (Appendix C) and “Place Names” (Appendix A) for resources expanding upon the present discussion, offering a fuller picture of this rich history and cultural landscape.

**Introduction to the Late Woodland Nanticoke Indians**

Captain John Smith reached the mouth of the Nanticoke River (which he referred to as “Cuskarawaok”) on June 8, 1608, and departed, passing nearby Fishing Bay, on June 11, 1608 (Rountree, Clark, and Mountford 2007: 86-89, 211; Smith 2007: 336). Those four days of exploration provide a look into the lives of early-17th century Indian inhabitants of the Nanticoke River watershed, and mark a major turning point with respect to the future lives of the Nanticoke peoples (Smith 2007: 337-338). However, as C. A. Weslager (1942: 27) notes, Captain John Smith’s writings provide only a glimpse into the settlement—and much less the daily lives—of the Nanticoke at this time:

A very important Indian community was situated on the Nanticoke River, which Captain Smith called the Kuskarawaoke. He recorded the names of five Nanticoke villages in existence in 1608; namely Nautaquack, Nause, Saropinagh, Arseek and Kuskarawaoke—the latter village had the same name as the river. Smith stated that there were 200 warriors on the river which means that it was probably the most populous community on the Eastern Shore. In the Maryland Records of 1696, the Nanticoke were said to have ten towns, which would imply that Smith’s observations were not complete. There were doubtless small villages on the Nanticoke tributaries which he did not see.
Rountree, Clark, and Mountford (2007: 211-212) clarify the situation of the names of people and the locations of known towns:

This [Kuskarawaok/Nanticoke] group consisted of five towns with an estimated 850 people…. The name was Anglicized to Chicone and survives as the name of a creek near the old capital town. The people were known as Nanticokes after around 1640…. The paramount chiefdom, which included the peoples of the Manokin, Monie, and Wicomico waterways, was one of the oldest ones in the Chesapeake region…. The towns were: Nause, near the river’s mouth, opposite and a little above Ragged Point, within Fishing Bay Wildlife Management Area…; Soraphanigh, mentioned only in Smith’s text, not on his map (location uncertain); Arsek, mentioned only in Smith’s text, not on his map (location uncertain); Nantaquack, near modern Lewis Wharf Road, opposite and above the mouth of Rewastico Creek; and Kuskarawaok, on Chicone Creek, north of modern Vienna (this was the chief’s town in 1608, and it gave its name to the river at that time. Nantaquack was later Anglicized to Nanticoke. This town—moved upriver to the area between Chicone Creek and the town of Vienna—later became the chief’s town and the tribe, and the river acquired the same name.

But what were the lives of these people like? How did they use their landscape?

The Late Woodland period, approximately 900CE - 1600CE, saw the emergence of Native life as would have been encountered by John Smith (Rountree and Davidson 1997:8). At this time the Nanticoke River watershed would have looked not wholly unfamiliar, with its lowland marshes, upland forests, emergent plants, and fertile fish-spawning areas. Food procurement at this time revolved mainly around hunting, fishing, trapping, and gathering, relying heavily on the abundance of fertile grounds for these activities. Corn-growing, often associated with the Late Woodland period, was limited in much of the region due to the loss of alluvial farmlands in river valleys resulting from sea level rise (Rountree and Davidson 1997: 8). Loamy soils, particularly near the confluence of the Nanticoke River and Marshyhope Creek near Chicone (near present-day Vienna, Maryland), did provide fertile ground for corn, as well as sassafras and a variety of other crops (Rountree and Davidson 1997: 9). Food procurement
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Months</th>
<th>Population Location</th>
<th>Wild Plants</th>
<th>Animals</th>
<th>Agricultural Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March, April</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Tuckahoe</td>
<td>Fish, anadromous fish, turkey, squirrel, migratory ducks and geese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, June</td>
<td>Dispersed hunting</td>
<td>Tuckahoe, acorns, walnuts, chestnuts, chinquapins, strawberries, mulberries</td>
<td>Fish, anadromous fish, crabs, tortoise, oyster</td>
<td>Planting fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June – August</td>
<td>Foraging while crops ripening</td>
<td>Tuckahoe, ground nuts</td>
<td>Fish, snake</td>
<td>Green corn ready</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July – September</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Tuckahoe, berries, nuts</td>
<td>Crops ripe, squash ripening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August – October</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Tuckahoe, berries, nuts</td>
<td>Crops to eat, passion fruit ripening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August – November (Times of Plenty)</td>
<td>Dispersed to hunt to store up for winter</td>
<td>Tuckahoe</td>
<td>Migratory ducks and geese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November – January</td>
<td>In village, living off stored foods</td>
<td>Tuckahoe</td>
<td>Migratory ducks and geese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Subsistence Model for Delmarva Native Groups (Petraglia et al. 2002: 5(16)).

required seasonal settlement patterns involving regular movement on large areas of land and water (see Table 1), although this is not to imply a wandering hunter-gatherer lifestyle. Chicone, for example, appears to have had a defensive palisade around part of the site during the Late Woodland period, indicating a well-protected, permanent village (Rountree and Davidson 1997: 24).

Regular trade and familial relationships existed with neighboring tribes, members of whom were often counted as relatives, according to conversations we have had with descendent community members. “The Nanticoke,” for example, “had strong connections to the Choptank people with direct familial relationships attested in the seventeenth century” (Busby 2010: 30). According to one descendent community member, regular trade and settlement may have occurred in a large landscape ranging from Monie (cited as the “Great Monie,” about two miles north of the mouth of the Monie Creek, home to a tribe known as the Monie Indians (Weslager 1950: 63, 66)) and Deal Island at the southern end of the study area, all the way up to the Choptank River and into Delaware.
Post-Contact Change

Smith’s writings do not anticipate the impact his and other Europeans’ explorations would have on the peoples and landscapes of the Nanticoke River watershed. These changes did not occur all at once. The following 400 years saw a steady transformation of the Nanticoke cultural landscape, with marked moments of upheaval.

Little is recorded about the Nanticoke immediately after Smith’s departure, until the late 1650s, “when European settlers began to encroach on Nanticoke lands. From colonial records, it appears that the Nanticoke conducted regular trade with the Dutch and, possibly, the Swedes, in addition to trade with Virginia colonists” (Busby 2010: 40). “Indian land” was set aside for the Nanticokes and others in the mid-17th century, and in 1698 the Chicone reservation was created (Busby 2010: 121; see Fig. 11), and across from it, a short-lived reservation called Puckamee (1678-1698) (Rountree and Davidson 1997: 126). Thirty years earlier the Choptank (Waiwash) reservation had been created, but by the time of the Chicone reservation, western portions of the land were already being taken from the Indians there (Busby 2010: 390). The Broad Creek (Nanticoke) Reservation followed, in existence from 1711 to 1768 (Rountree and Davidson 1997: 126). For much of the mid-17th century, the chiefdoms in the Nanticoke watershed retained control of many trading activities (Rountree, Clark, and Mountford 2007: 217), and in some ways the reservations acted as buffer zones around important settlement areas, protecting the livelihoods and culture of the residents (Busby 2010: 472).

Each of the reservations in the Nanticoke River watershed ICL study area dissolved by the end of the 18th century. Speck (1915) notes that by 1748 most of the Nanticoke had moved up the Susquehanna River to Pennsylvania, either to settle there, or to eventually return to the
Eastern Shore and settle around the Indian River area of Delaware. In 1792 William Vans Murray collected ethnological notes and vocabulary “at the Nanticoke village of Locust Neck Town, Goose creek, Choctank [sic] river, Dorchester county, Maryland, at the insistence of Thomas Jefferson” (Speck 1915: 7). Notes on the vocabulary record the names of two Nanticoke villages at that time: *Ama namo quun* (translated as Locust Neck) and *Mattappenen* (translated as a Nanticoke Indian town) (Speck 1915: 8). To be sure, a large scale migration was underway, with many Nanticoke Indians and their relatives moving to new land. Studies conducted by Porter (e.g., 1977), Weslager (e.g., 1983), and others have traced the migration, settlement, traditions, and culture of the Nanticoke. Chief William Daisey (Nanticoke Indian Tribe) describes the centuries of challenges his people faced this way:

Well, going back to John Smith…during his travels…he was welcome when he came, and they, the Nanticoke and other tribes, supported him. Nanticoke were the largest tribe at that time in Maryland, here, that met John Smith. And, of course, they were friends for a while. Then after a while, some people came to that area who were not very friendly. … They were interested in land. Well…owning land is an alien concept for the Native American. No one owns the land. So, they took advantage of that: ‘This is my land, this is my plot.’ They had deeds and all that. … After a while Native Americans wised up to the fact that they were faced with an invasion. Europeans kept coming, kept coming. At some point they became a danger to the Native Americans. By the time they realized what was going on, and started fighting against it…a bow and arrow can’t compete with a rifle. … They were placed on reservations, a couple of them in Maryland. Broad Creek Reservation was [another] one. … So, after they were placed on the reservation, it may sound like a good idea, except for the fact that when you put someone on a reservation who’s used to hunting and fishing to survive, now you can’t do that. You see? … So, let’s see if we can get away from here. And they left, and the migration started. They [colonists] restricted the migration to the point, because they were afraid that they [Nanticoke] would present a danger to them. At one time, the Nanticoke decided to get together in a swamp in Maryland. They decided to band together, but again, it was too late. They had a meeting, some of my ancestors were involved in that meeting in the swamp: Dickson Coursey, and there were others involved. … That’s when the migration began, and that’s when they started settling in this area [Millsboro, Delaware], because it was similar to what they were used to [in Maryland]. (Interview 9 August 2013 by Kristin Sullivan and Cindy Chance)
Present Day Native Communities

Today the Nanticoke Indian Association claims in its membership about "550 Nanticoke Indians in Sussex County [Delaware] and about 500 in other parts of Delaware," as well as many additional members living in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Oklahoma, and Canada (Nanticoke Indian Association 2013). The Association is the official group of Nanticoke tribal members, although there are undoubtedly Nanticoke Indians who are not part of this Association. It is headquartered at the Nanticoke Indian Center in Millsboro, Delaware. This location, as well as the location of the Nanticoke Indian Museum, is the site of a former Indian school. These were elementary schools set-aside for American Indian children. The existence of segregated schools hints at the powerful and at times overwhelming history of oppression faced by the Nanticoke peoples since the colonial era. Such forces led in part to the loss of traditional language, and discrimination against the traditional practices and beliefs of the Nanticoke. The difficulties to be faced today in identifying and interpreting cultural landscapes of the indigenous people of Delmarva have their roots in a systematic denial of Native heritage.

Little has been written about the Nanticoke Indians who chose to stay in the vicinity of the Nanticoke River. One group who today claim lineage to the Nanticoke of the Late Woodland period are the Nause-Waiwash Band of Indians, so named for two ancestral village sites in the vicinity of the Nanticoke River: Nause, on the Nanticoke south of Vienna, Maryland, and Waiwash, nearer to the Choptank River, east of Cambridge, Maryland. The Nause-Waiwash state that they are “descendents of the original Nanticoke Indians” who today count around 300 members (Nause-Waiwash 2013). According to Chief Sewell Fitzhugh of the Nause-Waiwash

---

3 According to Nanticoke informants, in addition to facing segregation at a young age, school children leaving Indian elementary schools were either forced to find work, which was limited according to race and ethnicity, or to continue schooling at high schools for Indian or black students as far away as Georgetown and Wilmington, Delaware. This often required relocation to live with relatives in those locations.
Band of Indians, in the centuries following the collapse of the reservations, the Nause-Waiwash lived throughout the areas surrounding Chicone, in what is now Vienna, Maryland, and south to Elliott Island, Maryland (see Fig. 9). They also had leaders who came from as far south as Monie, Maryland and moved as far north as Puckum Creek in Maryland. Chief Fitzhugh describes relatives far to the south on Deal and Little Deal Islands in Maryland, and Nause-Waiwash villages as far west as the western shores of Fishing Bay. The last Nause-Waiwash longhouse is said to have existed in Abbott Town, just northwest of Fishing Bay on the Blackwater River, where it lasted until 1945. The Nause-Waiwash are presently renovating an historical church at the corner of Maple Dam Road and Greenbriar Road, north of Fishing Bay, to use as their longhouse and headquarters.

Figure 3 Chicone Creek, northeast of Vienna, Maryland. Photo by Kristin Sullivan
Indigenous Cultural Landscapes in the Nanticoke River Area: Criteria, Methodology, and Process

Criteria

We expect that criteria for an ICL will vary to some degree from region to region, given the variety of uses and traditional life-ways dependent upon geographically specific natural and cultural resources. In order to determine appropriate criteria for the inclusion of particular landscapes within the Nanticoke River watershed ICL, we conducted text analysis of scholarly sources (e.g., Busby 2010; Griffith 2009; Rountree and Davidson 1997; Weslager 1983) and of transcripts of interviews we conducted with Chief Sewell Fitzhugh (Nause-Waiwash Band of Indians) and Chief William Daisey (Nanticoke Indian Tribe). This analysis involved coding, or highlighting, instances where the authors or speakers referenced resources necessary for Indian communities living nearby the Nanticoke River. For example, in an interview we conducted with Chief Daisey (9 August 2013, with Kristin Sullivan and Cindy Chance), he noted:

The Nanticoke are tidewater people, like to be near the water, fishing, clamming, all those things that relate to the water. And also, we have berries and stuff many times close to the water. To survive, that was the way we lived during the summer, basically. We used to hunt and trap. Hunting and trapping was basically a winter survival method. You moved into the woods for trapping. Some berries too, obviously - nuts, berries. You lived off the land.

In this passage we can see that the Nanticoke people required tidewater for fishing, plants nearby the water for food, and inland forest for wintertime hunting and trapping. As more sources corroborate these notes, anecdotes become data, and eventually supporting evidence or themes for criteria. From these themes we developed a list of ICL criteria specific to the Nanticoke River watershed. The Nanticoke River watershed ICL is likely to include all of the following features:
**Natural Features**

- Navigable water for ease of travel, including a confluence of rivers in multiple locations
- Fresh water sources (e.g., springs) nearby for drinking
- Access to tidal salt and brackish water for a variety of fish and shellfish for food and trade goods materials (e.g., shells for jewelry)
- Good agricultural soil (e.g., corn-growing soil)
- Inland forest for supplies (e.g., trees, medicinal plants), food (i.e., forest animals and plants), and winter settlement
- High ground for village sites (noting that “high ground” may be only a few feet higher than nearby low ground)
- Marshes and brush areas for foraging and hunting small game

**Cultural Features**

- Support from archaeology, ethnohistorical, and other scholarly accounts.
- Support from a descendent community’s oral history.

*Cultural features identified by scholarly sources and descendent communities include:*

- Known village or trading sites based on archaeological evidence
- Probable village and trading sites based on ethnohistorical data
- Culturally important natural features
- Landscapes known to have been used for spiritual or ceremonial purposes, or to have spiritual or cultural value.

Several locations within the ICL boundary fit multiple examples of these criteria area (see Fig.s 17 and 18). Some of these areas (e.g., the Burial Mound in Cambridge, Maryland; Broad Creek Reservation in Laurel, Delaware) are largely developed. However, a great number of important locations remain relatively undeveloped and evocative of the landscape that would have been
used by the Nanticoke people and their relatives. These areas best fit with the purposes and goals of the Captain John Smith NHT ICL designation, and meet criteria for an ICL as such. These include the Chicone and Puckamee Reservation areas in Maryland, surveyed sites along the Delaware portions of the Nanticoke River, and much of the land surrounding Fishing Bay in Maryland (see Fig.s 17 and 18).

**Methodology**

Methodology employed in this study includes archival research, informational interviews and meetings with regional and topical experts (see Appendix B), site visits, driving tours and interviews with descendent community representatives, consultation with and assistance from geographic information system (GIS) specialists, consultation with and assistance from partner organizations at the state level, and mapping. Detailed steps taken follow:

1. **We identified the Nanticoke River watershed as our primary study area.**

   Guided by advice from our NPS partners we identified the Nanticoke River watershed as our pilot mapping project location. Criteria helpful in making this decision included the Nanticoke River’s recent status as a connector trail on the Captain John Smith NHT, interest in ICLs in the region on the part of partner organizations such as the Maryland Historical Trust and the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, presence of descendent communities (the Nanticoke Indian Tribe, Nause-Waiwash Band of Indians), areas in which fruitful archaeological surveys have been conducted, and extensive public lands and landscape evocative of historical indigenous cultural landscapes.
2. We developed and maintained an annotated bibliography of sources related to the research focus and consulted historical maps and scholarly sources regarding the potential Nanticoke ICL.

In an effort to best understand the people and cultural landscapes associated with the Nanticoke River and surrounding area we developed the annotated bibliography found in Appendix C. Materials from this bibliography have also been cited as supporting data for specific site and landscape inclusions in a Nanticoke River ICLs (see Appendix A). These supporting data illuminate important places, rivers, and landscapes as well as criteria for use by the indigenous peoples of the Nanticoke River watershed.

3. We defined ICL for the purposes of this pilot project, and refined the definition as the project progressed.

Given the nature of this study, and the paucity of information regarding ICLs in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, we began with an understanding of ICLs based on the work of Deanna Beacham (2012) and others (e.g., Andrews and Buggy 2008, Carter 2010, Davidson-Hunt 2003). We then took into consideration the purposes and goals of the Captain John Smith NHT and the timeframe of importance—focusing on the early 17th century through the mid-20th century. Finally, we produced the working definition of an ICL provided in the introductory material. We realize that an ICL will mean different things to different organizations and for different projects, and encourage the NPS to acknowledge the Trail-specific usage of this intellectual frame.
a. We engaged regional and topical experts with practical knowledge of the geographic area in question.

Group meetings and informational interviews were conducted during the study. These meetings engaged regional and topical experts, including archaeologists, historians, geographers, and others with academic and practical knowledge of the Native peoples of the Nanticoke River watershed, with geographic areas adjacent to the watershed, and with the process of mapping or otherwise representing indigenous landscapes (see Fig. 4). In each of the group meetings experts were asked to identify potential ICLs on a large map of the study area, and indicate support for their identifications (e.g., archaeological or historical evidence). Experts were also engaged in identifying appropriate archival materials for consultation, and many were especially helpful in building relationships with descendent communities.
The following is a list of activities in which our team participated, or which our team organized to engage with regional and topical experts. This list does not include internal meetings, which included our team and NPS staff only, or conference presentation:

- **March 2013:** Presentation in the Large Landscape Conservation Webinar hosted by the NPS and engaged with representatives from a variety of organizations at the community, state, and federal level working on landscape conservation.

