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ABSTRACT

This thesis explores the food exchange network operating in Suffield, Connecticut during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. These reciprocal exchanges were based on family and social relationships, thereby illustrating how households worked together in order to meet their provisioning needs. While these trade rings had been in operation for decades, it was during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries that commercial markets began to overshadow the local exchange systems, ultimately undercutting the social and family relationships that these webs had served to reinforce.

The Suffield trade networks were examined from the point of view of a single household – that of Oliver Phelps. Phelps was born into a typical yeoman family but was apprenticed in a Suffield general store. There he cultivated social connections, as well as an eye for business, that ultimately allowed him to amass a great fortune. This rise to affluence gave him a unique perspective on the Suffield community. His multiple societal roles, including that of a merchant, land speculator, politician, neighbor, and exchange partner, allowed him to participate in the local economy on many levels, turning his own agrarian surplus into numerous forms of capital.

A wide variety of sources have been drawn upon in the course of this study. The Phelps family was very wealthy and therefore may have had the choice of participating in the Suffield exchange networks or of purchasing staples from the local market. Faunal remains recovered from the archaeological excavation of the homelot were used as a baseline reflecting the consumption patterns of the household. Documentary data outlined how this family participated with their neighbors in order to feed themselves.

After careful examination of both documentary and archaeological sources, it was determined that this family adopted a combined strategy, trading within the exchange rings for their domestic needs, while purchasing from the local shop for specialty items. In so doing, the Phelps' reflected the multileveled economic strategy that would ultimately be used by most New England households, thereby bridging the gap between agrarian reciprocity and currency-based capitalism.
SUBSISTENCE AND SOCIAL BEHAVIOR:
Evolving Strategies In The Rural New England Landscape
INTRODUCTION

Up until the middle of this century, rural New England was characterized as a community of self-sufficient yeoman farmers. Yet a study by B.H. Pruitt (1984) demonstrated that up to 30% of New England’s rural households had no means by which to provision themselves (Bowen 1990:26). Wealthy families generally had enough land and livestock to maintain a self-sufficient farm, however, poor and middling families did not. This unequal access to resources was compensated for through the local exchange of goods and services (Bowen 1990; Garrison 1991:33).

Rural families relied heavily upon one another to ensure that staples were available on a reliable basis. Not only did they offer assistance with large scale activities, such as building projects or crop harvesting, they also supported one another through the continual exchange of perishable items, particularly meat and dairy products. Poor families who were not able to provide for their own subsistence regularly performed tasks for wealthy farmers in exchange for foodstuffs. Work would be credited in personal account books and equated with a monetary value. It was presumed that payment would eventually follow (Bowen 1990). These family- and socially- based economic relationships served to maintain the status-quo rather than providing an avenue to social and material elevation (Mrozowski 1984:41).

While small scale exchanges provided most households with essential goods, manufactured items were generally not produced at the local level. Textiles, salt, tools, and ceramic wares were imported into virtually all of New England’s rural communities, providing a link to nearby urban markets, as well as the rest of the economic world (Clark 1990; Bowen 1990; Garrison 1985:167-169). New England experienced an upsurge in consumerism, or non-subsistence purchasing, throughout the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Increased demand for mercantile goods ultimately effected
production as drastically as it did consumption. The pressure to increase the supply of these goods virtually abolished any limitations to specialization in the New England countryside (Rothenberg 1992:9-13).

**Expanding Market Orientation**

Throughout the Connecticut Valley region, an increasing population provided a steady market base for the growing retail industry. A recognizable market economy had emerged in New England around the middle of the eighteenth century. By the beginning of the nineteenth century, many farmers were becoming increasingly involved in local markets to varying degrees. Traditional methods of kin-based production and community cooperation structured this involvement (Bowen 1990; Pruitt 1984:335).

Subsistence-oriented farmers had long been in the practice of trading whatever produce was left over after their own family had been provided for. However, by the late eighteenth century commercial farming began to emerge in the rural New England landscape. ‘Commercial farming’ indicates the cultivation of a particular crop to the exclusion of other subsistence crops with the express purpose of selling the harvest for a profit. This profit could then be used to purchase foodstuffs not produced within the household, as well as other types of goods and services (Gudeman 1978; Wolf 1966; Henretta 1978). Through the early nineteenth century farmers became increasingly involved in this cash-oriented economy (Bowen 1990; Clark 1990; Netting 1993; Pruitt 1984; Mann 1990; Parkerson 1995:7-8).