- **June 2013:** Large experts meeting attended by Deanna Beacham (NPS), Tim Brower (Maryland Department of Natural Resources (MD DNR)), Virginia Busby (Captain John Smith NHT Advisory Council and Archaeologist), Cindy Chance (NPS), Jonathan Doherty (NPS), Daniel Griffith (Archaeologist), Doug Herman (National Museum of the American Indian), Elizabeth Hughes (Maryland Historical Trust (MHT)), Richard Hughes (MHT), Julie King (Professor of Anthropology, St. Mary’s College of Maryland), and John Seidel (Director, Center for Environment and Society and Associate Professor of Anthropology, Washington College). In this meeting experts from the fields of archaeology, history, and geography were asked to demarcate sites and landscapes along the Nanticoke River used by and of value to indigenous communities in the late-16th and early-17th century. The criteria and methodology used to this end, and the maps created, served as a first stage in identifying ICLs along the Nanticoke River.

- **September 2013:** Follow-up experts meeting with Deanna Beacham, Virginia Busby, Cindy Chance, Jonathan Doherty, Chuck Hunt (NPS), and Daniel Griffith.
The goal of the meeting was to review and refine the Nanticoke ICL map-in-progress, and critique criteria and methodology developed.

- October 2013: Follow-up experts meeting with Christine Conn (MD DNR) and Richard Hughes. The goal of the meeting was to review and refine the Nanticoke ICL map-in-progress, to critique criteria and methodology developed at that point, and explore the ways in which an ICL team might work with state agencies such as the MHT and MD DNR.

- November 2013: Meeting with Jennifer Chadwick-Moore (MHT), Cindy Chance (NPS), Charles Hall (MHT), and Richard Hughes to review the ICL map-in-progress, discuss layers of information MHT may be able to provide, as well as discuss any concerns the MHT and Maryland State Archaeologist (Hall) have with the ICL study process.

- November 2013: We presented and participated in the Indigenous Cultural Landscapes Webinar hosted by the NPS and engaged with a variety of organizations at the community, state, and federal level working on landscape conservation.

In addition to attending or hosting these meetings, we also observed two meetings of the Lower Susquehanna ICL Study group, which aided in developing and refining our methodology and representation of potential ICL features.
b. We identified preliminary criteria for the Nanticoke River ICL, and refined these as the project progressed.

Beginning with Beacham (2011) and incorporating scholarly and ethnohistorical data, as well as knowledge from descendent communities, we identified several features that could potentially be used as evidence supporting inclusion of specific locations in the Nanticoke River watershed ICL (see e.g., Griffith 2009; Hassrick 1943; Rountree and Davidson 1997). These are listed in the section above.

Those areas known to contain overlapping criteria (e.g., see the Chicone Reservation area on Fig.s 17 and 18) may be understood as “hot spots” for an ICL—those places with the highest probability of constituting an ICL by the criteria applied, or providing the greatest evidence for inclusion as an ICL along the Captain John Smith NHT.

c. We engaged Native communities related to the area of interest and consulted the appropriate representatives.

During the course of our we engaged members of the Nanticoke Indian Tribe, the Nause-Waiwash Band of Indians, and the Lenape Indian Tribe of Delaware in our research (see Fig.s 5-7). This endeavor was conducted in cooperation with partners from the NPS and the Smithsonian’s National Museum of the American Indian, and under the direction of Deanna Beacham and others listed in Appendix B. Our objective was to ensure that indigenous communities affiliated with the study area would be part of the ICL identification process, and that we proceeded in a culturally sensitive and respectful manner. We encourage the NPS to continue working with descendent communities in the Nanticoke River watershed ICL, to more fully understand the distinct and possibly varied values different groups might place on their landscape, as well as to continue a
relationship of respect with people to whom this landscape has special value. This work may include collaborative identification of ICLs, engagement in interpretation of the landscape, and collaboration in developing plans for access to lands that might be conserved.

Figure 5 Chief Sewell Fitzhugh (Nause-Waiwash Band of Indians) discusses the mapping process with members of the ICL team, giving pointers for corrections to an early iteration of a cultural data map. Photo by Kristin Sullivan
The following are major research activities involving representatives of Native communities. Summaries and transcriptions of audio recordings from driving tours and meetings are on file with the NPS Chesapeake Bay Office.

- **June 2013**: Driving tour of landscapes important to the Nause-Waiwash people, with Chief Sewell Fitzhugh, Nause-Waiwash Band of Indians. Area covered included Vienna, MD, and the Chicone Reservation area south to the areas east of Fishing Bay and west of the Nanticoke River (e.g., Elliott Island).

- **July 2013**: Driving tour of landscapes important to the Nause-Waiwash people, with Chief Sewell Fitzhugh and Tribal Council Member Windsor Myers, Nause-Waiwash Band of Indians. Area covered includes Cambridge, MD, the Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge, and the areas west of Fishing Bay (e.g., Goose Creek, Chance Island).

- **August 2013**: Meeting and driving tour with Chief Bill Daisey, Nanticoke Indian Tribe. Area covered includes Millsboro, DE and landscapes surrounding the Indian River in Delaware. Additionally, we spoke with two Nanticoke Indian Association members and received a tour of the Nanticoke Indian Museum in Millsboro, DE.
- September 2013: Nanticoke Indian Tribe Powwow (attended by Cindy Chance, NPS)
- September 2013: Nause-Waiwash Powwow
- October 2013: Meeting with Chief Dennis Coker, Lenape Indian Tribe of Delaware

Figure 6 Chief William Daisey (Nanticoke Indian Tribe) leading members of the ICL team through the Israel United Methodist Church cemetery in Lewes, DE. Photo by Kristin Sullivan

It is important to note here that the Indian River and Millsboro areas in Delaware are not part of the Nanticoke River watershed ICL study area. Nevertheless, several locations important to Chief William Daisey and the Nanticoke people exist there and elsewhere in Delaware—for example, the Nanticoke Indian Center, a former school designated for American Indian children in Millsboro, and several churches and cemeteries founded by and comprised
primarily of American Indians. Locations such as these help the story of Nanticoke migration, persecution, and settlement post-European contact, and illuminate the lives of the Nanticoke people today.

Figure 7 Chief William Daisey discusses the Nanticoke Indian Nation flag with Cindy Chance (NPS). Photo by Kristin Sullivan

d. We created a collection of maps representing features leading to the ICL probability map for the Nanticoke River watershed study area.

Beginning with a large, unmarked map of the study area created by NSP GIS specialists, we filled in cultural and natural features important to determining an ICL. This was accomplished following the processes described above and with the aid of many of the people listed in Appendix B. We completed the following map layers, explained in
greater detail in the following section regarding the proposed ICL probability map for the Nanticoke River watershed study area:

i. Sites, waterways, paths, and locations of importance relayed by descendent community representatives

ii. Sites, waterways, paths, and locations of importance to the Nanticoke peoples’ story as relayed by participating archaeologists with topical expertise

iii. Approximate 18th century reservation boundaries as mapped in Rountree and Davidson (1997:126)’s *Eastern Shore Indians of Virginia and Maryland*, and converted to GIS data by the Maryland Historical Trust.

iv. Areas thought to be high probability areas for indigenous occupation or use, and on which Phase I archaeological surveys were conducted by the Maryland Historical Trust

v. Land-cover data (including vegetation, agricultural land, and developed spaces)

vi. Areas of probable historical corn-growing soil

*Limitations and Challenges*

There are many challenges associated with developing criteria and methodology for identifying and mapping ICLs. Among these is human interpretation. There are multiple locations for some sites and landscapes on the maps that follow (e.g., the village of Nause), and much scholarly debate about the placement of villages such as Kuskarawaok and Nantaquack (e.g., see Davidson et al. 1985). These differences are reflective primarily of different interpretations of historical texts and maps, and interpretations of oral history. These challenges of interpretation are as persistent today as they were in John Smith’s time. As Griffith (2009: 9)
points out, “errors in mapping compound with distance, particularly those [distances Captain John] Smith obtained from Indian informants. Contemporary researchers observe that Smith’s longitude and latitude is inaccurate….” Modern maps based on Smith’s or other early historians’ and explorers’ maps are likely inaccurate to some degree. Further, village and site locations may have shifted over time, and rivers and other locations have been renamed for a variety of reasons. Some of these shifts and changes may have been lost in the record, and presently the best we can do is account for what information is available to us.

Representing sensitive information presents another challenge. We have been entrusted with locations of burial grounds, ceremonial grounds, and other locations of special value to the Nanticoke peoples. For the purposes of mapping we identified all these locations as the names provided without indication of cultural value, or as “Indian sites,” so as to not draw untoward attention. In most instances, we have placed generic shapes on the site locations that do not reveal specific points of sensitive information. It is a challenge, nevertheless, to present this information broadly while retaining the significance of a sacred location such as a burial ground in interpretation.

Furthermore, we realize that there are distinct limitations to mapping ICLs in GIS. In reality, there are no hard borders demarcating an ICL; boundaries surrounding indigenous landscapes were and continue to be porous, and likely shifted over time. For future representation we encourage the use of blurred boundary lines, as well as interpretation that evokes an understanding of dynamic and imprecise historical boundaries. We do recognize that demarcation of boundaries may be necessary for administrative purposes such as partnering with state agencies for acquiring conservation easements. On the other hand, an important part of the
interpretive process regarding ICLs might well be providing explanations of cultural limitations and variation associated with representing and placing landscapes.

Figure 8 Looking southwest from a single-lane bridge on Bestpitch Ferry Road near the confluence of the Chicamacomico and Transquaking Rivers, looking south toward Fishing Bay. Photo by Kristin Sullivan
High-Probability Indigenous Cultural Landscape Area: Maps for the Nanticoke River Watershed Study

Armed with data gathered from ethnohistorical, scholarly, and descendent community sources, and with the criteria outlined above in mind, we created a collection of maps leading to the area of highest probability for a Nanticoke River watershed ICL. This was accomplished with the active involvement of the NPS Chesapeake Bay GIS team. While it is beyond the scope of our study to designate a specific ICL along the Captain John Smith NHT, the map shown as Figure 19 depicts that area we feel best encompasses those criteria that might constitute a Nanticoke River watershed ICL. The following steps outline the ways in which we arrived at this conclusion, and the accompanying maps depict the features leading to a high-probability ICL area.

**Step 1: Compile Cultural Data**

1a: Nanticoke River watershed ICL Study Map: Archaeologists’ and Nause-Waiwash Notes

Based on notes taken at meetings with regional experts, and areas drawn by archaeologists and Chief Sewell Fitzhugh (Nause-Waiwash Band of Indians), Figure 9 was developed. This map depicts village sites, trading sites, possible paths, important rivers, meaningful landscapes, areas subject to archaeological surveys, and reservation boundaries as described by our informants.

1b: Nanticoke River watershed ICL Study Map: MHT Archaeological Survey Data

The Maryland Historical Trust provided us with several helpful images and map layers. Figure 10 depicts Phase I archaeological survey areas examined with an eye toward determining whether Indian artifacts and remains may be found. Complete Native Data Set reports are on file at the Maryland Historical Trust.
Figure 9
Reservation boundaries depicted in Helen Rountree and Thomas Davidson’s (1997:126) Eastern Shore Indians of Virginia and Maryland, based on ethnohistorical data such as the map of Chicone in Figure 11, have been utilized to create the map in Figure 12. Maryland Historical Trust staff mapped Maryland reservation boundaries in GIS, which we show here: Chicone, Puckamee, Waiwash (Choptank), Cottingham’s Creek, and Tundotank. This layer, together with the Broad Creek (Nanticoke) Reservation drawn by archaeologists at our experts’ meetings, comprises the reservations of the eastern shore of Maryland and Delaware shown in the composite map, Figure 16. Of these, Chicone, Puckamee, Waiwash (Choptank), and Broad Creek (Nanticoke) are included in our focus.

It is worth noting that each of the Maryland reservations shown in Figure 12, along with others on Maryland’s Eastern Shore and in southern Maryland, were successfully nominated by the Maryland Commission on Indian Affairs to Preservation Maryland’s 2013 Endangered Maryland List as “Endangered Indigenous Landscapes” (Preservation Maryland 2013). This adds another layer of significance to these locations, revealing the confidence of two major Maryland organizations in the validity of these locations, and a sense of urgency for their conservation.

A layer of soil quality data provided by the Maryland Historical Trust, and based on the work of Helen Rountree, depicts areas in which soil would have been fertile for corn around the time of European contact. This “Indian Corn Soil” layer is depicted in Figure 13. Indian corn soil is
considered cultural data here, as it is historical data predictive of settlement based on traditional food-ways.

Figure 11 Historical map depicting "Chickacone" "Indian land" in 1703 at the approximate location of the Chicone Reservation, with the Nanticoke River south of the plotted land. Map courtesy of the Maryland Historical Trust.
Figure 12

Legend
Reservations from Rountree and Davidson
R1 - Wicawash (Choptank)
R2 - Chicone
R3 - Puckamee
R4 - Cottingham's Creek
R5 - Tundotank

Nanticoke River Watershed ICL Study - Reservations from Rountree and Davidson
Step 2: Compile Natural Resource Data

2a: Nanticoke River Watershed ICL Study: Land cover

Utilizing Chesapeake Bay Program resources we condensed several layers into three categories of landcover (see Fig. 14). These are: vegetation, agriculture, and developed lands. These categories depict the following elements:

Vegetation:
- Forests (deciduous, evergreen, and mixed)
- Shrub Scrub
- Grassland herbaceous cover
- Woody Wetlands
- Emergent Wetlands

Agriculture:
- Pasture and Hay
- Cultivated Crops

Developed Lands:
- Developed open space
- Low, medium, and high intensity urban space

These elements help build a picture of which landscapes may be most evocative of the early-17th century Nanticoke River watershed.

2b: Nanticoke River Watershed ICL Study: Protected Lands

The Protected Lands map layer (see Fig 15) was created depicting the following:

- Protected Lands (Chesapeake Bay Program data)
- Maryland Historical Trust Easements
- Nanticoke Protected Lands (Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control data)
- Nanticoke Agricultural Easements (Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control data)

These elements reveal lands protected by state and federal agencies (e.g., the Fishing Bay Wildlife Management Area (MD DNR) and the Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge (U.S. Fish
and Wildlife Service), as well as conservation easements. Together they reveal a picture of lands currently enjoying some level of protection from development, although it is unclear to what extent natural or cultural resources are given priority for protection. It is foreseeable that an environmental restoration project would cause harm to artifacts in the ground. As such, we urge caution when conceiving of protected lands as fully or wholly protective.
Step 3: Combine and Analyze Cultural and Natural Resource Data

3a: Nanticoke River Watershed ICL Study: Composite Data

A composite map was created with all layers overlapping (see Fig. 16). This map reveals a rich picture that shows “hot spots” of cultural data, such as the area around the Chicone reservation. From this point, an outline was created around important data, leading to Figures 17 and 18.

3b: Nanticoke River ICL Probability Map: ICL Probability Boundary

Figure 19 depicts a boundary drawn around an area of high ICL probability. This line includes those areas of value to our experts and informants, and that would most likely be of high value to the indigenous people of this region in the Late Woodland, contact, and post-contact periods. These features include tidal waters, Indian corn soil, rivers, fresh water, and reservation boundaries. This shows support for the creation of the ICL high-probability area boundary drawn here.

3c: Nanticoke River ICL Probability Map: Boundary, Landcover, and Protected Lands

Figures 20-22 depict the boundary around the high ICL probability area overlaid on top of landcover and protected land data. It is perhaps these layers that will be most significant to the NPS in the near future. These layers show potentially evocative landscapes which are relatively undeveloped (vegetation) or which may be restored to approximate an undeveloped state (agriculture), and which are culturally meaningful for the purposes of this study (within the high-probability ICL area). Much of this area has high potential for meaningful interpretation, visitor experiences, and future conservation.
Nanticoke River ICL Probability Map - Cultural Data and Indian Corn
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1) Johnson Farm
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7) Portsville Quarry
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Figure 17
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Figure 20
Figure 21
Figure 22
Step 4: Future Mapping

The NPS will likely explore future mapping options for more refined and project-specific applications, using these maps as building blocks. To this end, we make note of some of the data we were unable to obtain at the time of this report.

GIS-formatted topographical information will be an important layer for continued research. For future mapping of the Nanticoke River watershed ICL, it will be beneficial to know where points of higher ground exist, as we have come to understand that these “lumps,” as they are sometimes called, would have lent themselves to settlement or the development of paths, with footpaths connecting lumps through marshy areas (c.f., Hassrick 1943; interviews with Chief Sewell Fitzhugh). Additionally, with the threat of sea level rise, it may be beneficial to assess land acquisition priority with respect to elevation.

New information regarding cultural data will undoubtedly appear with new archaeological surveys, but also with the emergence of information from continued relationships with Native communities in the region. All of the Native participants in this study have expressed interest in remaining active participants in the ICL study process. Chief Fitzhugh has expressed interest in continuing tours and presentations of the Nause-Waiwash cultural landscape. Future Nause-Waiwash or Nanticoke driving tours, stories, and oral history may expand and fill out a picture of the Nanticoke River watershed ICL beyond what is known presently, for example, to include areas not presently included in this study, which are west of the present ICL high-probability area boundary shown in Figure 19. Future engagement with the Nanticoke Indian Tribe and related tribes will benefit all involved.

In addition to adding a layer of topographical information, and continuing to engage with Native communities to build a fuller picture of cultural data, there are options for working with
the information already collected that may benefit a more in-depth study of this high-probability ICL area. One such option is to create a heat map of the high-probability area. Such a map, created using GIS or other analytic software, depicts “hot spots” of information—those places designated as having more value, or where meaningful points or landscapes overlap—based on criteria decided upon in advance. If this technique is to be employed, we urge the NPS to consult with a range of experts and informants such as those engaged in this study, to determine values assigned to resources such as scholarly information, ethnohistorical data, archaeological evidence, natural resources, and oral history.
Conclusions

Since early in 2013, our team has focused its efforts on identifying the Nanticoke River watershed ICL. Through scholarly and ethnohistorical accounts; meetings with regional experts such as archaeologists, historians, and geographers; and the accounts of descendent community members and their relatives in and nearby the Nanticoke River watershed, we have developed a sense of what this might be. We have developed a picture of sites, waterways, and landscapes of historical interest and of special value to the indigenous people of this region, and in collaboration with the NPS Chesapeake Bay, created a series of maps representing the high-probability ICL area, including relevant cultural and natural resources found therein.

As we have noted, this is an initial effort intended primarily to establish relevant ICL criteria and to develop and field test a methodology for identifying potentially useful ICLs on the basis of these criteria. Our decision to focus on the Nanticoke River watershed, made in collaboration with NPS Chesapeake Bay staff, was based on several factors, including interest by partner organizations in potential ICLs in the area, archaeological evidence and historical accounts, the presence of descendent communities, and abundance of evocative landscape. While we trust that the work and methodology described in this report will be useful in subsequent efforts to broaden our understanding of ICLs associated with the Captain John Smith NHT, it must also be recognized that each such potential landscape will present its unique characteristics and require adaptations of the approach described in this report.

We feel that it is important to note that procedures used to identify potentially useful ICLs during the course of our study are specific to the conservation and interpretive aims of the NPS Chesapeake Bay. It is to be expected that preferences for particular ICLs, and for the features that are held to constitute an ICL, will vary with the needs and intentions of their authors.
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APPENDIX A: PLACE NAMES

The following selection of sources provides support and context for the inclusion of particular places, sites, and landscapes in the Nanticoke River ICL. Additional support may be found in the annotated bibliography (see Appendix C).

Source Key

F1  Driving tour with Chief Sewell Fitzhugh, Nause-Waiwash Band of Indians 14 June 2013, transcription
F2  Driving tour with Chief Sewell Fitzhugh and Mr. Windsor Myers, Nause-Waiwash Band of Indians 12 July 2013, transcription
F3  Driving tour with Chief Sewell Fitzhugh and Mr. Windsor Myers, Nause-Waiwash Band of Indians 16 August 2013, transcription
WD  Interview and driving tour with Chief William Daisey, Nanticoke Indian Tribe 09 August 2013, transcription
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place or Landscape</th>
<th>Approximate Location</th>
<th>Time Period(s) of Use</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbott Town</td>
<td>Blackwater River, north of Fishing Bay</td>
<td>20th c.</td>
<td>F1: The last Nause-Waiwash longhouse was here F2: Village location where Nause-Waiwash people lived up until 1945. (p. 14) “Way up into the 19th century, many of the families that still followed the seasons and the water, that didn’t have much farmland, the lived up in Abbott Town. In the spring of the year they’d pack up the dogs, the chickens, the kids, the wood stove. They would sail out with the wind and the tide to Snake Island. They would spend the night on Snake Island. The next day, with the wind and the tide right, they would sail here [Goose Creek]. The women and the children, the dogs and the chickens, would live here. The men would go out by boat, out to old grounds, which is Billy’s Island, where they had fishing shanties and all, and they would fish. Then in the fall of the year they would reverse it and go back up to Abbott Town and all so they could trap, and do the fur.” (p.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adina – See Burial Mound, Sandy Acres</td>
<td>Cambridge, MD</td>
<td>Early woodland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderton’s Branch</td>
<td>Small tributary of the Nanticoke River</td>
<td>Post-Contact</td>
<td>F1: Fitzhugh’s people moved to Snake Island, then Willy's Neck, and then to Andrews. F2: Area where the Nause-Waiwash moved after living in Willy's Neck (p.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>post-1742</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annamessex River Drainage</td>
<td>Name corresponds to modern area</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>VB: References Rountree and Davidson (1997:32) to point out that the Nanticoke's territory sometimes spanned this area (p. 28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 20</td>
<td>Within the Chicone Study Area for Busby's Dissertation</td>
<td>Late Woodland</td>
<td>VB: Base camp for study (p. 433)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 21</td>
<td>Within the Chicone Study Area for Busby's dissertation</td>
<td>Late Woodland</td>
<td>VB: Base camp for study (p. 433)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arseek</td>
<td>possibly Marshyhope river in MD or upstream Nanticoke</td>
<td>Late Woodland</td>
<td>DG: Recorded but not mapped by Smith, likely mentioned by Indian informants - p.17 RD: Mentioned in Smith's Generall Historie - p.32 RCM: Mentioned only in Smith's text, not on his map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnes Woods</td>
<td>north bank of Nanticoke on Butler Mill Branch</td>
<td>Late Woodland</td>
<td>DG: Noted as a site occupied during the Terminal Late Woodland/Contact Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bead Site</td>
<td>North bank of Nanticoke River</td>
<td>Late Woodland</td>
<td>DG: Noted as a site occupied during the Terminal Late Woodland/Contact Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bestpitch</td>
<td>Aries, MD</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>F2: Some of the Nause-Waiwash lived here, and Annie Oakley is said to have target shot with Fitzhugh's people in this location (see p.5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Mill Pond</td>
<td>Head of Chicamacomico</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>F2: Mentioned as being at the head of the Chicamacomico (see p. 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place or Landscape</td>
<td>Approximate Location</td>
<td>Time Period(s) of Use</td>
<td>Descriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billy Rumley's Settlement</td>
<td></td>
<td>mid-18th c.</td>
<td>F2: Chief Billy Rumley was from Waiwash. He refused to leave, and came to Goose Creek after buying land from Zebulon Pritchett (which, SF points out, was illegal; Indians couldn’t buy land from white men at that time). Rumley married a white woman and built a house. A white man eventually kicked Rumley off his land. Many of SF’s people moved south to the Goose Creek area because Chief Rumley moved there. These are the people who refused to go north. Others settled in Broad Creek after being displaced, just after the Revolutionary War. (see p.19) F3: Fitzhugh: &quot;He was the last recorded predominant chief in this area, as far as the white man was concerned. That was 1740s.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billy's Island</td>
<td>Bloodsworth Island</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>F2: Old fishing grounds (see p. 21) F3: See Bloodsworth Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwater River</td>
<td>corresponds with modern location</td>
<td>pre-contact</td>
<td>F1: Waterway used by the Nause F2: Possible river where John Smith sailed; transportation route for the Nause-Waiwash (see p. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloodsworth Island</td>
<td>mouth of Nanticoke</td>
<td>Contact period</td>
<td>F3: See Billy’s Island RCM: Island at the mouth of the Nanticoke River, reached by Smith in June 1608 - p. 85-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place or Landscape</td>
<td>Approximate Location</td>
<td>Time Period(s) of Use</td>
<td>Descriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Broad Creek        | Laurel, DE           | set aside for Nanticoke in 1711; ended in 1768 (Busby 391) | F1: Nanticoke reservation here  
F2: Village location, said to have been home to people who traded at Easton Market with villagers from Hawkeye, Cabin Creek, Waiwash, Vienna, and Chicone (see p.3)  
F3: Noted as being much like the springs at Mardela, a reservation existed there (p.6); "Maryland wouldn’t let [the Nanticokes] back in [after the 1742 uprising] because they were afraid they would uprise all of us again. So that’s when they settled over to Indian River and then moved down to, well they settled in Broad Creek and then got pushed out of there and went to Indian River. That’s the Nanticokes in Delaware.” (p.9)  
WD: Daisey states: “They were placed on reservations, a couple of them in Maryland. Broad Creek Reservation was one. The reservation over in Vienna, Maryland…Chicone. Broad Creek was in Laurel, in Delaware now, but it used to be part of Maryland.” (p.2)  
VB: At the time of the 1742 uprising against the colonists, there are references to "multiple simultaneous Nanticoke chiefs that include two from Chicone and two from Broad Creek” (p. 45); in early 1700s, many of the Nanticoke at Chicone moved to this reservation after encroachments on their land and mistreatment at Chicone (p. 55)  
DG: Smith seems to have been here and obtained information about the area from an Indian informant. This region would’ve been travelled through for trading with Atlantic coast Indian communities - p.15  
RD: Created after the Chicone reservation, potentially "prompted by a desire to quiet the Nanticoke Indians at a time when Maryland feared trouble from 'foreign' Indians…” (p. 115)  
RCM: Turn-around point for Smith’s expedition on 6/10/1608, possibly only described to Smith by Native people drawing maps for him - p.87-88  
W: Reference to Broad Creek possibly being a Nanticoke village site during the time of John Smith’s voyage and a documented site that Nanticoke moved to when relocating away from Chicacoan (both permanently and temporarily)(p. 117); On November 3, 1711, the Maryland Assembly passed a law that reserved over 3,000 acres at Broad Creek for the Nanticoke (p.118-119) |
<p>| Bunker Hill        | South bank of Nanticoke River in Blades | Late Woodland | DG: Noted as a site occupied during the Terminal Late Woodland/Contact Period |
| Burial Mound       | west side of Cambridge, MD | Early to Late Woodland | F2: Near a Nause-Waiwash village (name unknown) that went out of existence by the early 17th century. Near the cliffs overlooking the Choptank River, not far from Hambrooks Bay. (see p.6) |
| Bush River         | Bush River, MD | ? | W: Nanticoke man was killed by white settlers on the Bush River and the incident was documented to some degree (p. 102-103) |
| Cabin Creek        | NE of Cambridge, MD | Contact? | F2: Village location where there were several cabins. Said to have traded at Easton Market with others from Waiwash, Hawkeye, Vienna, Chicone, and Broad Creek (see p.3) |
| Cambridge          | Cambridge, MD | Pre-contact and reservation | F2: Once on reservation land (see p.3). A burial mound is located here. (see p. 4) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place or Landscape</th>
<th>Approximate Location</th>
<th>Time Period(s) of Use</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Chance Island      | Chesapeake Bay, MD   | ?                     | F1: Indian tombstone recorded there by Fitzhugh (p. 12)  
|                    |                      |                       | F3: "This here is a holy place. It is a burial ground and it is a spiritual place. I have permission to tell you all that in hopes that you will help project it from being robbed anymore. … It’s called Chance Island and if you go on it’s not marsh. It’s still a rigid land in there that’s high. Some almost consider it part of Guinea, but it’s not. The village on Guinea, that is where they buried, ok? Alright? … You’re over above Fishing Bay. Guinea Island—it’s off from Guinea." (p. 11) |
| Chapel of Ease     | Vienna, MD           | contact/colonial?     | F1: Church originally on the outskirts of Vienna; Fitzhugh says it was placed as such in order to access Indians for conversion. It has been moved into town. |
| Chicamacomico River| corresponds to present day location | pre-contact | F1: Waterway used by the Nause  
|                    |                      |                       | F2: Branches off of the Transquaking; transportation route for the Nause-Waiwash. Possible place where John Smith sailed. (see p. 2) |
| Chicone; See also Chicone Reservation | Vienna, MD | post-Contact period (Busby 3); 1684 surveyed to become reservation (Busby 46); 1698 established as a reservation (Busby 50); 1782 land sold to settlers (Busby 56); | F1: Town at the oxbow in Chicone Creek. Mentioned by Fitzhugh as having influence on both sides of the Nanticoke (see p. 2-4 driving tour notes)  
|                    |                      |                       | F2: Fitzhugh states that John Smith visited the village here (p.2)  
|                    |                      |                       | F3: "You’ve got to remember we were here for a long, long, long time. … We had a Chief of Chief for 13 generations at Chicone, and that was in 1608. Okay? So that means the present form of our society and all had existed for 13 generations before John Smith” (p.2); "Once you get in across the marsh, the land got high in Chicone and that’s where the palisaded village was.” (p.10)  
|                    |                      |                       | VB: Served as the focal point of Nanticoke leadership for the 17th and 18th centuries (p. 3); associated with post-Contact period Nanticoke "emperors" (p. 3) Additional references on pages 41-43, 45-46, 50, 54-56, 97, 109, 431-432, 451-452.  
|                    |                      |                       | RD: Archaeology revealed large numbers of storage pits that turned up artifacts indicating use throughout the Late Woodland period. A defensive palisade likely surrounded part of the site. (p.24); Principle town of the Nanticokes is Chicone (p. 95); Drainage town established by the proclamation of 1678, said to be the seat of the Nanticoke emperor, "located along the west side of the Nanticoke between present-day Chicone Creek and Marshyhope Creek in Dorchester County” (p. 109)  
|                    |                      |                       | W: In 1677, it was documented that this was "the headquarter village of the Nanticoke Emperor” and it had been known to serve this purpose previously (p. 81); reference to a fortification at Chicacoan in 1680s and after (p. 95); In 1678, Lord Baltimore refers to one of the areas occupied by the Nanticoke as "Chiccacene" (p. 110); After Nanticoke complain about settlers infringing on their territory, the Maryland Assembly made a law on October 20, 1698, officially setting aside Chicacoan "consisting of 5,166 and 1/4 acres” (p. 114); Documentation of William Ashquash living on Chicacoan and raising corn there in 1722 (p. 131-132) |
| Chicone Creek      | Name corresponds to modern creek | ?                     | F1: Florida fields, reservation, Chicone, etc. in this area - seems to be a very important riverscape/landscape.  
<p>|                    |                      |                       | VB: Along with Nanticoke River, forms the primary drainage for the Chicone site |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place or Landscape</th>
<th>Approximate Location</th>
<th>Time Period(s) of Use</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Chicone Hunting Grounds; See also Puckamee | Southeast of Vienna, just across the Nanticoke River | contact/colonial | F1: Land set aside for Indian hunting and trapping  
F3: Land across the Nanticoke River from where the Chicone Creek flows into the Nanticoke, designated for use by the Nause-Waiwash (p.1); “My understanding is across from Chicone, there was a thousand acres in here that was put aside. That’s what the treaty says, and supposedly it’s directly across from Chicone.” (p.10), may have been part of the Puckamee Reservation (p.10) |
| Chicone Reservation; see also Chicone | Vienna, MD | post-contact | F2: Approximate location drawn on the map by Fitzhugh.  
F3: Reservation noted by Fitzhugh, across the Nanticoke River from the assigned hunting grounds (p.1)  
WD: They were placed on reservations, a couple of them in Maryland. Broad Creek Reservation was one. The reservation over in Vienna, Maryland…Chicone. Broad Creek was in Laurel, in Delaware now, but it used to be part of Maryland. p. 2  
RD: Created by a 1698 act (p. 115); increasingly the focus "of the Indians' political, social, and economic lives" (p. 121); as the smaller Indian towns were abandoned in the late 17th c., "the population of the remaining larger Indian towns (i.e., reservations) probably grew" (p. 127); large areas such as the Chicone reservation would have served as “buffers or filters that softened the impact of English culture on the Indian way of life” (p. 130); as early as 1717 Englishmen began leaving portions of the Chicone reservation (p.150); reservation land was entirely in the hands of Englishmen by 1785; MD legislature passed a bill authorizing the purchase of all remaining rights to Chicone from the Nanticoke Indians (p. 159) |
| Choptank Reservation; See also Waiwash Reservation | Northern Dorchester County | Post-Contact | VB: After unsuccessful 1742 uprising, some Nanticoke moved here (p. 55)  
RD: "At the beginning of the eighteenth century, the Choptanks still occupied a large and unified reservation on the Choptank River above the English town of Cambridge. There had been a significant amount of encroachment on the western third of the reservation in the 1690s, but most of the 16,000-acre tract was still in Indian hands.” (p.127) |
| Church Creek | ? | ? | F1: Place where a treaty was signed. There is now an "Old Field Road" there. John Smith likely came up this. |
| Clashtown | NW of Fishing Bay | ? | F2: Fitzhugh tells a story about a white man who “fell in love” with a black Indian woman, and they bought a piece of land that became Clashtown. Some of their daughters have children by Nause-Waiwash men. (p.12) |
| Deal Island | Chesapeake Bay, MD | pre-contact | F1: Place where the Nause-Waiwash would have "skated" to find marriageable partners.  
F2: When asked if the Nause-Waiwash were on Deal Island, Fitzhugh responded: “Little Deal. We had a community on Little Deal and as Little Deal washed always, they went to main Deal. Hence the name Winona.” KS: “What does that mean?” SF: “It’s an Indian name. It’s a woman’s name.” (p. 1)  
F3: Fitzhugh and Windsor Myers both note several ancestors buried here. Fitzhugh recorded names at an Indian graveyard on the island years ago (p.7); Fitzhugh points out that there are descendents in Deal, but few are enrolled in the tribe (p.17) and that his people went back and forth between Deal and Fishing Bay to find marriageable partners (p.19); there is an Indian graveyard that Fitzhugh recorded, on Deal Island (p.19) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place or Landscape</th>
<th>Approximate Location</th>
<th>Time Period(s) of Use</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Market/</td>
<td>East New Market, MD</td>
<td></td>
<td>F1: Trading post here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East New Market</td>
<td></td>
<td>F2: Location of an Indian trading post (see p.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliott's Creek</td>
<td>corresponds with modern location</td>
<td></td>
<td>F1: Now listed as &quot;McCready&quot; on maps; noted, but no description given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliott Island</td>
<td>corresponds with modern location</td>
<td>Late Woodland to present</td>
<td>F1: High location from which you can see and feel the Nanticoke ICL. F3: &quot;Nause also stretched by our tradition all the way into Elliott's Island. ... Because in all the research that's been done on Elliott's Island, they all admit the first inhabitants were Nause.&quot; (p.9-10); &quot;In fact, [Nause burial grounds are] behind my house and in front of my house. Part of it now is a white graveyard. That ridge stretched all the way back, and everyone I’ve talked to, including the old white families—. Now, Ms. Knorr [Nora?] is dead now and her sister is dead; they described that as the burial grounds, and they said that’s why they started burying their ancestors there because it was already a burial ground.” (p.10); &quot;That lump of trees - Elliotts, Langrells. See how it’s opening? Duck Point, those two little—. If you look at your map of Dorchester, look at Elliotts Island. The land comes down like this to a point, at the mouth of the Nanticoke. There’s the beginning of it where it comes up like this. See it?&quot; (p.13) RCM: Smith explored past here, noting the Transquaking River (but not exploring it) - p. 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliott's Island Road</td>
<td>corresponds with modern location</td>
<td></td>
<td>F1: Possible &quot;old path&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emperor's Landing</td>
<td>Vienna, MD</td>
<td></td>
<td>F1: End of the Nanticoke River Boardwalk in downtown Vienna. Would have been a good launch for the Nause-Waiwash (see quote in tour notes, p.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Creek</td>
<td>Toddville, MD</td>
<td>post-contact</td>
<td>F1: Fitzhugh points out the Hard Hayward Bridge near Farm Creek. Farm Creek is said to come out to Tideville, and then out to Fishing Bay. (p. 17) F3: &quot;If you come in Farm Creek, you don’t have to come in far. My understanding—where the dance ground and the ceremonial place is—it’s still bald. Nothing will grow on it. ... I was told the ground is still bald and it’s one of my elders who told me that. We would like that protected.&quot; (p. 11-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing Bay</td>
<td>SW of Vienna, MD</td>
<td>Late Woodland, contact, post-contact</td>
<td>F1: Several important islands are here and around here. Fitzhugh would like for his people to have rights to aquaculture here. F2: Location where John Smith is said to have sailed. Fitzhugh located maps showing Fishing Bay as swamp in the 17th century, and raises the question of whether John Smith went up rivers off of Fishing Bay and called wherever he went Fishing Bay. (see p.2) F3: Fitzhugh is concerned with whether Fishing Bay was marsh at the time of John Smith's exploration. If so, he likely went up rivers that feed into it. (p.1); Fitzhugh states that his people went back and forth between Deal Island and Fishing Bay to find marriageable partners (p.19) RCM: Smith likely fled here after leaving Nause (p. 87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place or Landscape</td>
<td>Approximate Location</td>
<td>Time Period(s) of Use</td>
<td>Descriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Florida Field      | Vienna, MD           | ?                     | F1: Fitzhugh states that he would like to see this preserved. He believes the last Chief of Chiefs had an English-style home there. Approximate location noted on the Fitzhugh map.  
F2: Village location, said to have been home to people who traded at East Market with villagers from Hawkeye, Waiwash, Broad Creek, and Cabin Creek. (see p.3) |
| Goose Creek/Bishop's Head | corresponds with modern location | 1742 (Post-contact period) | F1: Where Chief Rumley settled, and in 1742 refused to go North; Rumley came from Waiwash.  
F2: Approximate location of Billy Rumley's land (see p.19) Also mentioned by Speck (1915b, see Appendix C) |
| Graw's Island      | McGraw's Island near Fishing Bay | pre-contact           | F2: Location with a freshwater spring, where his people once farmed. (p.14) |
| Gray's Island      | East of Fishing Bay   | pre-contact           | F1: Noted as a settlement of Fitzhugh's people with a freshwater spring. There are remnants of a path to here.  
F3: Noted as being near Nause |
| Green's Island     | on Fishing Bay        | pre-contact           | F1: Soft landing spot, likely used by the Nause  
F3: Noted as being near Nause |
| Guinea Island and Marsh |                         | pre-contact           |  |
| Handsell Tract     | Vienna, MD           | post-contact          | F1: Chicone, Florida Fields, and an old path are likely within this area  
VB: "Davidson (1982a) has used colonial records to argue that it [Handsell tract] contained the 'core settlement' of the larger village of Chicone during post-Contact times. The Handsell tract consisted of a 700-acre square-shaped parcel. Its boundaries consisted of Chicone Creek to the southwest, the Nanticoke River to the southeast. Its northern boundary extended north of the present-day Chicone Road about 2000 feet and east of the present-day Panguash Creek about 2,000 feet. The tract was originally patented in 1665 by Thomas Taylor (McAllister 1962: 72) but later became the property of Christopher Nutter who subsequently sold the land to John Rider in 1720 (McAllister 1960, Vol. II: 2 Old 45, 52)" (p. 50-51); Nanticoke complained about illegal plantation settlement on their reserved lands, especially on the Handsell Tract in the Chicone Reservation (p. 53); "I argue that these reflect a linear arrangement of native settlements associated with the waterways and marsh resources and further that the Handsell tract is so large because it was intended to encompass the main settlement of Chicone" (p.390); purchased by Christopher Nutter (trader and interpreter for the Nanticoke) at some point (p. 398); "It has already been established that the chiefly residence of Unnacocasimon was located within the Handsell tract at the southern tip of Chicone Indian Town" (p. 561); Within Chicone Reservation (see map on p. 49); a square tract that takes advantage of the intersection of Chicone Creek and Nanticoke River (p. 388)  
RD: Owned by Thomas Taylor, bought by Christopher Nutter in 1693 - the land grant included the Nanticoke Fort at Chicone (p. 147); sold to John Ryder in 1721 (p. 149) |
<p>| Harmony Church     | Millsboro, DE        | 19th-21st c.          | WD: Predominantly American Indian church, built in 1875 and founded by American Indians. Many Nanticoke Indian Association members worship here. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place or Landscape</th>
<th>Approximate Location</th>
<th>Time Period(s) of Use</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harriet Tubman Trails</td>
<td>near Fishing Bay</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>F2: Fitzhugh states that many of the trails used by Harriett Tubman were old Indian paths (p.12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Hawkeye | NE of Vienna, closer to the Choptank | Late Woodland, reservation | F1: Indians were given land here as land was taken away elsewhere. Approximate location noted on the Fitzhugh map.  
F2: Village site (see p.3) |
| Hollyville School | Millsboro, DE | 20th c. | WD: One-room schoolhouse for minority students (see p. 5) |
| Honga River | corresponds with modern location | Late Woodland, contact | F3: Fitzhugh suggests this as a place for the group to visit, regardless of whether Smith sailed up the straits. It is an area important to his people. (p.2)  
RCM: Bypassed by Smith (p. 89) |
| Hooper's Islands and Hooper Strait | corresponds with modern location | Late Woodland, contact | F2: Locations where Fitzhugh's people would have travelled (p.19)  
RCM: Smith went through the Strait and reached Lower Hooper Island 6/11/1608 (p.89) |
| Howard High School | Wilmington, DE | 20th c. | WD: High school for minority students, which many American Indians attended. (p.2-3) |
| Indian Bone Road | Indian Bone Rd. | ? | F2: Village and Burial site at on one end of this (not near Aries Rd.); see p.9 |
| Indian Creek | Vienna, MD | ? | F1: Creek in the Chicone Reservation, near where Virginia Busby dug. |
| Indian Mission United Methodist Church | Indian River Hundred/Lewes, DE | 20th c. | WD: Church comprised of primarily American Indian members.  
W: Used by Nanticoke Indians during their Powwow weekend in 1982; Nanticokes in regalia took active parts in the Sunday morning service (p. 17) |
| Indian Paths | MD, DE | pre- and post-contact | F1: Many of the roads are old Indian paths. (see also Old Path near Chicone)  