Through the late eighteenth century, labor markets included: subsistence-based reciprocal labor exchange, or the exchange of task-oriented assistance between households; tenants, who performed labor for board; and occasional day laborers, who were usually hired along with their tools for piece work (Bowen 1990; Rothenberg 1992:149). While reciprocal labor exchange was predominate throughout most of the
eighteenth century, day labor became more prevalent near the turn of the century as farmers began to produce crops and livestock for profit. These workers rarely lived with their employers, and were usually compensated immediately, rather than at a later date making this a less intimate form of labor than that of preceding decades (Bowen 1990:39). Delayed payment and reciprocal exchange presupposes a relationship of mutual obligation between the parties involved. No such relationship is required for the direct, immediate exchange of labor for goods or cash (Bowen 1990:38-42; Schumacher 1975:88; Bennett 1968).

The movement of occasional day laborers into a system of commercial agricultural labor was a natural one. These forms of employment were comparable in that they were both based on differential access to resources. These differences were only exacerbated as wealthy farmers became increasingly socially distant from their hired workforce. Changes in the relationship between employer and employee ultimately brought about changes in diet and subsistence practices (Bowen 1990:38-42).

Most rural inhabitants had no direct intention of changing their own production methods. However, as goods became more available, rising material expectations, and the associated need for cash with which to fulfill these ambitions, drew many farmers into specialized agriculture (Parkerson 1995:9; Clark 1990). A commercially-oriented economy emerged when transaction costs declined. These transaction costs included those imposed by poor traveling conditions, loosely linked social networks, unreliable news networks, and regional differences in price and wage determination (Parkerson 1995:6). The expansion of mercantile ventures led to an increased disparity between rich and poor households, allowing for more outwardly defined class stratification (Bowen 1990:24-25).

The incorporation of traditional communities into a larger capitalistic system is a topic that has been relatively well-documented by anthropologists over the past thirty
years (ie. Gudeman 1978; Ortiz and Lees 1992; Netting 1993). Their work has
demonstrated that this shift is never absolute – that traditional practices coexist with
commercially-oriented economies. Historians have likewise studied this shift (Bidwell
viewpoints have rarely tackled the complex nature of rural exchange or the social
implications of these intricate networks. While their work has proven informative with
particular regard to historical economic theory, these studies have tended to oversimplify
the transition from agrarian to commercially-based domestic economies.

Archaeological studies of the move towards capitalism are relatively rare. Those
that have been conducted have tended to concentrate on ideological power struggles
between the different social classes and the social pressures placed upon these
communities through the use of material objects (Leone and Potter 1988; Shackel 1996;
Lucas and Shackel 1994). Generally, archaeologically-based economic analyses rely on
such artifact sets as ceramics, glass, and personal items such as tobacco pipes and
clothing.

The underlying premise [of such studies] is that objects made or modified by man
reflect, consciously or unconsciously, directly or indirectly, the beliefs of the
individuals who made, commissioned, purchased, or used them and, by extension, the beliefs of the larger society to which they belong (Prown 1988:19 as quoted in

However, production of these types of goods was rarely, if ever, under the direct control
of consumers.

Food products, on the other hand, were usually produced locally. Consequently,
the loss of control over the production of foodstuffs ultimately resulted in the loss of
control of food distribution – food exchange was extracted from community-level
exchange-based economies. Extensive debate has occurred over the definition of
‘markets’ and ‘market systems’ (Hodges 1988:1-33). Rothenberg, in her analysis of the
growth of the market system in Massachusetts between 1750 and 1850, outlined the difference between what she called a "market economy" and a "market-place economy." A market economy was one in which the society survived solely through the exchange of goods and services for cash. A market-place economy described a society that was not unacquainted with cash-based exchange, but did not rely solely upon commercial transactions for their subsistence (Rothenberg 1992:20-22). Unfortunately, such a distinction draws an arbitrary line down the center of what is, at its essence, the same process. While there are inherent differences in societies that engage solely in reciprocal trade and those that rely on externally fixed prices, these two forms of economy are not mutually exclusive, rather they occur in tandem (Bennett 1968; Bowen 1990; Ortiz 1992; Gudeman 1978).