WD: Daisey states: “Many of them were Indian paths; then they changed them to roads. This, at one time, was a path, Route 24, part of it. … The paths were basically hunting paths. They didn’t necessarily connect, until a store. Then they would connect to a store." (p. 9) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place or Landscape</th>
<th>Approximate Location</th>
<th>Time Period(s) of Use</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian River</td>
<td>Millsboro, DE</td>
<td>post-migration</td>
<td>F3: “Why do you think we call it Maryland Nanticokes and Delaware Nanticokes? It was that Mason Dixon line that caused a division. When the Nanticokes came back from Canada and wanted to come back into Chicone, okay? The Mason Dixon line had been put in. Maryland told them they couldn’t come back. They had their Indians under control, so that’s why they first settled over to broad Creek, okay, and then went to Indian River because they got pushed out of Broad Creek. Broad Creek is much like the springs I’ll show you in Mardela. It was the same scenario at broad Creek.” (p.6); “Maryland wouldn’t let [the Nanticokes] back in [after the 1742 uprising] because they were afraid they would up-rise all of us again. So that’s when they settled over to Indian River and then moved down to, well they settled in Broad Creek and then got pushed out of there and went to Indian River. That’s the Nanticokes in Delaware.” (p.9) WD: Settlement place of many Nanticoke Indians after migration from Maryland. Referred to as “Nanticoke River” by Daisey. W: A place that Nanticoke descendants moved and settled (p. 197-198)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiantown Road</td>
<td>Vienna, MD</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>F1: Noted as &quot;a very old road&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel Church</td>
<td>Lewes, DE</td>
<td>20th-21st c.</td>
<td>WD: Church founded by and comprised of primarily American Indian members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack's Creek</td>
<td>Cambridge, MD</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>F2: Noted as one of a few possible escape routes from a village site near Vienna, MD (p.7) F3: &quot;In the oral histories that were given to me, Jack’s Creek is described as one of the back entrances for Nause…. Remember I said there was always more than one escape by water from a village if need be? And Jack’s Creek, you can make your way through to Fishing Bay. It don’t show it on the map, but by water we knew how.&quot; (p. 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenkins Creek</td>
<td>Cambridge, MD</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>F2: Noted as one of a few possible escape routes from a village site near Cambridge, MD (p.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Smith's Cross</td>
<td>Laurel, DE?</td>
<td>Late Woodland</td>
<td>DG: Placed at the limits of exploration - possibly 8.6 miles ENE of Kuskarawoak, up Broad Creek or Deep Creek - in Laurel, DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson Farm</td>
<td>north bank of Nanticoke River below Seaford, DE</td>
<td>Late Woodland</td>
<td>DG: Noted as a site occupied during the Terminal Late Woodland/Contact Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Island/</td>
<td>Kent Island</td>
<td>documented use in post-contact 1600s</td>
<td>W: Kent Island was used as a trading post; the Nanticoke people visited it in order to trade with the British (p. 56); Kent Island was called Monoponson by Native Americans (p. 69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings House</td>
<td>Vienna, MD or into DE</td>
<td>Late Woodland</td>
<td>DG: At Kuskarawoak, moved to Nantaquak/Chicone sometime early/mid-17th c.; said by Griffith to be on the north side of the Nanticoke River, opposite its confluence with Broad Creek in DE, extending northward several miles to the Butler Mill Branch tributary (p. 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place or Landscape</td>
<td>Approximate Location</td>
<td>Time Period(s) of Use</td>
<td>Descriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuskarawoak (see also Nause and Nantaquack)</td>
<td>possibly Laurel, DE; Conflicting research conclusions on location</td>
<td>Late Woodland to Contact Period</td>
<td>VB: Named in John Smith's account and described as &quot;the village farthest up the river and is demarcated as the chief’s village&quot; (p. 28); Smith noted it was &quot;one of the best places in the region to trade for furs&quot; (p. 29); Some disagreement over location as Busby reports: 1) According to Smith, on the Nanticoke River, more northern than Nantaquack; 2) according to Davidson et al. 1985, near Laurel, Delaware; 3) maybe the same place as the Broad Creek Reservation* (p. 41); 4) Griffith 2009 source suggests that Kuskarawaok could be site 7S-E-1, along the main branch of the Nanticoke River in Delaware (p. 41); 5) Bourne 2005 and Scott 2005 suggest that Kuskarawaok is in the vicinity of Vienna and the Chicone site (p. 42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langrell's Island</td>
<td>on Fishing Bay</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>F2: &quot;Lump&quot; mentioned by Fitzhugh. There is a legend about a white woman who lived with the Nause-Waiwash there and eventually claimed it (see p. 10) F3: Pointed out, but not discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel, DE</td>
<td>corresponds with modern location</td>
<td>post-contact</td>
<td>DG: Potential site locations associated with the Nanticoke (especially into the early 18th c) are here, including a large ossuary burial - p.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewes, DE</td>
<td>corresponds with modern location</td>
<td>post-contact</td>
<td>N: Identified as one of the places where Nanticoke descendents moved and settled; Weslager confirms this in three separate interviews with descendents in the 1941 (p. 197)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis Wharf</td>
<td>South of Vienna, MD</td>
<td>present</td>
<td>F2: This area is a good vantage from which to see the Nanticoke River and how it looked historically. Likely a Nause-Waiwash landing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place or Landscape</td>
<td>Approximate Location</td>
<td>Time Period(s) of Use</td>
<td>Descriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Little Deal Island | Deal, MD              | ?                     | F2: When asked if the Nause-Waiwash were on Deal Island, Fitzhugh responded: “Little Deal. We had a community on Little Deal and as Little Deal washed always, they went to main Deal. Hence the name Winona.” Kristin Sullivan: “What does that mean?” Fitzhugh: “It’s an Indian name. It’s a woman’s name.” (p. 1)  
|                    |                      |                       | F3: Where the Abbots originally settled before being pushed off; there were Indian houses and burials here. Fitzhugh states that it reminds him of Snake Island (p.20) |
| Locust Neck        | just north of Chicone; located on part of the Choptank Reservation lands (Busby 95); along Choptank River | ?                     | VB: “To provide [Thomas] Jefferson with a word list to aid his study of surviving tribes and the antiquity of the Indians, a local gentleman visited a small group of Indians living in Dorchester County, just north of Chicone at another settlement called Locust Neck, a small enclave on lands forming the remains of the Choptank Reservation. These people were closely affiliated with the Nanticoke if not also intermarried with them by this time. Thanks to Jefferson’s efforts, a substantial word list of late eighteenth century Eastern Shore Algonquian exists which represents the language spoken by the Nanticoke” (p. 95); Many of the Nanticoke who remained in Dorchester County after the 1742 uprising moved to Locust Neck settlement and joined remaining members of the Choptank, but they maintained Nanticoke identity (p.395); “When William Vans Murray visited the last known settlement of Indians in Dorchester County in 1792 to fill out the word list requested by Thomas Jefferson, he noted that Wynicaco the last Choptank chief who died sometime after 1706 was buried in a charnal house associated with the Locust Neck settlement. The chief had been dead around 70-75 years in 1792 and his body and importance were part of the preserved memory of the native people and of the settlers of the area alike as with the maintenance of “quiankeson” in the names of Anglo-American land parcels associated with the structures” (p. 424); ”Further evidence of a mixture of housing styles at Eastern Shore Indian settlements comes from descriptions of the Locust Neck reservation. In 1792, nine people inhabited the Locust Neck Indian lands. One of these people was the relict’ wife of the later ‘colonel’ or king. This woman, Mrs. Mulberry lived in one of the two framed houses and her house possessed a glass window. In addition to the framed houses there were also five wigwams (Murray 1792a). The difference in housing styles is very likely related to different social statuses” (p. 455-456)  
<p>|                    |                      |                       | W: Dr. William Van Murray misidentified a group of Native descendents as Nanticoke; they were Choptank; he was collecting some of their language's words for Thomas Jefferson’s studies (p. 194-195) |
| Long Field         | north of Fishing Bay | 18th or 19th c.       | F3: Area where slaves were killed and ghosts or spirits are said to still wander (not necessarily Native) (p.12) |
| Longhouse; See also Nause-Waiwash Headquarters | intersection of Greenbrier Rd and Maple Dam Rd. near Fishing Bay | ?                     | F3: A longhouse sat here (p. 12) |
| Lumps              | marshlands           | x                     | F2: High pieces of land in a marsh. Fitzhugh states that his people would have settled on every lump (see p. 2) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place or Landscape</th>
<th>Approximate Location</th>
<th>Time Period(s) of Use</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Man-made canal</td>
<td>south of Vienna, MD on the peninsula</td>
<td>present</td>
<td>F2: Not American Indian, but good access point for kayakers; locally called Cal's Creek.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manokin River Drainage</td>
<td>Name corresponds to modern area</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>VB: Busby references Rountree and Davidson (1997: 32) to point out that the Nanticoke's territory sometimes spanned this area (Busby p. 28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RD: R &amp; D state that &quot;there is good reason to suspect that the authority of the Nanticoke 'emperor' also extended into the Manokin River drainage.&quot; (p. 95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RCM: Manokin is part of the paramount Nanticoke chiefdom (p. 211)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Dam Road</td>
<td>north of Fishing Bay</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>F2: An old Indian path or trail that went through the marsh. (p.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mardela Springs</td>
<td>Mardela Springs, MD</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>F3: Location of several natural springs, and possibly part of the hunting grounds adjacent to the Chicone reservation (p.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshyhope River/Creek</td>
<td>Vienna, MD</td>
<td>Late Woodland</td>
<td>F1: Runs into the Nanticoke River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F2: Possible river around which towns were built  (p 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F3: Fitzhugh runs the group along the Marshyhope as they trace the Chicone Reservation (p.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DG: Possible river around which towns were built - p 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RD: At the Nanticoke - a vicinity promising for site excavation due to its location (topography, salinity, etc.) - p.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RCM: Possible area of exploration by Smith - p.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place or Landscape</td>
<td>Approximate Location</td>
<td>Time Period(s) of Use</td>
<td>Descriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Monie             | Monie, MD            | ?                     | F2: “The great village of Monie sometimes describes themselves as being Nanticoke. Other times they are their own independent—I think it waned and grew as whether they had enough warriors to if need be. But the people from Monie, if we get down to where Billy Rumly lived, there was an English doctor who settled there whose last name was Pritchett. And Dr. Zebulon Pritchett treated the Natives along with the Europeans and the Europeans came to him and told him that if—he was really like a pharmacist—if he continued to treat the Natives, they would not come to him. So he looked at him and said, ‘ok, well that’s fine. You know, I’m gonna go continue to treat the Natives.’ Of course if you get sick enough…. Puckum, the Great Chief at Monie at that time, and him become such good friends that he named one of his sons Puckum. And then when the village of Monie started shrinking because of disease and warfare and slavery, Chief Puckum went up the Nanticoke.” (p. 1-2)  
F3: Fitzhugh - “Alright, Chief Puckum was the Great Chief at Monie, remember? We’ve already talked about him. Okay? When Monie began to become overwhelmed by the European and all, and he felt they could no longer continue without being either killed off, or diseased—whatever. He came up the Nanticoke, and he came up the Marshyhope, and he settled in here. This, even today, this area is referred to as Puckum.” (p.3); ”The great village of Monie was how it was always described to me. It had to be along the Monie Creek. ... You see where Monie Creek is? I’m not sure if it was on both sides or one side, but the highland as you come in, I would say that’s where the village sat, much like Chicone.” (p.10); Fitzhugh points out that the Monie area looks very much like Bishops Head (p.16, 17)  
RD: The Great Monie Indian town was patented by Nehemiah Covington, Sr., and then Christopher Nutter (p. 147)  
RCM: Part of the paramount Nanticoke chiefdom - p. 211 |
| Nantaquak/Nantiquak | Possibly Vienna, MD; Research conflicts regarding precise location | Late Woodland, reservation as Chicone | F2: May be where the Westin Manor is today  
VB: Named in John Smith's account and described as a "commoner village"; Some disagreement over location as Busby reports: 1) according to Smith, on the Nanticoke River, more southern than Kuskarawaok; 2) according to Davidson et al. 1985, 0.9 miles north of Vienna, MD; 3) in the same place as Chicone (p. 41)  
DG: Documented as where the archaeological site of Chicone is (see p. 9) - at the confluence of Chicone Creek and the Nanticoke River. Nanticoke leadership relocated here by 1677, from Kuskarawaok; referred to as a "commoner's village" (p.13) at time of Smith's arrival  
RD: Satellite town of Nanticoke/Kuskarawaok, north of Nause - p. 32  
RCM: Near modern Lewis Wharf Rd., opposite and above the mouth of Rewastico Creek - p. 211  
W: Description of modern geography of the Nanticoke, noting its source is in Sussex County, Delaware; list of tributaries (p. 26) |
<p>| Nanticoke Indian Center | Millsboro, DE | 19th-21st c. | WD: Former Indian school, present home of the Nanticoke Indian Association, Inc. (see p. 4-5) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place or Landscape</th>
<th>Approximate Location</th>
<th>Time Period(s) of Use</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Nanticoke Indian Museum | Millsboro, DE | 19th-21st c. | WD: Former Indian school, present home of the Nanticoke Indian Museum (see p.5-6)  
W: In 1982, the Nanticoke Indian Association had plans for turning this abandoned school house into a Nanticoke Indian Museum (p. 15)  |
| Nanticoke River, Territory and Migration | MD, DE (Migration beyond) | X | F2: Fitzhugh's people use the entire river, and commuted by water to the Choptank and other waterways.  
F3: On territory: "Both sides of the Nanticoke, both sides of the Choptank, all the way to the source, and then all the way to the Delaware Bay - because Dagsboro, DE was the village of Blackfoot." (p.2); "We're the Maryland Nanticoke, you know. Though we use the old reservation name because they started referring to us as the Waiwash Nanticoke and then over time, they dropped the Nanticoke and started referring to us as Waiwash Indians, ok?" (p. 8); "There was a period in time [1742], when the Nanticoke were chased out of Somerset, across the river, all of them that were back in Dorchester and then right around 1742, there was a militia against us because of the uprising, and many of us crossed over into Somerset and Wicomico for a period of time, for like five or six years, and then all of us started wandering back." (p.8)  
WD: Daisey states: "We came from Maryland. Because Maryland gave them such a hard time, they decided to move: came through Delaware, up to New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Canada, all over the place. There was a migration. … It's slow. It began around 1700." p.1; Daisey occasionally refers to the Indian River as the Nanticoke River  
RD: "The main reasons that the English were uneasy about the Nanticoke…stemmed from the geographical location and cultural affinities of the tribe. Nanticoke territory stood between the Maryland colony and the Delaware or Lenape Indians who lived along the Delaware Bay." (p. 98); "In 1697 the Maryland authorities acknowledged that the tribe inhabited ten different towns. … A late eighteenth-century writer...estimated the tribe's population early in the century at 500...” another writer gave evidence of 120 Indians in 1722, all of whom lived (probably) in Broad Creek (p. 128-9)  
RCM: Included five towns and approx. 850 people, including 200 warriors. Chicone is the Anglicized name of one; the people were known as Nanticoke after around 1640  
W: Description of modern geography of the Nanticoke, noting its source is in Sussex County, Delaware; list of tributaries (p. 26); In 1621, King James I grants Lord Baltimore control of all of Nanticoke territory and the territories of other native groups ("from the south shore of the Potomac River north to the 40th degree of latitude south of Delaware Bay") (p. 49); 1697 report refers to ten Nanticoke villages (p. 111); In 1621, King James I grants Lord Baltimore control of all of Nanticoke territory and the territories of other native groups ("from the south shore of the Potomac River north to the 40th degree of latitude south of Delaware Bay") (p.49); 1697 report refers to ten Nanticoke villages (p. 111) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place or Landscape</th>
<th>Approximate Location</th>
<th>Time Period(s) of Use</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Nause              | south of Vienna, MD  | pre-contact           | F1: Described as a place where there are clumps of trees, visible from along Elliot's Island; also described as stretching all the way down the Nanticoke river (south of Vienna) (e.g., p. 7)  
F2: "My great, great, great-grandfather was supposed to have come from Nause. And they moved from Nause because the European was taking it over, to Snake Island, and then my great-grandparents and all were born and raised on Snake Island. The last longhouse in my family was on Snake Island. And then they moved up into Willy’s Neck, which I will show you, and then they moved up into what is Andrews. It was all one point. Andrews and Robbins at one point was the same community. But when they brought the road in with the New Deal, people started moving up along the roads. So they split it in two communities; same blood lines, same families, you understand what I’m saying?” (p.15)  
F3: Points out three lumps of trees that would be east of Elliott Island, on the Nanticoke, which comprised Nause (p.9)  
VB: Some disagreement over location, as Busby reports: 1) According to Smith, on the Nanticoke River, even more southern and closer to the mouth of the river; 2) according to Davidson et al. 1985, in the vicinity of present-day Elliott’s Island in Dorchester County  
DG: Referred to as a "commoner's village" (p.13)  
RD: Satellite town of Nanticoke/Kuskarawaok, "down in the marshy mouth of the Nanticoke River" - p.32  
RCM: Near the Nanticoke's mouth, opposite and a little above Ragged Point, within Fishing Bay Wildlife Management Area; probably a fishing camp. - p. 211; Where Smith rowed when seeing smoke, finding two or three houses that were likely a summer fishing camp - p. 87 |
| Nause-Waiwash Headquarters; See also Longhouse | Maple Dam Rd., north of Fishing Bay | unsure of original build, rebuilt in 1917 | F1: Family church deeded to the Nause-Waiwash  
F2: A 19th Century Methodist meeting hall, alternatively owned by American Indian and African American members. This building is currently under renovation, and Fitzhugh hopes it will become the Nause-Waiwash headquarters. (p.13) |
<p>| Nause-Waiwash Territory | south Dorchester County, MD | Late Woodland | F2: Extended into Caroline County and over to the Delaware Bay (see p.3) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place or Landscape</th>
<th>Approximate Location</th>
<th>Time Period(s) of Use</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nutter’s Neck</td>
<td>south of Chicone across the Marshyhope River (Busby 398)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>VB: Busby states: &quot;For the Nanticoke, they held a special relationship with the trader and interpreter Christopher Nutter who held a plantation just south of Chicone across the Marshyhope at Nutter’s Neck. Nutter also had purchased the Handsell patent that formed the bottom point of the Chicone Reservation. His relationship with the Nanticoke spanned the 1670s - 1702 ending with his death. Routtree and Davidson (1997:148) observe that Nutter’s time of involvement with the Nanticoke spanned the time of the appointment of Panquash and Annotoquin to when Emperor Ashquash was reinstated and they surmise that his influenced internal 'political' activities. Nutter’s inventory is one of the ways in which we glimpse the Nanticoke’s participation in trade at this time with many guns (for trade?) and a large amount of Indian bowls present. I was able to briefly investigate portions of Nutter’s Neck with descendants of Christopher Nutter. The initial minimal field walking yielded a medium-sized round cobalt blue glass trade bead and European redwares dating to the seventeenth century. No evidence of native-produced trade wares were present, however, additional fieldwork is required to flesh out the picture the total Nanticoke/Chicone community that involves this plantation site&quot; (p. 398) RD: Christopher Nutter was the principle trader with the Indians at Chicone (p. 148-9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Orchard</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>F2: Location where some Nanticokes lived who attempted to get a language program off the ground (see p.5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Fields</td>
<td>regional</td>
<td>pre-contact</td>
<td>F1: A term used in land records that usually denotes an old Indian field. F3: These, when on maps, refer to places where the original lands were likely Indian fields (p.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Path near Chicone/Old Chicone Trail</td>
<td>Vienna, MD</td>
<td>pre- and post-contact</td>
<td>F1: Path running between the Chief of Chief’s village (Florida Fields, Chicone town area) to Hawkeye. In part it is Chicone Rd. Approximate location noted on the Fitzhugh map. F3: A trail mostly covered by development and farmland now, which connected Chicone to Hawkeye and Waiwash (p.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Trail in the Blackwater Marsh</td>
<td>Blackwater Wildlife Refuge</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>F2: Indian Path (p. 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pendertown</td>
<td>NW of Fishing Bay</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>F2: Fitzhugh states: Our community on the other side of this marsh, where the Blackwater is...right here there was a community; some of them were tri-racially mixed. Some of them were biracially mixed. They are the Penders, the Clashes, the Lays (?). That road there goes back to where it hits the marsh, and that was Pendertown,&quot; (p.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips Landing</td>
<td>South bank of Broad Creek, in DE</td>
<td>Late Woodland</td>
<td>DG: Possible trading place (p.13) with non-local ceramics (p.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poplar Island</td>
<td>corresponds with modern location</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>F1: Noted, but not discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsville Quarry</td>
<td>South bank of Broad Creek, in DE</td>
<td>Late Woodland</td>
<td>DG: Noted as a site occupied during the Terminal Late Woodland/Contact Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prickly Pear Island</td>
<td>south bank of Nanticoke River, below Broad Creek</td>
<td>Late Woodland</td>
<td>DG: Possible trading place (p.13) with non-local ceramics (p.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place or Landscape</td>
<td>Approximate Location</td>
<td>Time Period(s) of Use</td>
<td>Descriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puckamee; see also Chicone Hunting Grounds and Puckum</td>
<td>Immediately south and across the Nanticoke River from Chicone Reservation (Busby 46)</td>
<td>Reservation from 1678 to approximately 1698</td>
<td>VB: Busby states this is a &quot;short-lived area of reserved Nanticoke Indian land&quot; (p. 46); some question to whether or not this was considered part of the village of Chicone (p. 400-401) RD: Drainage town mentioned in the proclamation of 1678, establishing Indian towns, said to be on the east bank of the Nanticoke River upstream from Barren Creek (p. 109) W: In 1678, Lord Baltimore refers to one of the areas occupied by the Nanticoke as “Puckamee” (p. 110); also called Hellbury Neck (p. 115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puckum; see also Puckamee</td>
<td>Vienna, MD</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>F1: Fitzhush says the last great Chief at Monie is named Puckham, and there is place called that - curious if this is Puckamee. F3: Fitzhugh states: “Alright, Chief Puckum was the Great Chief at Monie, remember? We’ve already talked about him. Okay? When Monie began to become overwhelmed by the European and all, and he felt they could no longer continue without being either killed off, or diseased — whatever. He came up the Nanticoke, and he came up the Marshyhope, and he settled in here. This, even today, this area is referred to as Puckum.” (p.3) RD: A John Puckham is listed as an Indian who married a woman of another race, and whose children were considered &quot;free mulattoes&quot; in 1681, in Monie (p. 163, 233)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puckum Creek</td>
<td>NE of Vienna, MD</td>
<td>18th c.?</td>
<td>F3: Fitzhugh states: “We’re pretty sure he [Puckum?] settled on that creek. There’s never been any work there, no research. We’re pretty sure his descendants stayed. Now, whether they moved down into the community with us? I would assume there was some intermarrying going on. The research that we’ve done - we have twenty-some names that we know are Indian, that somehow connect to us, we just don’t know how yet. We’re trying to do it right, in other words, by the letter of the law….“” (p.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puckum's Purchase</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>F3: Fitzhugh states: “This is where the Lee family had their plantation. There was a village on the other side. There were burials on the other side. Remember we came in the other way, we didn’t go much farther than to turn up here, and I was telling you there were burials that had been robbed and all on the other side where those gravel pits are. I don’t know if you can see the rebuilt manor house but it sits back in here. They call it Puckum’s Purchase.” (p.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puckum Settlement Site</td>