Bennett argued that there was no real distinction between market and non-market economies. In communities where both are employed, exchange is the "cooperative local phase" of the larger market system (Bennett 1968:303). The key word in this statement is 'cooperative.' Culturally, a cooperative form of economy reflects a very different mindset from one based on fixed currency prices. The reciprocal exchange of goods and services requires a social connection between the parties involved. Value equivalence must be established in order to determine what can be considered adequate compensation for what. Such exchange provides "a built-in format for social interaction" (Bennett 1968:302). However, in an economy based on currency transactions the value of a particular good is often externally fixed. Cash prices are determined through a multitude of pressures, therefore the role of personal relationships is greatly reduced.

The reciprocal exchange of goods and services may decrease with market expansion, however this type of economy tends to revive itself during time of economic stress (Bennett 1968:282). Even after the influx of cash transactions, reciprocal
exchanges have continued to occur. Farming communities have long demonstrated the simultaneous operation of each type of trade.

**Research Problem**

The reciprocal food network of Suffield, Connecticut was first described by Joanne Bowen in her 1990 dissertation. In this work, Bowen not only confirmed the existence of this exchange system, but also outlined its structure. This thesis explores the participation of a single family in Suffield’s exchange network, as well as the social relationships that provided the foundation for their participation. This thesis will demonstrate that while this family was well acquainted with monetary transactions and capitalistic modes of distribution, their interaction in Suffield’s local economy, and in particular their subsistence economy, followed the reciprocal networks already in place.

The family at issue is that of a Mr. Oliver Phelps. Phelps originally came to Suffield at the age of seven as an indentured servant. He left the town as a young adult, returning roughly two decades later in the late 1780s as a powerful and successful merchant and land speculator. While he returned to Suffield a wealthy man, he departed again near the turn of the century financially ruined.

**Suffield, Connecticut – General History**

William Pynchon first established a fur trading post in the upper Connecticut River Valley in the 1630s. This original post grew to become Springfield in 1636 and was the first settlement in the upper valley (Lewis 1978). Early on, William Pynchon was able to capitalize on the fertile soil and climate, which was well suited for both agriculture and livestock husbandry (Bowen 1990:50; Bailyn 1955). In 1652 William’s son John took over his father’s position as the area’s primary political, economic, and judicial figure, and began to expand the territory (Innes 1983:17). John Pynchon continued to
purchase and develop land in the valley, all the while maintaining primary control over
the early destinies of these new townships as well as most of their inhabitants (Bowen
1990:51-52; Innes 1983). The land that was to become Suffield was purchased by John
Pynchon from the Native Americans in 1669 for £30. Suffield was one of the last areas to
be settled due to its limited agricultural prospects, which included a relative lack of
alluvial soils and deforested meadowland. By 1671 several families had already settled in
the town (Bowen 1990:52-53; Innes 1983).

Like other surrounding communities, Suffield’s social climate was stratified from
the beginning. “The Committee spelled out clear intentions to bring together ‘men of
different standing,’ and the amount of land to be given out to any ‘Planter’ or admitted
‘Inhabitant Resident’ would be based on ‘...the Quality, Estate, Usefulness, and other
considerations of such Persons...’ (Bowen 1990:52, as quoted from Sheldon 1879:54).
Businesses were encouraged, particularly those of practical necessity to a growing
township. By the early nineteenth century, Suffield had four cotton factories, one paper
mill, one oil mill, three fulling mills and clothiers works, two carding machines, three
grain mills, and three tanneries (Bowen 1990:53: Sheldon 1879: Pease and Niles
1819:87).

Throughout the eighteenth century agricultural opportunities in Suffield increased
as merchants from nearby towns became involved in exporting to destinations as close as
Boston and Hartford, or as remote as the southern colonies and West Indies. While this
trade was halted through the Revolutionary period, the market boomed again when
restrictions were removed in 1793. Exports included salted fish, beef, and pork, butter,
cheese, grains, flaxseed, lumber, apples, potatoes, and vegetables. Most farmers,
however, continued to produce at the subsistence level (Pabst 1940:12-13; Martin 1938:5-
6; Bowen 1990:50-56).
Subsistence Strategies in Suffield

The physical realities of agriculture and husbandry imposed a rhythm on agrarian life. Tasks were determined by the seasonal confines of the New England climate (Bowen 1990:22). Lengthy storage of perishables was often not practical, therefore a system of “social storage” evolved that served to distribute surplus food to households lacking the resources to produce their own (Ingold 1983:561; Bowen 1990:37).