<td>convergence of Marshyhope and Puckum Creek</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>F3: Fitzhugh states: “And everyone is in agreement that that is where Chief Puckum settled — along that Creek. When he come up from Monie that is where he settled” (p.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place or Landscape</td>
<td>Approximate Location</td>
<td>Time Period(s) of Use</td>
<td>Descriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quianceson Neck</td>
<td>See 17th Century survey and patent certificates; inside the area known as Puckamee possibly (Busby 423)</td>
<td>1699 patent reference but would probably predate this record (Busby 423)</td>
<td>VB: Busby states: &quot;Documentary evidence regarding specifically the Nanticoke, the Choptank, and Assateague of the lower Eastern Shore, indicates that quiankeson houses, containing the remains of past chiefs and the wealth of the living chiefs, were located away from villages or core habitation sites in low, swampy areas (Marye 1936b; 1937a, 1944, Murray 1792). Seventeenth century survey certificates and land patents mention a piece of land called ‘Quianceson Neck’ which was described as being where the “Indian Quianceson Houses” stood and which was associated with cypress swamps. Marye (1937:211 citing Patents, Liber B. No. 23, folios 189 and 190, folio 199; Liber D. D. No. 5, folio 14) states that the parcel lies in Wicomico County, no more than ¼ miles east of the town of Vienna, across the Nanticoke River in salt marshes and that Barren Creek lies just south of it (Marye 1937:212). This would make the quiankeson houses located inside of the Indian reservation of Puckamee which was bounded on its south by Barren Creek (see discussion of Puckamee above). The patent references to the tract called “Quianceson Neck” date to 1699 and do not indicate that the quiankeson houses were gone at this time. I propose that they could still have been in existence at least at the time of the naming of the tract and still used by the Nanticoke” (p. 423)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raccoon Creek</td>
<td>Cambridge, MD</td>
<td>Late Woodland and contact</td>
<td>F2: Flanks one side of the burial mound in Cambridge, MD. (see p.4). Fitzhugh states that some of his people ended up in this location, who were originally from Nause (p.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ragged Point</td>
<td>mouth of the Nanticoke</td>
<td>Late Woodland to Contact Period</td>
<td>RCM: Likely approximate location where Smith anchored when trying to enter the Nanticoke and encountered arrow fire - p. 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Banks</td>
<td>Sharptown, MD; Mardela Springs, MD</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>F1: Noted, but not discussed F3: Noted as a place naturally fortified swamp (p.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Allen School</td>
<td>Wilmington, DE</td>
<td>20th c.</td>
<td>WD: High school for minority students, which many American Indians attended. This went through 11th grade. (p.2-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers End</td>
<td>Confluence of Nanticoke River and Deep Creek</td>
<td>Late Woodland</td>
<td>DG: Noted as a site occupied during the Terminal Late Woodland/Contact Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roasting Ear Point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F1: place where longhouses are shown on contact-era maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbins</td>
<td>NW of Fishing Bay</td>
<td>20th c.</td>
<td>F2: Area where the Nause-Waiwash moved after living in Willy's Neck (p.15) F3: Robbins Landing noted as a community near Abbott Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosedale Convention Hall and Resort</td>
<td>Millsboro, DE</td>
<td>20th c.</td>
<td>WD: Entertainment venue utilized largely by Nanticoke people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury, MD</td>
<td>corresponds with modern location</td>
<td>Late Woodland</td>
<td>F3: &quot;We had villages all the way up where Salisbury is.&quot; (p. 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Acres/ Sandy Hill; see also Burial Mound</td>
<td>Cambridge, MD</td>
<td>early to late woodland</td>
<td>F1: Burial mound there F2: Western portion of the Waiwash Reservation, taken away early in the reservation's history. (see p.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place or Landscape</td>
<td>Approximate Location</td>
<td>Time Period(s) of Use</td>
<td>Descriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Island</td>
<td>West of Fishing Bay</td>
<td>19th-20th c.</td>
<td>F2: Fitzhugh states: “This is where a lot of our people are buried, and when the white family was asked why there were allowing us to bury here and live down in Abbott Town, the comment was, ‘Indian people have to have somewhere to live.’” (p. 15) Many Abbotts and Robinsons are buried here. The location is approximately five miles from Snake Island by water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarapinagh</td>
<td>possibly Marshyhope river in MD or upstream Nanticoke</td>
<td>Late Woodland</td>
<td>DG: Recorded but not mapped by Smith, likely mentioned by Indian informants - p.17 RD: Mentioned in Smith's Generall Historie - p.32 RCM: Mentioned only in Smith's text, not on his map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah Lake</td>
<td>off of Elliot's Island Rd. near Vienna, MD</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>F1: Pointed out by Fitzhugh, no description given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorter's Wharf</td>
<td>West of Fishing Bay</td>
<td>Late Woodland to post contact</td>
<td>F2: Part of a trail that runs through this was an old Indian trail that Europeans began using due to its existence. (p.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 18DO1</td>
<td>Eastern side of the Marshyhope / sometimes called the Northwest fork of the Nanticoke River; just north of the northeast corner of the Chicone Reservation (Busby 401)</td>
<td>Late Woodland</td>
<td>VB: Micro-band base camp, the Willin Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 18DO10</td>
<td>Within the Chicone Study Area for Busby's dissertation; &quot;the western 1.5-acre portion of a two- acre rectangular agricultural parcel located within the study area, approximately half a mile northwest of site 18DO11&quot; (Busby 351)</td>
<td>Early Archaic, Middle Archaic, Terminal Woodland, Early Woodland, Middle Woodland, Late Woodland, Post-European Contact (Busby 382, 435)</td>
<td>VB: European trade goods found by early researchers (p. 99); Maps showing various artifact distributions are found in Busby's dissertation on pages 355, 359, 363, 373, 374, 375, 378, 381; &quot;Late Woodland component is the most pronounced” (p. 382); could represent a single habitation site (p. 383); surface collection suggests post-contact structure with brick foundation, central hearth or chimney dated to mid to late 1700s and whoever was using this structure would have been present on Chicone reservations lands at the time when the reservation was occupied by Nanticoke people (p. 384); Late Woodland habitation and 17th/18th Century habitation (p. 435); &quot;Returning to William Ashquash and site18DO10, in addition to being in contact with northern Indians who incorporated European influences in their architecture to a greater degree than the Nanticoke remaining at Chicone, William was also in contact with traders and northern Indians who had greater access to European trade goods and who also used a predominance of European goods in addition to those of their own production. Hence, William was in a position to acquire such goods and bring back items in a style and amount to be worthy of remark by Maryland colonial authorities. These references provide plausible evidence for the potential for the seventeenth and eighteenth century archaeological remains at 18DO10 to be the product of an Indian habitation that incorporated English architectural styles and a greater number and variety of European goods while not discounting their potential attribution to a colonial encroacher” (p. 455)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Landscape</td>
<td>Approximate Location</td>
<td>Time Period(s) of Use</td>
<td>Descriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 18DO11</td>
<td>On the east side of Chicone Creek, approximately 0.6 miles upstream from where the creek intersects with the Nanticoke River. Lying at the southernmost tip of the former Chicone Indian Reservation...approximately 11.5 acres of an agricultural field and adjacent woodlands within the farm property&quot; (Busby 214)</td>
<td>Middle Archaic, Late Archaic, Early Archaic, Middle Woodland (Busby 435); Late Woodland, Early Late Woodland, Late Late Woodland, Post-European Contact (Busby 173)</td>
<td>VB: This site &quot;has been posited to represent the nucleated residential area of the Nanticoke 'emperors'&quot; (Busby 78); &quot;Using aerial reconnaissance, these researchers identified a dark, donut-shaped circular soil stain at 18DO11 that they determined likely represented a palisade&quot; (Busby 100); Maps showing various artifact distributions are found in Busby's dissertation on pages 142, 143, 145, 149, 161, 164, 167, 216, 232, 234, 235, 260, 262, 276, 277, 292, 293, 295, 297, 300, 305, 311, 313; &quot;The scorched earth and ash deposit features combined with thermally altered rock, and burned and calcined bone fragments indicate food processing activities and other activities requiring the use of fire. The post molds in Units 18 and 19 to the east are part of this dense area of occupation&quot; (Busby 271); evidence of sedentary occupation (Busby 272); evidence of multi-household habitation (Busby 273); evidence of food processing, including European pig bones (Busby 318); In area C of this site, European artifacts comprise 20 percent of artifact assemblage, compared with 79 percent Native-made (Busby 319); Middle Archaic resource procurement, Late Archaic resource procurement, Early Woodland resource procurement and habitation, Middle Woodland resource procurement and habitation, Late Woodland habitation, Contact period habitation (Busby 435); no definitive statement can be made about presence of a fort on this site (Busby 458-459)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 18DO147</td>
<td>Within the Chicone Study Area for Busby's dissertation</td>
<td>Late Woodland, possible Post-European Contact (Busby 173)</td>
<td>VB: Base camp (p. 433)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 18DO148</td>
<td>Within the Chicone Study Area for Busby's dissertation</td>
<td>Late Woodland (Busby 173)</td>
<td>VB: Early Archaic resource procurement, Late Woodland base camp (p. 433)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 18DO155</td>
<td>Within the Chicone Study Area for Busby's dissertation; &quot;on the second terrace above Chicone Creek on its southern shore&quot; (Busby 321)</td>
<td>Post-European Contact (Busby 173)</td>
<td>VB: Maps showing various artifact distributions are found in Busby's dissertation on pages 326, 328, 329, 337, 342; &quot;represents at least one household occupation dating to the second half of the seventeenth century potentially ranging into the early eighteenth century with a range of activities taking place. The presence of turtle bones suggests a spring/summer seasonal occupation at least&quot; (p. 348); Both European and Native artifacts recovered (p. 349-350); contact period habitation (p. 434)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 18DO3</td>
<td>Eastern side of the Marshyhope /sometimes called the Northwest fork of the Nanticoke River (Busby 401)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>VB: Ossuary burial sites destroyed during sand and gravel mining activities in the area (p. 401)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 18DO331</td>
<td>Within the Chicone Study Area for Busby's dissertation</td>
<td>unknown (Busby 434)</td>
<td>VB: Map in Busby's dissertation on page 171 shows shovel test pit distributions for this site and 18DO332; oyster shell midden (p. 434)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place or Landscape</td>
<td>Approximate Location</td>
<td>Time Period(s) of Use</td>
<td>Descriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 18DO332</td>
<td>Within the Chicone Study Area for Busby's dissertation</td>
<td>Post-European Contact (Busby 173)</td>
<td>VB: Map in Busby's dissertation on page 171 shows shovel test pit distributions for this site and 18DO331; Contact period habitation (p. 434)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 18DO333</td>
<td>Within the Chicone Study Area for Busby's dissertation</td>
<td>Middle Woodland (Busby 433); Late Woodland, Late Late Woodland (Busby 173)</td>
<td>VB: Middle Woodland resource procurement, Late Woodland camp (p. 433)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 18DO334</td>
<td>Within the Chicone Study Area for Busby's dissertation; &quot;the parcel located outside the former reservation boundaries on the west side of Chicone Creek at its juncture with an unnamed tributary... in the southeastern corner of the parcel&quot; (Busby 175)</td>
<td>Occupation from Late Archaic through Early and Middle Woodland and &quot;more pronounced occupation&quot; from Late Woodland through Contact period (Busby 212)</td>
<td>VB: Maps of artifact distributions for this site can be found on the following pages of Busby's dissertation: 183, 187, 189, 193, 197, 202, 204, 208; Late Archaic resource procurement, Early Woodland resource procurement, Middle Woodland resource procurement, Late Woodland resource procurement, Contact period habitation, 17th/18th Century European/American presence (p. 435)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 18DO335</td>
<td>Within the Chicone Study Area for Busby's dissertation</td>
<td>Middle Woodland possible; Post-Contact period</td>
<td>VB: Middle Woodland camp possible, 18th Century field scatter (p. 433)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 18DO4</td>
<td>Eastern side of the Marshyhope / sometimes called the Northwest fork of the Nanticoke River (Busby 401)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>VB: &quot;Ossuary burial sites destroyed during sand and gravel mining activities in the area&quot; (p. 401)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 18DO412</td>
<td>Within the Chicone Study Area for Busby's dissertation</td>
<td>Late Woodland, Late Late Woodland (Busby 173)</td>
<td>VB: Short term resource procurement and camp (p. 434)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 18DO413</td>
<td>Within the Chicone Study Area for Busby's dissertation</td>
<td>unknown (Busby 434)</td>
<td>VB: Oyster shell midden (p. 434)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place or Landscape</td>
<td>Approximate Location</td>
<td>Time Period(s) of Use</td>
<td>Descriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 18DO414</td>
<td>Within the Chicone Study Area for Busby's dissertation</td>
<td>Middle Woodland (Busby 433); Late Woodland, possible Late Late Woodland (Busby 173)</td>
<td>VB: Large oyster shell midden, Late Woodland habitation/processing (p. 433)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 18DO415</td>
<td>Within the Chicone Study Area for Busby's dissertation</td>
<td>Late Archaic, Middle Woodland possible, Late Woodland (Busby 434)</td>
<td>VB: Oyster shell midden, Late Woodland camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 18DO5</td>
<td>Eastern side of the Marshyhope / sometimes called the Northwest fork of the Nanticoke River (Busby 401)</td>
<td>Late Woodland, possible Contact period</td>
<td>VB: Busby (p. 41) references Griffith's (2009) assertion that this site may be the site of the Kuskarawaok that Smith maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 18DO7</td>
<td>Eastern side of the Marshyhope / sometimes called the Northwest fork of the Nanticoke River (Busby 401)</td>
<td>Late Woodland</td>
<td>VB: Base camp (p. 401)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 7S-E-1</td>
<td>along the main branch of the Nanticoke River in Delaware</td>
<td>Contact period</td>
<td>VB: Busby (p. 41) references Griffith's (2009) assertion that this site may be the site of the Kuskarawaok that Smith maps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Snake Island       | pre-contact, and post-1742 | F1: A "holy place" where the sprits walk. Fitzhugh says that his people moved to Snake Island, then Willy's Neck, and then to Andrews. The last longhouse in Fitzhugh's family was here.  
F2: Fitzhugh states: "It’s the center of our world. In fact, many of believe that Snake Island, which is just about washed away, is the center of our world. We consider it a very sacred place. I still try to go out once a year by boat. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place or Landscape</th>
<th>Approximate Location</th>
<th>Time Period(s) of Use</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Susquehanna River</td>
<td>Name corresponds to modern area</td>
<td>Post-Contact: 1742, 1768, 1780s</td>
<td>VB: After the unsuccessful 1742 uprising &quot;large groups of Nanticoke leave the Maryland colony to settle along the Susquehanna River under the protection of the Iroquois&quot; (p. 45); &quot;With the Nanticoke who left the Eastern Shore, references to a “Chief Sam” in 1768 associate him with the settlement at Otsiningo along the Susquehanna River near present-day Binghamton, New York. Sam appears to have led the group there off and on with a person named “Billy Chelloway” for at least a two year period (Fliegel 1970). From the 1760s – 1780s a chief named Robert White maintained authority over the cohesive cluster who integrated as a group with the Iroquois during the mid to late eighteenth century (AM 9:537; Weslager 1983)” (p. 533)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swamps and Marshy Areas</td>
<td>regional marsh areas, e.g., Fishing Bay</td>
<td>multiple; uprising in mid- 18th c.</td>
<td>WD: Daisey states: “At one time, the Nanticokes decided to get together in a swamp in Maryland. They decided to band together, but again, it was too late. They had a meeting, some of my ancestors were involved in that meeting in the swamp: Dickson Coursey, and there were others involved. … He was a chief. … That’s when the migration began, and that’s when they started settling in this area, because it was similar to what they were used to.&quot; (p. 2) VB: After unsuccessful 1742 uprising, some Nanticoke moved here (p. 55); “Off reservation living consisted of seeking shelter in areas unattractive to European colonists, mostly marshy areas or areas in the mid-peninsular drainage divide where soils were not conducive to productive agriculture” (p. 393); “Other examples supra-village ritual activity in low, swampy sites undertaken by the Nanticoke and related lower Peninsula groups included curative and strengthening ceremonies, and those associated with the making of a chief. These took place on islands in marshy areas and involved the participation of several different groups (AM 28: 266-269; Marye 1936b, 1937a, 1944)” (p. 421); “In addition to the symbolic properties of fast land, water represented the underworld. It could be considered a liminal place where otherworldly beings could and must be addressed in ritual exchange (Hamell 1983:6). The Powhatan waterside temple offerings and the peninsular use of marshes embody these beliefs. Otherworldly beings with the power to destroy were also associated with water. An early Contact period Powhatan priest’s vision foretold of such a force coming via the waters of the Chesapeake Bay immediately prior to the establishment of the Jamestown colony (Strachey 1953:108)” (p. 421)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor's Island</td>
<td>up the Blackwater River</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>F1: A place where Fitzhugh's people could canoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading Locations; See also Waitipton, Nutters Neck</td>
<td>multiple</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>F3: One near Dames Quarter, another between Monie and Chance - p.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transquaking River</td>
<td>Name corresponds to modern area</td>
<td>pre-contact</td>
<td>F1: Waterway used by the Nause F2: Possible river where John Smith sailed; transportation route for the Nause-Waiwash (see p. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tundotank</td>
<td>Wicomico River near Salisbury, MD</td>
<td>contact, into 18th c.</td>
<td>RD: Chief of the Wicomico Indians resided here, and the Wicomico “were almost certainly under the suzerainty of the Nanticoke paramount chief. … Tundotank was considered a Nanticoke town by both the Nanticoke and the English…” (p. 95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place or Landscape</td>
<td>Approximate Location</td>
<td>Time Period(s) of Use</td>
<td>Descriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Island in the Nanticoke River</td>
<td>Unknown Island in the Nanticoke River; possibly See Swamps/Marshy Areas</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>F2: Fitzhugh explained that there used to be an island in the Nanticoke River where his people’s warriors, from “all the villages,” would gather for war. He explained that they were betrayed by one of his own for liquor, and without the element of surprise the uprising was impossible. Following this, some of his people asked permission to go north.” (p.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnacko-ssimmon Sign</td>
<td>Vienna, MD</td>
<td>Late Woodland to present</td>
<td>F1: State historical marker at entrance to Vienna RD: This sign commemorates &quot;the first leader mentioned by the Maryland authorities; he was already talkleeck in 1669, when the first Maryland-Nanticoke treaty was signed. He was probably the same person as Cockasimmon, 'king of the Nanticoke;' who was mentioned in a court document dating to 1655.” (p. 116)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna, MD</td>
<td>Vienna, MD; corresponds with modern location</td>
<td>Late Woodland to present</td>
<td>F1: Possible feasting grounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia's Eastern Shore</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Late Woodland</td>
<td>F1: Cited as a place from which some of the original Nanticoke came. P.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiwash Town and Reservation</td>
<td>Cambridge, MD</td>
<td>Late Woodland to present</td>
<td>F2: Established in the early 1600s; said to have been taken away in parts nearly as soon as it was established (see p.4). Dr. William Van Marrow (spelling?) was said to have recorded the local language here in the 18th c. (see p.5). F3: &quot;Waiwash was the last occupied traditional village on the last active Indian reservation on the state of Maryland and the land wasn’t settled up until the 1860s, after the Civil War&quot; (p. 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Landing</td>
<td>Convergence of Nanticoke and Marshyhope</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>F1: noted, but not discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watipton</td>
<td></td>
<td>Late Woodland</td>
<td>F3: Short-lived trade location there. - p. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesley Chapel</td>
<td>North of Fishing Bay</td>
<td>late-19th c. to present</td>
<td>F2: Originally an old feasting ground. Cemetery there with American Indians buried. (p.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westin Manor House</td>
<td>south of Vienna, MD</td>
<td>late 18th c?</td>
<td>F1: The house is not directly related to American Indians, but serves as an important vantage point to see and feel the Nanticoke ICL. Manor homes are brought up repeatedly by Fitzhugh as such. F3: Fitzhugh states: &quot;We think there was a village site and all, and that's why the Steel family took it.” (p. 9); &quot;See Westin—that was our discussion, when we were helping with that map. Westin, we believe, is a village site. It’s been described as a village site. What village it is we don’t have an exact name for. You understand what I’m saying? Now, whether it stretched that far like Nause does,...” (p.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicomicco County Quiankeson house associated with Nanticoke</td>
<td>near present-day Maryland and Delaware border in a location associated with &quot;water and low, swampy areas&quot;; approximately 5 miles North of Chicone on Nanticoke River's main branch (Busby 423)</td>
<td>1738 patent reference to a Nanticoke Quiankeson's former existence (Busby 423)</td>
<td>VB: &quot;Documentary evidence regarding specifically the Nanticoke, the Choptank, and Assateague of the lower Eastern Shore, indicates that quiankeson houses, containing the remains of past chiefs and the wealth of the living chiefs, were located away from villages or core habitation sites in low, swampy areas (Marye 1936b; 1937a; 1944, Murray 1792)” (Busby 423)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place or Landscape</td>
<td>Approximate Location</td>
<td>Time Period(s) of Use</td>
<td>Descriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Wicomico River drainage | Name corresponds to modern area | ? | VB: Busby references Rountree and Davidson (1997:32) to point out that the Nanticoke's territory sometimes spanned this area (p. 28); "In terms of the authority of the emperor, I argue that even at times when they did not have an emperor, the Nanticoke claimed prerogative over land outside their territory based on their position as the group who could exert such control. My evidence for this stems from a reference in 1767 to “a Claim to some Land at the head of Wiccomoco about four Miles below Venable’s Mill but that the English several Years ago took Possession of it” (AM 32: 210). This area is south of the core of Nanticoke territory. This might include their ability to subsume the indigenous groups who had inhabited this are and the Nanticoke’s ability to maintain control over it. “ (p. 537)  
RCM: Wicomico is part of the paramount Nanticoke chiefdom - p. 211 |
| William C. Jason School | presently Delaware Technical Community College | 20th c. | WD: High school for minority students, which many American Indians attended. (p.3-4) |
| Willow Street | Cambridge, MD | 20th c. | F2: Location of Fitzhugh's boyhood home for a time. (see p.4) |
| Willy's Neck | Northwest of Fishing Bay | post-1742 | F1: Fitzhugh says that his people moved to Snake Island, then Willy's Neck, and then to Andrews.  
F2: Area where the Nause-Waiwash moved after living on Snake Island, and before moving to Andrews. (p.15) |
| Winnasoccum | an island in Pocomoke Swamp (Busby 425); approximately 3 miles into the Pocomoke swamp (Busby 427) | 1742 (Post- contact period) | VB: A low swampy area; the chiefs leading the 1742 uprising gathered here to meet in the spring of 1742 and the Chicone Nanticoke were leading the effort (p. 425)  
W: Several hundred Native Americans, including Nanticoke gathered here to plan the 1742 uprising (p. 138) |
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APPENDIX C: ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND PLACES IN THE NANTICOKE RIVER WATERSHED AND SURROUNDING AREAS