Kinship played a major role in determining how Suffield’s poor and middling families subsisted. Exchange relationships were generally between households with like financial resources. However, households related by blood or marriage did not have to be of like status in order to form an economic alliance. Wealthy farmers rarely entered into exchange relationships with poor households outside of their own kin group. When they did, the quality of the food offered was inferior to that offered to kinfolk (Bowen 1990:80-81).

Food items tended to flow down the socioeconomic scale. Wealthy families rarely exchanged for subsistence items as they were generally able to provide for themselves directly. Food exchanges between wealthy households usually took the form of large-scale exchanges of meat, such as a side of lamb or a quarter of beef (Bowen 1990:156). Poor households, on the other hand, regularly procured small amounts of food from more affluent families in exchange for labor (Bowen 1990:73-74). Clearly, households with kinship ties to the town’s elite had a distinct subsistence advantage to those without such family connections (Bowen 1990:80-81).

The Shifting Economy of Suffield

The late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries caught Suffield in a state of transition: from subsistence to commercial farming; from an exchange-based economy to one based on monetary transactions; and from family affiliation as the primary
determinate of one's social life to social relationships being structured around business connections. Perspectives on subsistence items were also in transition during this time. Foods that had previously been cultivated for the primary use of the family, were increasingly produced as commodities. This ultimately had a great impact on overriding attitudes towards these products and on the social and family-based relationships that had previously dictated their distribution and consumption.

The term 'commodity' has been defined as “anything intended for exchange” (Appadurai 1986:9). This definition, while broad, specifies the planned trajectory of an object from its original production. The commodity status assigns a quantifiable value to objects whose previous worth may not have been so overtly considered (Appadurai 1986:4). Because economic exchange is, at its core, an exchange of values (both cultural and financial), all commodities have social potential. This potential is defined by the object’s marketability over time. Commodities are by definition tradable, however, items can move in and out of the commodity state (Appadurai 1986:13). The shifting status of a particular item demonstrates its social context (Appadurai 1986:5).

While a strong market for imported goods, such as ceramic and glass wares, existed in Suffield from at least the middle of the eighteenth century, foodstuffs generally fell outside of the ‘commodity’ state. However, this status began to change during Phelps’ time in Suffield, as the profit potential of subsistence items began to be realized. However, the local circulation of food items was predicated on the extant family and socially-based relationships that had long directed the exchange of all domestically produced goods and services. While foodstuffs were increasingly produced for the purpose of export, the domestic economic practices of Suffield residents remained consistent with traditional practices.
Oliver Phelps and the Suffield Economy

In the fall of 1992, the Antiquarian and Landmarks Society of Connecticut began extensive renovations of Phelps’ Suffield residence. Based on findings from preliminary mechanical digging, archaeological excavations were proposed. In the spring of 1993 a total of 25 units were excavated (Gradie 1993). All faunal material recovered from these excavations was forwarded to the Colonial Williamsburg faunal laboratory for analysis. By combining the results of this analysis with the exchange/purchasing pattern of Oliver Phelps within the town of Suffield, it was expected that a picture would emerge detailing how the Phelps family cooperated with their neighbors in order to fulfill their subsistence needs.

In order to analyze the extent to which Oliver Phelps participated in these subsistence networks, Phelps first had to be placed in the physical, economic, and social context of late eighteenth century Suffield. The archaeological material provided direct evidence of the Phelps’ household diet, while documentary sources helped to outline his provisioning system, including his local family and social connections, his relative financial worth, his own subsistence pursuits, and his participation in local exchange both personal and mercantile. Documentary references include: account books, tax lists, genealogical sources, land histories, legal documents, letters, and diaries. Sources were examined not only for information pertaining directly to Oliver Phelps, but also to local residents known to have interacted socially or economically with him or members of his household.

Bowen’s research provided a wealth of data with which to compare Phelps to the greater Suffield society. Her study of Suffield’s farm-related account books reached several conclusions regarding general household participation in the local food exchange network.
The household was the primary unit of production, supplying most of its own labor and producing as much of the basic food supplies as possible. Depending on the extent of the household resources and the presence of kin living nearby, a farmer also drew upon boarders, laborers, and exchange partners. The result was a series of ego-centered exchange networks composed of neighbors of equal rank and kin that assisted each other in tasks requiring many hands. Among themselves, they exchanged foods, goods, and a variety of services. Those truly needy individuals who had no wealthy kin living nearby and therefore did not engage in exchange partnerships with wealthier farmers could either board or hire out their children to wealthier households needing additional labor. After marriage these boarders often settled nearby and hired themselves and their sons out as day laborers to these same farmers (Bowen 1990:56).

Bowen’s findings addressed poor families without kinship ties, and households of all income levels connected to local family networks. However, as a wealthy merchant born outside of Suffield, Phelps fit into neither of these categories. Phelps had no direct kinship ties in town. As Phelps was not a farmer by trade, it was questionable whether he maintained a subsistence-level farm. He was, however, a wealthy man with connections to merchants and tradesmen all over the New England area, and therefore could have had the opportunity to trade retail goods for subsistence items.

The inquiry into the domestic economy of the Phelps family focused on the household’s diet. How did Phelps’ status as a wealthy merchant effect his family’s subsistence strategies? Was Oliver Phelps exchanging subsistence items with Suffield residents? Were these exchanges based on mutual reciprocation of subsistence items, or were they primarily cash-based? Were any of these exchanges predicated in familial ties or economic alliances? Lastly, how did his family’s social relationships effect their diet? The answers to these questions were expected to illuminate not only the subsistence strategies of one of Suffield’s wealthiest families, but also the cultural assumptions at play during this time of economic transition.
Summary

Human nature is a double helix of biology and culture. As a species we cannot survive without both of these attributes. As stated by Godelier (1987), there is a fine line between cultural realities and physical realities. This boundary dissolves when discussing foodways and subsistence systems. Cultural perceptions about eating dictate what is and is not considered food; ideas that are so ingrained that individuals have starved to death rather than eat what they have been raised to believe are non-food items. It is this culturally-charged nature of food and eating that has drawn the attention of researchers. All aspects of food systems, from production and distribution to consumption and disposal patterns, have long been topics of interest to anthropologists. Classics in ethnography regularly included discussions of food-related beliefs and practices (ie. Fortune 1932; Evans-Pritchard 1940; Levy 1973). Current researchers continue to be intrigued by the foodways of other cultures (ie. Counihan and Van Esterik 1997).

The modes of food production are determined by the social organization underlying all economic processes. These social structures likewise determine distribution systems, ultimately controlling consumption patterns (Bowen 1990; Godelier 1987:19-20, 1978:70; Gudeman 1978:9). Structures underlying the production process evolve slowly, often taking on a new form long before it is recognized as a different system (Ortiz 1992:44). With the transition from local reciprocal trade to an economy based on cash exchanges, control over the production process gradually shifted from producers to the owners of these resources. Money eventually became an end unto itself (Wolf 1997:354; Godelier 1978:64).

Phelps’ participation in the domestic economy of Suffield holds the potential to illustrate cultural attitudes towards New England’s shifting circumstances. As will be described in the following chapters, his societal role in Suffield was unique, potentially
allowing him the choice of participating within local exchange networks or of maintaining his social and economic distance from those around him. Phelps used this position to devised a duel economic strategy, combining traditional socioeconomic practices for his subsistence needs with a business-oriented approach for his financial dealings.

Answers to the research questions listed above have provided a window into the domestic economy of one of New England’s rural communities during its introduction to active world-market participation. Oliver Phelps offers a prime example of the shifting economic rationality slowly spreading throughout New England’s rural countryside; attitudes that resemble our own financial motivations today.
OLIVER PHELPS' BIOGRAPHY

Early History

Oliver Phelps, born just south of Suffield on October 21, 1749, was the son of Thomas Phelps, grandson of Sgt. John Phelps, and great-grandson of George Phelps who had emigrated to New England from Tewksbury, England in 1630 (Stiles 1891:589). Oliver was born into a typical yeoman family, the youngest of seventeen children. Thomas Phelps had married twice. By his first wife, Hannah Phelps, he had eight children, and nine more by Ann Brown (Phelps and Servin 1899:1273). Oliver was born only three months before his father's death, and was the only living descendant not mentioned in his father's will, dated May 16, 1749 (transcribed in Phelps and Servin 1899:1293).