The following bibliography includes sources that discuss American Indian tribes related to the Nanticoke River watershed, as well places of importance in and nearby the same. These sources provide support for the inclusion of landscapes within the Nanticoke River watershed high-probability ICL area, and will be helpful for the interpretation of these landscapes. In a few cases we were unable to locate or obtain sources named, but nevertheless chose to leave these in the bibliography due to their potential usefulness.

Babcock describes a group of contemporary Nanticoke Indians living in the Indian River area of Delaware. He asserts that this group is made up of 50 or 60 individuals living in the “sandy pine-land country which lies between the northeastern shore of Indian river and the coastline, comprising approximately the two county subdivisions or ‘hundreds’ of Clear spring and Indian river” (277-78). Noting that the Nanticoke attend Methodist and Protestant churches, and that they have intermarried with both white and African American individuals, Babcock makes guesses about the birth and death rates of the Nanticoke community. He also describes an Indian mound that his Nanticoke informants showed him. Additionally, he asserts that the Nanticoke have lost many of their traditions and their language, noting that Lydia Clark—who was deceased at the time of his research—was thought to be the last community member who could speak the Nanticoke language.

Barbour explains that he has written this narrative about Captain John Smith in order to contextualize Smith’s life and to expand on some of Smith’s competing and changing roles. With these roles in mind, Barbour has organized the narrative into three overarching sections: adventurer, colonist, and promoter. Barbour describes Smith’s bartering and other encounters with the Nanticoke briefly in the section that details Smith’s role as a colonist (e.g., see 203, 216, 256).

Three volumes, all edited by Barbour and published after his death, present the 17th century writings of Captain John Smith, including those writings Smith completed about his travels in the Chesapeake Bay. Barbour has added notes to Smith’s writings, drawing on the works of later scholars in order to make the texts more fully accessible to 20th century readers.
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Busby, Virginia Roche


In this dissertation, Busby uses archaeological and ethnohistorical data to trace the history of the Nanticoke Indians in the Chesapeake Bay from 1600 to 1800. Her archaeological fieldwork focuses on the Chicone village site, adjacent to the Nanticoke River. This site reveals occupation from the Late Woodland period through the 18th century. Using evidence from site, related sites, and the historic record, Busby argues that the Nanticoke have transformed and sustained their distinct group identity throughout the contact era.

Chesapeake Bay Foundation


This atlas includes 11 maps and accompanying text that, taken together, help to provide a picture of the Nanticoke River watershed’s natural and cultural resources. The atlas includes mapped and textual information about major tributaries, general land use, land cover, agricultural lands, forests and riparian forest buffer, wetlands and submerged aquatic vegetation, wildlife and aquatic habitat areas, cultural resources, and several potential threats to water quality. Of particular relevance to those interested in Nanticoke cultural landscapes, the cultural resources map (Map 8) includes over 300 documented archaeological sites present in the watershed.

Clark, Wayne E.


This article provides an overview of the a range of different archaeological complexes—artifact groups that archaeologists infer would have been associate with different cultural groups—found in
the Chesapeake Bay region, with a focus on the Piscataway and other mainland groups. Clark makes inferences about relationships between Native groups, and about the processes by which groups were displaced, based on the distribution of artifacts. The Nanticoke are not mentioned specifically; nevertheless this article is useful for those interested in Nanticoke history because it provides a larger context of intertribal relations in the Chesapeake Bay region around the contact-era.

Custer, Jay F. and Daniel R. Griffith
1986 Late Woodland Cultures of the Middle and Lower Delmarva Peninsula. In Late Woodland Cultures of the Middle Atlantic Region. Jay F. Custer, ed. Pp. 29-57. Newark: University of Delaware Press.

Custer and Griffith focus on American Indian groups living in the southern two-thirds of the Delmarva Peninsula and on the time period of 1000 CE to 1600 CE. They explain that the Late Woodland chronology for this part of the Delmarva Peninsula is based on seriation of Townsend ceramics and radiocarbon dates, and that archaeologists have categorized the artifacts found here as belonging to the “Slaughter Creek complex,” which is a grouping of artifacts thought to be associated with a particular cultural group. Using archaeological data, and also referencing ethnohistorical evidence, the authors conclude that a shift occurs between the Early/Middle Woodland era and the Late Woodland era. During this time the examined societies, including the Nanticoke, turn to “intensified use of stored resources, particularly plant resources, and shellfish resources” (55). They also note that the archaeological record suggests these societies remained relatively egalitarian, even as they began to practice more intensive agriculture (56).

Davidson, Thomas E., Richard Hughes, Joseph M. McNamara

The authors here explain how they used a combination of documentary research, color film and infra-red film aerial photography, and pedestrian surveys to locate the Chicone and Locust Neck sites in the Chesapeake Bay watershed. Chicone is associated with the Nanticoke Indians, while Locust Neck is associated with the Choptank Indians. The authors note that these and other contact period Eastern Shore sites may have been overlooked as such, and mislabeled as exclusively Late Woodland sites previously, because they did not show obvious signs of European influence. They assert that the Eastern Shore’s indigenous groups were able to maintain their traditional practices and languages longer than mainland Chesapeake Bay indigenous groups because of the Eastern Shore groups’ relationships with relatively few European traders.

Dent, Richard J. Jr.

Dent presents this book as an interdisciplinary look at the prehistory of the Chesapeake Bay region and as an interpretation of how that prehistory has shaped the region’s present circumstances. He brings together archaeological evidence (pointing out how archaeological practice and human perspectives on the past have changed over time), accounts of natural history, and discussion of continuing cultural tradition. With regard to the Nanticoke, Dent includes them on a map of Native Chesapeake groups at the time of contact with Europeans and points out that they are reported to have had the largest population compared with the other six Native groups of the Eastern Shore (263-264).
de Valinger, Leon  
**1941**  *Indian Land Sales in Delaware. Wilmington: Archaeological Society of Delaware.*  
In this publication of the Archaeological Society of Delaware, de Valinger chronicles a history of land “sales” between Europeans and the Native groups in Delaware, beginning with a deal established between local Indians and the Dutch in 1631 (1). Throughout this text, he refers to American Indian groups only as the “Indians,” neglecting to differentiate between the Lenape, the Nanticoke, and other groups. Discussing a series of instances in which multiple individuals or groups of European settlers claim to have made deals to buy the same pieces of land from American Indians, de Valinger suggests that the Indian negotiators believed they were only agreeing to use rights rather than selling parcels of land. He asserts that all Indians had migrated out of Delaware by 1753 (13).

Dunlap, A. R. and C. A. Weslager  
Dunlap and Weslager discuss the practice of naming groups of people whose members have a combination of African, Caucasian, and American Indian ancestry. The Nanticoke people are provided as one example of such a group, and the authors seem to regard the use of the group-name Nanticoke as misleading because perpetuates a solely American Indian name and identity, rather than a tri-racial identity. The authors also note that groups developing with this combination of ancestry are often geographically isolated.

Feest, Christian F.  

Fenton, William N.  
The author reviews C. A. Weslager’s 1943 monograph, *Delaware’s Forgotten Folk: The Story of the Moors and Nanticoke*. He praises Weslager for his accessible writing style and contribution to knowledge about the Nanticoke and the Moors of Delaware. He also notes how Weslager frames the earlier scholar Frank G. Speck as an advocate for the Nanticoke people, a role that is not communicated through Speck’s own writings.

Griffith, Daniel R.  
Griffith reports the results of excavations in Delaware taking place between 1974 and 1976. He introduces a system for differentiating between styles of Late Woodland period ceramics, paying particular attention to variations in space and time.

Griffith, Daniel R.  
**2009**  *Captain John Smith Chesapeake National Historical Trail Upper Nanticoke River, Delaware Feasibility Study. Frederica, DE: Griffith Archaeology Consulting.*  
This report responds to questions regarding the feasibility of adding the upper Nanticoke River watershed in Delaware to the Captain John Smith Chesapeake National Historic Trail, by determining whether the landscape is illustrative of the natural history of the 17th century, whether the watershed is significantly associated with the voyages of Captain John Smith, and whether the watershed is significantly associated with American Indian towns and cultures of the 17th century. Griffith and his
team employ analysis of primarily archaeological and ethnohistorical data and find that the watershed does meet requirements, to varying degrees.

Haile, Edward Wright

2008  **John Smith in the Chesapeake. Champlain, VA: Round House.**
The author provides context and interpretation for Captain John Smith’s writings and maps from his 1607-1609 voyages in the Chesapeake Bay region. He briefly narrates Smith’s life before this time, describes several maps attributed to Smith, and includes Smith’s original writing accompanied by a series of summaries.

Hassrick, Royal B.

1943  **A Visit with the Nanticoke. Bulletin of Archaeological Society of Delaware 4(May):7-8.**
Hassrick describes his visit with residents of the Indian River district, which he specifies as being located 60 miles south of Wilmington, Delaware. He asserts that the Nanticoke people live like the other people of this area, farming and raising chickens. He also observes where the Nanticoke people have built their housing: “Their cottages and houses are placed upon the high ground near the fields of corn or hay. Gum swamps and tracts of pine separate the family communities” (7). Hassrick seems to be impressed with Nanticoke group identity, and he notes their physical characteristics, social autonomy, roles individuals play for the community, and fine cross bow crafting.

Howard, James H.

1975  **The Nanticoke-Delaware Skeleton Dance. American Indian Quarterly 2(Spring):1-13.**
The author briefly chronicles the histories of conflict and migration that the Nanticoke have experienced since the English colonized the areas now known as Delaware and Maryland. He provides a literature review, explaining how pervious scholars have described the Nanticoke and their practices. Focusing on the Nanticoke’s fabled treatment of their deceased, he compares their practices to other groups of American Indians in the southeastern United States. He juxtaposes four accounts of a practice he calls the “Nanticoke-Delaware Skeleton dance” and traces each account back to members of the Oklahoma Delaware, or this subgroup’s ancestors.

Hughes, Richard B.

1980  **A Cultural and Environmental Overview of the Prehistory of Maryland’s Lower Eastern Shore Based Upon a Survey of Selected Artifact Collections from the Area. Prepared for the Maryland Historical Trust and Coastal Resource Division, Tidewater Administration, Department of Natural Resources, Annapolis, MD.**
This overview integrates data from artifact collections, environmental conditions, and previous archaeological studies in counties of Somerset, Wicomico, and Worcester (Maryland). It provides an archaeological chronology for this study area based on phases, from the Paleoindian Period to Post-contact Period. Furthermore, it provides a model for environmental change in the study area, and identifies areas that may contain dense distributions of artifacts, based on a number of environmental factors and previous archaeological studies. Hughes recommends further archaeological investigation in the Pocomoke River drainage system.

Hunter, William A.

Hunter discusses the various subgroups of American Indians in Delaware. He makes the point that the same Native individuals and groups were involved in land transactions on both sides of the Delaware River, showing that their lands were not divided, but rather connected, by this body of water (21). He
specifically mentions the Ockanickon or “Crum Creek” Indians living on both sides of the Delaware River (21, 22). He also describes land transactions involving the “Brandywine Indians” and “Schuylkill Indians” and the migrations of these groups (22-27).

When explaining the documentation of migrations, he asserts that these groups may have been known by different names after migrating to New Jersey and Pennsylvania.

Hutchinson, H. H.
1961 Indian Reservations of the Maryland Provincial Assembly on the Middle Delmarva Peninsula. The Archeolog 13(October):1-5.

Hutchinson, H. H., Warren H. Callaway and Charles Bryant

Jones, Elias
The majority of this book chronicles the events and perspectives of Dorchester County’s (Maryland) powerful, landowning families of European descent, from the 17th to 19th centuries. In the author’s discussion of early European settlement on the land that was to become the Dorchester County, he refers to the Nanticokes as “treacherous” and explains that they were living “higher up the [Nanticoke] river” as compared with the early colonists; he also discusses a treaty that was established between “Lord Proprietary and Vinnacokasimmon, Emperor of the Nanticokes, on May 1, 1668” and that reportedly allowed settlers to move further in Nanticoke territory without fear of attack (30). Jones lists the names of troops who were sent “against the Nanticoke Indians” and paid for their service in 1674 (40). He discusses the ownership history of a property called “Nanticoke Manor” in a part of the county called “East New Market” (97). He also includes a discussion of and selected text from the Act of 1704, which established reservation boundaries for both the Nanticoke and Choptank tribes (183-185).

Jones, Elias
This book updates Jones’s 1925 book on the same topic. Jones’s 1966 edition has been corrected for factual errors, supplemented by 50 new illustrations, and supplemented by an introduction by the author’s daughter, Mary Ruth Jones.

Kenny, Hamill
The author explains that Maryland’s landscape is marked by about 315 Algonquian place names. He asserts that the American Indian groups whose languages contained these words have left the region or “dwindled into insignificance” by 1700 (1). In order to create this list, he has consulted the writings of Captain John Smith and Lord Baltimore, in addition to the early land records and maps. Providing a dictionary of place names and an introductory essay, he points out place name patterns; for example, he writes that group names correspond to the streams near which those groups lived. In his dictionary entry for Nanticoke, he concludes that this place name derives from Algonquian words meaning “‘Tidewater people’” or “‘They who ply the tidewater stream’” (97).
Kinietz, Vernon and Maurice A. Mook
Kinietz describes the book, Delaware’s Forgotten Folk: The Story of the Moors and Nanticokes, as interesting and entertaining reading for anthropologists and others. He emphasizes how the Moor and Nanticoke peoples have married into both white and “Negro” families, asserting his amazement that they have maintained Native identities over time (294). Mook writes a separate and complementary review of the same book. He includes descriptions of chapter topics and “facial type” illustrations that appear in the book (295).

Marye, William B.
The author draws on surveying records from the 17th and 18th centuries in Maryland to make predictions about where routes used by Native people on the Delmarva Peninsula may have existed. He suggests that roads used today may have first been Indian paths (6). Focusing on the “Old Choptank or Delaware Path,” he provides a series of transcribed copies of Maryland land records that mention Indian paths.

Marye, William B.
This essay is a continuation of Marye’s previous work on “Indian paths” for the same publication. While providing descriptions of two paths—“The Old Choptank or Delaware Path” and “The Indian Path from ‘Jones Creek to the Choptank’”—he qualifies that he is writing about the “probability” of where these paths may have existed (e.g., see p. 5, 7, 8).

Marye, William B.
This essay is a continuation of Marye’s previous work on “Indian paths” for the same publication. He includes a hand-drawn map and descriptions of Nanticoke and Choptank towns.

Marye, William B.
This essay is a continuation of Marye’s previous work on “Indian paths” for the same publication. As in previous essays, he builds on the topic of locating Indian paths on Maryland’s Eastern Shore and includes transcribed land records as evidence.

McNamara, Joseph
The author describes archaeological investigations of a shell midden located within the historical boundaries of the Choptank Indian Reservation near a site known as Locust Neck, in Maryland (87). The research from which he draws his findings took place between 1982 and 1984. Asserting that the site was occupied from the Middle Woodland period through the time of contact with European colonists, he establishes a history of sustained use of this site, although he qualifies that it would have been used seasonally—during the spring and fall.

86
Parker, Arthur

Parker begins this article by summarizing Captain John Smith’s writings about the Nanticoke, which Smith referred to as the Kuskarawock or Cuskarawock. He asserts that in the year 1642, the Nanticoke were particularly hostile to European settlers. Presenting quotations from several treaties, he explains how the colonists developed legislation that allowed “encroachments” by settlers into Nanticoke territory (89).

Parker, Arthur

Parker explains how the Nanticoke describe themselves as connected to other Native groups: they are said to see the Lenape as their “‘grandfathers’” and the Mohegans as their “brethren” (3). He mentions the Nanticoke’s burial practices, dialect and language, occupations, chiefs, and migrations.

Porter, Frank W., III

This publication is presented as a “case study in cultural change and survival which focuses on the Nanticoke Indians who originally resided on the Nanticoke River on the Eastern Shore of Maryland, but subsequently removed to Indian River Inlet in Delaware” (1). Porter includes descriptions of the ways in which the Nanticoke have both isolated themselves and assimilated into neighboring cultures, along with discussions of major events in the group’s history from 1784—when they relocated to Indian River Inlet—to the time of this publication. The photographs provided include important places such as schools and churches, important individuals organized by family names, craftsmanship and material culture, changing architecture, agricultural activity, and revivalism. This last category includes documentation of building construction, individuals practicing traditional dancing, and making clothing.

Porter, Frank W., III

Porter discusses the Nanticoke’s interactions with anthropologists over time, beginning in 1898. He concludes that these interactions have contributed the Nanticoke people’s successful maintenance of their Native identities, and provides examples of how the Nanticoke have reinforced their identities. For example, he writes that they refused to send their children to high schools for “Negroes,” at a time when high schools for whites refused to admit Nanticoke students. He explains, however, that these circumstances resulted in few Nanticokes graduating from high school in Delaware before 1965 (14).

Porter, Frank W., III

1978b Quest for Identity: The Formation of the Nanticoke Indian Community at Indian River Inlet, Sussex County, Delaware. Ph. D. dissertation, Department of Geography, University of Maryland, College Park.
In this dissertation, Porter writes to dispel the “Myth of the Vanishing Indian in the East” (3). He focuses on the Nanticoke Indians living at Indian River Inlet in Sussex County, Delaware as an example of a Native group maintaining its identity in the eastern part of the United States. He interrogates the roles of two pervious scholars—Frank G. Speck and Clinton A. Weslager—in the Nanticoke’s’ continued maintenance of their identities. He asserts that the Nanticoke’s’ lifestyles at the time of this research closely resemble the lifestyles of their white neighbors, but that they have
intentionally chosen to continue some cultural practices as part of the identity maintenance he describes.

Porter, Frank W., III


Porter provides a comprehensive list of sources about American Indian groups of Maryland and Delaware, and notes which of these sources he judges to be suitable for secondary school students (57-107). He also provides shorter lists of sources recommended for the “beginner” and for a “basic library collection” (xvii-xix). In order to introduce these lists, he crafts a series of topical introductory essays that list the Nanticoke as one of the four principal tribes of the region, and he discusses the following topics: subsistence strategies, material culture, technology, language, population, demography, early voyages, missionaries, land tenure, reservations, migration, and survival strategies.

Porter, Frank W., III


In this overview of American Indian groups in Maryland, Porter makes a clear effort to demonstrate the continued existence of these groups, explaining that the common belief that these groups became “extinct” by the end of the 18th century is not correct (15). Instead, he explains that they moved into more remote places—“usually swamps and marshes” (17). The Nanticoke are mentioned as a distinct group only briefly: once referring to an incident that illustrated the discrimination that one of the group’s members faced and once defining the word Nanticoke as “They who ply with the tidewater stream” (21-22, 25).

Porter, Frank W., III


Porter presents an annotated bibliography of sources on American Indian groups in Delaware and Maryland, with a strong focus on archaeological contributions to his knowledge. He divides this bibliography into the following sections with accompanying introductions: the First Century (referring to the first century of archaeology in this region, which he defines as the 1800s), Salvaging the Past (covering archaeology conducted in the early late 19th and early 20th centuries), the Beginnings of an Organized Survey of Potomac River Village Sites, the Search for Indian Survivals, an Assessment (evaluating the methods and reliability of early archaeological investigations) and a general bibliography.

Porter, Frank W., III


Porter discusses the Nanticoke Indians’ strategies for survival as a distinct group. He frames this discussion by listing all the challenges, including “disease, massacres, expulsion, and discrimination,” that American Indian groups living east of the Appalachian Mountains have had to contend with since the time of contact with European settlers (139). Porter points out two primary circumstances that contributed to group identity survival for the Nanticoke: 1.) “the Nanticoke purposefully selected a marginal environment as their habitat to prevent the continued encroachment of their land by Whites and to reduce the contact between the two cultures,” and 2.) “perceived as mixed bloods or mulattoes, the Nanticoke experienced the same cultural and spatial segregation an treatment accorded the
Negroes, which resulted in the formation of a distinct community” (140). In order to provide evidence for these claims, Porter describes the Nanticokes’ negotiations for their reservation lands and presents two maps—one of “ethnic” households in the Indian River Community in 1867 and one representing the same spatial data in 1985 (158-159).