Oliver lived with his mother and young siblings until the age of seven, at which time he was indentured to a Suffield merchant. No paperwork has survived detailing this working arrangement. Nevertheless, the Leavitt family dominated Suffield's commercial economy in the late eighteenth century, and it is presumed here that it was to this family that Oliver was sent as a boy. This presumption is based not only on the mercantile status of the Leavitt family, but also on the fact that Oliver Phelps maintained an economic and social relationship with Thaddeus Leavitt, Jr. for most of his adult life. Thaddeus Leavitt, Sr., who was roughly old enough to have been Phelps' father, provided Oliver with continual support, both economic and social, throughout most of Phelps' adult life. This relationship was recorded in both private letters and the surviving Leavitt account books. In effect, the Leavitt family became the core of Phelps' 'kin' group. As will be told, this relationship broke down during Phelps' economic descent, proving there was a limit to their 'fictive kin' relationship.
The Leavitt store carried virtually all products a growing town would need, including dishes, hardware, sewing materials, books, tobacco pipes, bottles, utensils, locks, indigo, wood, clothing, alcohol, and food items. This latter category included such items as meat, dairy products, spices, tea, coffee, chocolate, livestock, sugar, vegetables, and various types of grain (Alcorn 1970:92). Leavitt also operated a shipping business whereby goods were transported to destinations as nearby as Windsor (roughly six miles to the south of Suffield), or as remote as the West Indies (Alcorn 1970:94).

Oliver remained with this merchant family for roughly fifteen years. In 1771, at the age of 22, Phelps moved to Granville, Massachusetts, where he became a merchant in his own right. While his initial trade dealt primarily in woodenwares (Alcorn 1970:81), Phelps ultimately expanded his inventory. In a letter dated May 25, 1782, John Trumbull, presumably an agent of Phelps', wrote to him detailing inquiries made in New London and Boston regarding the latest prices and availability of products such as sugar, tea, and coffee, as well as the cost of shipping these items to destinations such as Hartford and Granville (KML Folder II 2 - Phelps, Oliver - letter).

During his residence in Granville, Phelps became heavily involved in both local and regional politics. In 1774, he was chosen to serve on a committee of seven who were called to “inspect the debate between the Colonies and Great Britain” (Wilson 1954:131). As described by Wilson in his history of Granville:

[Phelps’] experience as a merchant had led him into a wide acquaintance in the Colony, and by reason of his ability he was in 1776 appointed Deputy Commissary of the Colonial Army on the staff of General H. Champion, at that time Commander in Chief. Thereafter he was made Superintendent of Purchases for Massachusetts in the Revolutionary Army. He was a member of the Governor’s Council. All these duties for the nation and state were carried on with dispatch and success, in addition to which he kept up his store at home and performed various public duties there. In 1778 he was elected Town Clerk, which office he held for nine consecutive years. This period included all those difficult days in the latter part of the War for Independence and the days immediately thereafter. He served as one of the Selectmen six years beginning 1779, and he
was one of the Town's representatives to the General Court in 1779 and 1780. It would seem that his knowledge and ability were appreciated wherever he went, for his capacity for work seems to have been without limit (Wilson 1954:131).

By the time he was 25, Phelps had laid the foundation for a profitable future. His small country store in Granville was quite successful. While Phelps used his newfound influence for political purposes, monetary profits were used to buy real estate and wholesale beef cattle. One year into the Revolutionary War, Phelps secured the job of beef supply sub-agent for the Northern Department of the Continental Army, in Hampshire and Berkshire Counties. His skill as a merchant earned him a promotion, and in 1781, he was appointed Superintendent of Beef Supply for the Continental Army in those counties. By the end of the war, Phelps' quick wit, energy, self-confidence, boldness, and natural instincts as a trader earned him a reputation as a sharp negotiator and as an effective speculator (Siles 1978:28-29).

His central role in purchases and provisioning for the Revolutionary Army allowed Phelps to establish a vast network of business connections which clearly served to make him one of the most successful merchants in the country. By the end of the 1780s, Phelps was already a wealthy man. This wealth was soon multiplied when he became involved in land speculating.

**Land Speculation**

With the close of the Revolution, conditions were ripe for the settling of the area that is now Ohio and western New York.