Roth, Hal
Roth defines Delmarva as a distinct region of Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia, and explains that this collection of stories is his attempt to “preserve a few of the more obscure events of Delmarva’s history, its lore, its tales; a bit of flavor, if you will, of the times from John Smith to the [Chesapeake Bay] bridge and beyond” (viii). In the story that gives the book its title, “You Can’t Never Get to Puckum,” there are references to a man named John Puckum, who married Jone Puckum in 1682 and was a member of the “Monie Tribe whose town stood on the north side of Great Monie Creek two miles above its mouth” (15).

Roth, Hal
Roth introduces this collection as serving a similar purpose to his previous (1997) collection of stories. He attempts “to preserve a few of the more obscure events in Delmarva’s history, its lore, its characters—old and new—and to poke a little fun here and there at that political bunch on the other shore” (xiii). He includes an updated version of the story about finding Puckum, this time called “You Still Can’t Get to Puckum,” and—just as in the previous version—the name of this place is attributed to John Puckum, purported to be a “Monie Indian” (4).

Rountree, Helen C

Rountree, Helen C., Wayne E. Clark, and Kent Mountford
2007 John Smith’s Chesapeake Voyages. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.
Rountree, Clark, and Mountford trace Captain John Smith’s voyages in the Chesapeake Bay, providing insight into the places and peoples he encountered. The authors describe the Chesapeake environment of the early 17th century as well as details of daily life including Native customs, appearance, villages, transportation, and farming. Details are provided regarding Smith’s encounters on a day-by-day basis, as well as conditions of the lands and waters around his pathways, for example: salinity, soil types, pottery found in nearby lands, and limits of plant growth. Further, the authors explain many of the changes in landscape and population that have occurred in the Chesapeake Bay since Smith’s voyages, briefly noting archaeological resources of the area.

Rountree, Helen C. and Thomas E. Davidson
The authors provide a description of tribal history, culture, and ecology from the eastern shore of Maryland and Virginia; they do not specifically describe tribes of Delaware. Rountree and Davidson focus on formally organized tribes through the late-18th and early 19th century, including detailed accounts of interaction with colonists, and activity during the reservation period, including political disputes and treaties. In addition to a narrative recounting pre-contact, contact, and reservation period
Eastern Shore Indian life, the authors provide appendixes listing Indian personal names, useful wild plants, and important fish and shellfish of the region.

Seabrease, Wilsie G.
1969  The Nanticokes and Other Indians of Delmarva. Easton, MD: Easton Publishing. This brief account, describing the Nanticokes’ and other Algonquin Native groups’ practices before contact with European settlers, was written explicitly for elementary school students. It focuses on the last 300 years before contact with European settlers. Topics covered include subsistence practices, clothing, housing, social organization, tool use, tool craftsmanship, trade, art, games, and reasons for migration away from Delmarva. The author acknowledges that some Nanticokes and other Algonquins still live on the Delmarva peninsula (27-28).

Semmes, Raphael
Semmes combines the accounts of Captain John Smith with those of colonial officials in order to provide estimates of indigenous group populations at the time of contact. Drawing from Smith’s account, Semmes reports that there were about 600 American Indians living on the Nanticoke River in the early 17th century (160). He summarizes Smith’s writings about the series of villages located on the Nanticoke River and about how these villages had reputations as centers of trade (161-162). Drawing on archival records, he also mentions that the Nanticoke Indians are notable in that they were one of the few tribal groups on the eastern shore of Maryland to “boast a fort” (162).

Smith, John
Smith discusses his travels in 1608 and 1609 to the Virginia colony and through Chesapeake Bay waterways. He also provides maps of the regions he has explored, naming rivers and other place names, and groups of American Indians. He writes about interacting with and observing several tribes, including the ancestors of groups that later became known as the Nanticokes and others.

Speck, Frank G.
Speck describes the Nanticoke people as “mixed-blood” descendents of the Nanticoke Indians, living in two bands: those in Indian River Hundred (Sussex County, Delaware) and those in Cheswold (Kent County, Delaware) (391). He provides a brief history of the Nanticoke Indians, and then focuses on the early-20th century condition of the tribe with emphasis on phenotypical differences and claims to race, as well as tribal migration and settlement in Delaware. Speck reports that these community members number about 700 and they “form self-recognized communities, with their own schools and churches, and possess a decidedly endogamous tendency” (391). Further, he provides several photographs of Nanticoke community members.

Speck, Frank G.
Speck here provides a report on the customs and stories of the Nanticoke community of Delaware in the early 20th century, based on his own ethnologic work over several months during four years. His overview includes a brief history of the tribe, and detailed accounts of hunting, fishing, and other industrial pursuits, folklore, stories, and other customs. He includes photographs of tribal members,
apparently to categorize types of people, as well as drawings of tools such as baskets and snares.

In the history section, Speck recounts Captain John Smith’s report of the Nanticoke, and provides some account of encounter with colonists and eventual migration from the Chesapeake Bay into Pennsylvania and Delaware. Speck also includes some history as told by William Vans Murray, who conducted research on the Nanticoke villages of Locust Neck and Goose Creek near the Choptank River and in Dorchester County, Maryland, in the mid-18th century.

Speck, Frank G.  
**1927 The Nanticoke and Conoy Indians, with a Review of Linguistic Material from Manuscript and Living Sources: An Historical Study.** *Wilmington: Historical Society of Delaware.*  
The author brings together his own accounts of Nanticoke linguistic records written by Williams Vans Murray, John Heckewelder, and possibly Thomas Jefferson—records which had been stored in the archives of the American Philosophical Society since the time of their creation in the 1792 and 1785. The author includes his own more recent linguistic record titled “Nanticoke Vocabulary from Six Nations Reserve, Ontario, 1914.” He also includes a series of photographs of individuals who he labels as Nanticoke and identifies by name. Some of the topics he covers are the migrations that different branches of the Nanticoke have undertaken and the Nanticoke’s relationships with other Native groups of Delaware: the Conoy and the Delaware.

Speck, Frank G.  

Speck, Frank G.  
Speck describes a tradition known as “the Frolic” practiced among the Nanticoke of Delaware (2). He defines the Frolic as “a short period of voluntary cooperative work engaged in by a group of men whose objective is the completion of a specific task for the benefit of an associate who suffered a handicap through illness or misfortune” (2). He further explains that the Frolic often entails “seasonal rotation of farm demands, such as clearing the fields in March, plowing in April, sowing seed in May, thinning the corn hills late in June and July, ‘saving fodder’ in July and August, digging potatoes and stacking fodder in late September, husking corn and ‘hog killin’ in November, cutting and hauling winter wood in December” (2-3). Speck sees the Frolic as illustrative of a long-standing tradition of communal activities reinforcing group identity among the Nanticoke.

Speck, Frank G.  

Tooker, William Wallace  
Tooker seeks to address the question of who the Kuskarawaokes of John Smith’s accounts might have been, and where the village of the same name would have been. He describes the Kuskarawaokes as “busy workers in the hive of industry, and…their handiwork was eagerly sought after by far-distant tribes” (3). Tooker provides a detailed etymology of the tribe’s name suggests the name Kuscawauanauck, which he relates to Kuskarawaoke, means “a place of making white beads” (5). He notes that after Smith there is little record of these people, and suggests that the Kuskarawaoke people were absorbed into neighboring tribes. Regarding the Nanticoke, he suggests that this group
includes some of the Kuskarawaoke, as well as descendents of the Massawomeks, Sasquesahanoughs, and other tribes.

Vans Murray, William

Vans Murray, William
The 300 word vocabulary listed in this publication was recorded at the Locust Neck Indian Town on Goose Creek in Dorchester County, Maryland in 1792. Vans Murray claims to have recorded the words from conversations with a woman named Mrs. Mulberry, known as the “widow of the last chief of the Nanticokes” (1). The vocabulary is listed alphabetically in both Nanticoke to English and English to Nanticoke formats.

Wallace, Anthony F. C.
Wallace here presents information covered in a talk presented to an anthropology class at the University of Pennsylvania in 1948, which addressed the results of field trips taken by faculty at the University to the Nanticoke community at Indian River Hundred. Wallace provides a brief account of the pre-contact Nanticoke people, and then describes the situation of the 20th century Nanticoke people, including fishing practices, their status with regard to race, the lack of education opportunities, and the status of the Nanticoke Indian Association.

Wallace, Anthony F. C.
Here Wallace reports on a field trip undertaken by himself and others (including Dr. Frank G. Speck) to the Nanticoke Indian community at Indian River, Delaware. He states that the group’s research has discovered “an unexpectedly large body of culture elements earing the signs of aboriginal coastal Algonkian culture living vigorously as the basis of the modern, superficially westernized river culture” (3). He then briefly describes the strong “river-orientation of Nanticoke Culture,” which includes territorialism along the river and fishing practices (3).

Walsh, J.O.K.
2006 Historic Footsteps: Indian Paths through Caroline County, Maryland. Pamphlet prepared for the Annual Meeting of the Caroline County, Maryland Historical Society, April 1999. (not on file with MHS; possibly located at the Caroline County Historical Society)

Weslager, C.A.
The author here provides overview information regarding indigenous tribes of the Delmarva Peninsula. Weslager urges scholarly consideration of the entire Delmarva Peninsula when studying indigenous populations, rather than breaking groups up according to state, as populations moved
around the entire peninsula at times.

The tribes detailed, as grouped by Weslager, include the Accomac and Accohannock, Pocomoke and Assateague, Nanticoke, Oizinies, Tockwhogh, Choptank, Indian River Indians, The Lenni Lenape (Delaware), Minquas, and assorted others of the Iroquois and Shawnee nations.

Regarding the Nanticoke specifically, Weslager writes that they are a “very important Indian community…situated on the Nanticoke River, which Captain Smith called the Kuskarawaoke” (27). Further, he states that Maryland records from 1696 suggest the Nanticoke had 10 towns, and they doubtless had small villages on Nanticoke tributaries that John Smith did not see.

Weslager discusses the application of the name “Nanticoke,” burial practices, crafts and trade goods, Chiefs, and migration patterns post-contact.

Weslager, C. A. 
The author details burial practices common to Indians of the Delmarva Peninsula, including the Assateague, Pocomoke, Choptank, and Nanticoke tribes. Included in this account are places where burials were found by archaeologists, developers, and others in Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia.

Weslager, C. A. 
Weslager explains that, spurred his own curiosity, he sought to learn the origins of the Nanticoke people, as well as another group he refers to as the Moors. The latter group is comprised of people who exhibit phenotypic similarities to American Indians, but who do not necessarily refer to themselves as Nanticokes or Indians, nor do their neighbors consider them Indians (17). Weslager uses a mix of ethnohistorical data and evidence from oral history to write a history of these peoples, speculating about their origins as well as providing look into their early 20th century lives. In the process he comments extensively on previously conducted research, especially that of Frank G. Speck. He also provides an account of important flora and fauna, traditional medicines, traditional practices (e.g., the “frolic”), and the state of education for these people. He documents buildings such as churches and schools, and provides pictures of some of the individuals he discusses.

Weslager, C. A. 
Here Weslager emphasizes the fact that American Indians, like Europeans, have a long history of moving to new locations. This contradicts then-popular opinion that Indian tribes were established in permanent locations. He provides an account of the introduction of southern Indian communities to Pennsylvania in the late 17th century, describing the movement of the Shawnee, Ganawese, Piscataway and Canoy, and Nanticoke tribes. The account of this movement includes details about relationships between tribes, especially the aforementioned tribes—focusing on the Nanticoke—with the Susquehannock and Iroquois tribes.

Weslager, C. A. 
Weslager, starting with information from Dr. William Vans Murray’s linguistic study of Algonkain-
speaking Indians in the vicinity of the Choptank and Nanticoke Rivers in Maryland, provides an
historical account of leadership of the Nanticoke and related Indians. He focuses on the life of
Wynicaco, who was proclaimed a Nanticoke Indian chief living on the Choptank River by Vans
Murray in the 18th century. Weslager questions Vans Murray’s conclusions and suggests that
Wynicaco, along with other Eastern Shore Indians in the vicinity of the Choptank and Nanticoke
Rivers in the 18th century, were “remnants” of a Choptank Indians (401). Further, Weslager suggests
that remaining Choptank Indians were “absorbed by the local Negro population” by the mid-19th
century (402).

Weslager, C. A.
1945 Nanticoke and the Buzzard Song. Bulletin of the Archaeological Society of Delaware
Weslager recounts a trip to Indian River, Delaware to visit the Nanticoke, accompanied by Lloyd
Carr, L. T. Alexander, and Frank G. Speck. He recalls Speck teaching the group the “Buzzard Song,”
which he had previously learned from Nanticoke individuals. Throughout this short article, Weslager
focuses on this single visit, during which the group was hosted by Lincoln Harmon, Patience Harmon,
Oscar Wright, and Winona Wright. He describes some “lore” surrounding the Buzzard Song and
Nanticoke beliefs about buzzards.

Weslager, C.A.
Press.
This article is an overview of the customs, beliefs, and daily life of Delaware Indians, including the
Lenni Lenape and Nanticoke tribes, with some attention paid to regional tribes elsewhere on the
Delmarva Peninsula, including the Accohannock, Pocomoke, and others. Weslager includes
descriptions of houses, villages, food, clothing, creation myths, and other aspects of traditional
culture. Further, he includes many place names of importance to the Lenni Lenape and Nanticoke, as
well as drawings of many described items, including common hunting devices and houses.

Weslager, C.A.
Here the author describes the ways in which the Nanticoke Indian communities of Delaware have
incorporated modern American practices such as driving cars, as well as the ways in which the
Nanticoke Indians of Indian River Hundred retain “strong ties with the flora and fauna” of the area
(37). Weslager emphasizes traditional medicinal practices, interpretation of weather and seasonal
signs (e.g., when rain is coming or winter is over), and lore related to animals such as osprey (fish-
hawks) and snakes.

Weslager, C.A.
This book focuses on English settlements in the Delaware Valley from 1610 to 1692. Although there
is little mention of the Nanticoke, some interactions with the native groups in the Chesapeake region
are described. Specifically, the English are described as having “Indian troubles,” especially with the
Nanticoke (76).

Weslager, C.A.
1968 Delaware’s Buried Past: A Story of Archaeological Adventure. New Brunswick, NJ:
Rutgers University Press.
Weslager frames this work as a popular science book and denies that it constitutes any contribution to
the archaeological record. Herein he provides a firsthand account of excavating human remains, some of which were washed away before being either fully documented or reburied (e.g., see 55-57, 86, 96). He also provides brief accounts of talking with contemporary Nanticoke Indians—those living at the place known as the "Indian River Hundred" in Sussex County, Delaware, in the 1930s and 1940s. Drawing from these conversations, he reports that the Nanticoke called a blue-bellied lizard "a scorpion lizard" and comments on their practices of honoring the deceased. He explains that the Nanticoke moved the bones of their "honored dead" to Pennsylvania during a migration (56-57).

Weslager, C.A.

The author discusses folklore and cures used by American Indian groups, specifically those with which he has done research in “Oklahoma, Canada, and elsewhere” (x). He includes both the Nanticoke of Maryland and the “Moors” of Delaware in his account, giving particular credit to the Nanticoke for their influence on other groups’ practices: “The Delawares, Shawnee, Seneca, Mahican, and other eastern Indians claimed that their forebears originally received their knowledge of mah-tah-pah-see-kun [roughly translated as sorcery, healing, and poisons] from a tribe called the Nanticoke” (105). While he writes that the Nanticoke homeland is in Maryland on the Nanticoke River, he asserts that they left this land beginning in 1743 (105). According to his account, the Nanticoke of Oak Orchard (Sussex County, Delaware) incorporated as a group under the name of the Nanticoke Indian Association in 1922 (107). He refers to an Indian school in this location that is now closed and gives examples of herbal and non-herbal cures used by Nanticoke informants and their relatives (107, 108).

Weslager, C.A.

Weslager lists 224 works about the Delaware Indians. He also includes a brief essay describing the group’s history, and he narrows down his expansive bibliography into two sub-lists of sources: “For the Beginner” and “For a Basic Library Collection.”

Weslager, C.A.

1983 The Nanticoke Indians Past and Present. Newark: University of Delaware Press. This book provides an overview of the history and practices of the Nanticoke peoples, spanning the 1600s through the time of its publication. Using an interdisciplinary approach that combines history, sociology, ethnography, and folklore, Weslager creates a “tribal chronicle,” while acknowledging that many of the sources he relies on give emphasis to white perspectives about the Nanticoke (9). Weslager brings together early accounts of the Nanticoke, such as the writings of Captain John Smith, with his own ethnographic accounts of the Nanticoke’s activities in the 20th century.

Weslager, C.A. and Lewis Cass

1978 The Delaware Indian Westward Migration: With the Texts of Two Manuscripts, 1821-22, Responding to General Lewis Cass’s Inquiries about Lenape Culture and Language. Wallingford, PA: Middle Atlantic Press.
Weslager presents the previously unpublished manuscripts of General Lewis Cass, who wrote about the Delaware Indians in 1821 and 1822. At the time of Cass’s accounts, a group of the Delaware had migrated from the Chesapeake region to Indiana. Weslager contextualizes Cass’s accounts by providing information about the events leading up to this migration as well as the events that followed this migration, including the process of some members of this group relocating from Indiana to Missouri, Kansas, and Oklahoma. The Nanticoke are mentioned several times in this work. They are described as one of the tribes related to the Delaware, specifically as “brothers” to the Delaware (e.g.,
see 89, 165). One of the Delaware chiefs, captains, and elders who signed a treaty in St. Marys, Ohio in 1818—the treaty that granted the Delaware land rights in Indiana—signed his name as James Nanticoke.

Williams, William H.  
2008 **Man and Nature in Delaware: An Environmental History of Delaware.** Dover: Delaware Heritage Press.  
William Henry Williams narrates an environmental history of the state of Delaware, spanning from the “before the arrival of the Europeans” to the year 2000 (13). While recognizing that a larger grouping of Nanticoke lived in the area now known as Maryland, he describes the Nanticoke as a smaller group of Native Americans in Delaware, as compared with the Lenape (later called the Delaware) (19). He identifies the Nanticoke’s settlement as “Broad Creek in southwestern Sussex” and asserts that the Nanticoke were more dependent on agriculture than the Lenape, explaining that this dependence on agriculture likely corresponds with other societal characteristics: a higher birthrate, a more sedentary pattern of movement, and a less egalitarian social organization (19, 24). Williams confines his discussion of the Nanticoke to the chapters on Delaware’s early history.