A rapidly multiplying population competing for limited reserves of good land increased land prices, thereby reducing the size and quality of new farms. Many small propertied farmers were forced to cultivate inexpensive marginal land which reduced yields, increased labor requirements, and ultimately lowered their standard of living. Continuous division of older farms among family members also contributed significantly to the reduction of family farms. Farm lands were divided and redivided among the sons of the original owner until there was little left for the later generations to farm (Siles 1978:8).
These pressures were soon relieved with the developing of unsettled land to the west.

Before these areas could be developed, however, arrangements had to be worked out, not only with the native population, but also between those states seeking rights to this property. In 1786 the state of New York granted Massachusetts the right to purchase from the Indians a tract of land to the west called the Genesee Country. This tract was estimated to contain roughly 6 million acres. Phelps first learned about the potential of the Genesee from a minister-turned-lawyer named Hezekiah Chapman. After spending several months in 1787 exploring the region, Chapman formulated plans to purchase the pre-emption rights. He wanted to form a company of wealthy influential men for this purpose and sought the aid of Phelps.

Current land policy stipulated that anyone granted pre-emption rights was legally responsible for surveying the land into townships, laying out town plots, constructing a road system, building saw and grist mills, allotting space for a cemetery, attracting settlers to the property, and providing religious and educational institutions in the towns. Overall, this legislation limited initial access while promoting steady settlement.

This policy furthered the interests of wealthy men at the expense of small propertied individuals, because only men with surplus capital commanded the resources necessary for developing a large tract of land, such as the Genesee Country, into a viable society (Siles 1978:19-21).

Nathaniel Gorham had also approached the General Court in hopes of bidding on the rights. Rather than competing with each other, Phelps suggested that they form a partnership, thus increasing their chances of winning the rights. In 1787 the Phelps-Gorham Company was born (Siles 1978:31-34). Later that same year, the state of Massachusetts agreed to sell the pre-emption of the entire Genesee tract to Phelps and Gorham for £300,000. However, when Phelps held council with the Indians it became
apparent that the tract encompassed only about 2.6 million acres, rather than the 6 million originally promised.

Phelps and Gorham secured a treaty with the native population on July 8, 1787 for the purchase of the available land (Wilson 1954:131-132; Conover 1893:86). This was no easy treaty to forge since those men who had made previous attempts at negotiating with the native population had earned their distrust to the point that they had threatened to “take up the hatchet” against one of the white representatives. Despite these initial obstacles, Phelps was ultimately able to finalize an agreement of sale (Siles 1978:46-52).

Phelps and Gorham were careful to keep all of these problems from public knowledge so as not to scare off potential investors. Phelps divided the acreage into 120 shares of land, each containing 50,000 acres, reserving 72 shares from himself and Gorham. The remaining shares were sold within ten months of the purchase for more than double the price paid for the pre-emption (Siles 1978:53).

Phelps petitioned for the establishment of a separate county. In 1789 this petition was granted, thus creating Ontario County, New York (Conover 1893:108). Phelps and Gorham established a land office at Canandaigua, located at the heart of the purchase (Conover 1893:94), thus creating the central town of Ontario County. Due to Phelps effective development of town plots, roads, services, and schools, Canandaigua enjoyed rapid growth in both form and population (Wilson 1954:132).

**Back to Suffield**

During his early years in Granville, Phelps married Mary Seymour and by her had three children: Lavinia, born in 1774, who probably died while still an infant; Oliver Leicester, born September 22, 1775; and Mary, born Sept 5, 1778 (Phelps and Servin 1899:1323). Between 1788 and 1789, Phelps moved his permanent residence back to Suffield, Connecticut, into a large opulent home located in the center of town. Phelps’
eclectic business and civic activities continued during his time in Suffield. From 1793 to 1795 he was the director of the Hartford National Bank & Trust Company. He also served as the first judge for the newly established county of Ontario in New York, as well as continuing his land speculating activities, traveling back and forth between Suffield and Canandiagua as business demanded.

Phelps' new Suffield home was built by Shem Burbank between 1761 and 1767. It was a peaked roof, two story house, appraised in the 1778 tax lists as "a house of first class with 'four smoaks'" (Anon n.d.:113). The house underwent extensive renovation during Phelps' occupancy. His initial changes included altering the roof of the main house, and the construction of a new south wing in 1788 and 1790, which probably served as his Suffield land office. In 1794, Phelps contracted for the addition of the north wing. It is possible that a new kitchen was also erected at this time. Other changes included the addition of classical window cornices, decorative quoins, a portico to the main house, and a garden house (Anon n.d.:115-118) [Figure 1].

**Figure 1:** Phelps' Suffield Residence Today.
Other alterations made by Phelps were to the interior. "The walls of the north wing were covered with five different block-print wallpapers produced in France in the 1790s. At least one of them bears the monogram of Jean-Baptists Reveillon, the premier wallpaper manufacturer of the Louis XVI period. The papers are alive with neoclassic motifs such as urns, arabesques, and drapery swags" (Anon n.d.:126). A different pattern was used in every room, each with up to sixteen colors [Figure 2].

FIGURE 2: Interior Hall of Phelps' Suffield Residence.

The early financial success of large scale land speculating led to a land purchasing mania that resulted in the economic ruin of many investors. Like many, Phelps suffered a disastrous loss in the Western Reserve deal, from which he was never able to recover. By the beginning of the nineteenth century, financial reverses had taken away much of the wealth Phelps had amassed. He was forced to leave his home in Suffield, which was eventually passed into the hands of the state for unpaid debts, and move permanently to Canandaigua. Fortunately for his family, his previous Suffield neighbor and business
partner Gideon Granger, Jr. was appointed by the state of Connecticut to discharge his debts and settle the Phelps estate. Granger was able to insure that a large amount of property was passed on to Phelps’ heirs despite his extreme debts (Anon 1876:18-19). Phelps died in Canandiagua in 1809 [Figure 3]. A memorial was erected at his grave with a detailed biographical inscription, the final sentence reading:

Enterprise, Industry and Temperance cannot always ensure success, but the fruit of these virtues will be felt by Society

**Figure 3:** Portrait of Oliver Phelps, Esq.
DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

A number of documentary sources were available that detailed Oliver Phelps’ position in Suffield society. These documents dated to as early as the late 1770s and continued until the year of his death. They include family histories, account books, day books, letters, diaries, and legal transactions. Two secondary sources were also of particular assistance. Throughout the mid-twentieth century, a Suffield resident named Delphina Hammer Clark spent countless hours transcribing the town’s land history. In this eleven volume work, Clark traced each deeded parcel of land in Suffield through time, including maps, family histories, and architectural details. Her work is known not only for its completeness, but also for its accuracy, particularly concerning property boundaries. This source was therefore used to discern Phelps’ land transactions within Suffield. The second source was Joanne Bowen’s 1990 dissertation described above. This text provided an incredible amount of information about Suffield’s food exchange network. All data concerning accounts that did not mention Oliver Phelps specifically, were taken from Bowen’s analysis of these sources.

In order to grasp Phelps’ subsistence possibilities, two issues had to be addressed. First, what were his means of production? What resources were available to Phelps in Suffield? It was expected that a combined examination of available tax records and land histories would discern Phelps’ physical resources, including his land and livestock holdings, and his relative cash worth. Account and day book transactions would offer a glimpse into the types of items Phelps used for exchange as well as what he was trading for. Account books were also expected to outline with whom Phelps was trading.

This leads to the second issue to be addressed: what social resources were available to Phelps, or, what was the make up of his work group? An individual’s work group includes all of those individuals with whom one interacts in order to fulfill one’s
basic economic needs. Suffield work groups generally included same-generation kin (siblings and first cousins) and friends of like economic and social standing. Exchanges within these work groups were not always equilateral. Trade between friends usually involved the exchange of like goods and services. For wealthy households this typically included the exchange of large-scale goods or business-related services. Less affluent family members often made up the labor pool that sustained these wealthy households. Subsistence items were offered as compensation for this labor (Bowen 1990).

It was expected that an examination of census records and family histories would determine if Phelps had any same-generation kin living in Suffield. Tax records were expected to demonstrate which Suffield households shared his affluence. It was hoped that letters and diaries would also shed light on Phelps' friend circle. Finally, it was expected that account and day books would pin point the specific families with whom Phelps traded.

There were at least two subsistence possibilities available to Phelps: participation in the reciprocal exchange networks operating in Suffield, or purchasing food directly from the local commercial market. Account and day books were expected to be of particular assistance in ascertaining whether or not Phelps buying home necessities, including food, or if he was exchanging with local families for these perishable necessities.

**Genealogical Sources**

Bowen found that most exchanges took place across a single generation or between immediately successive generations. For this reason, the genealogical search looked only so far as the generations containing Oliver and Mary Phelps’ parents, aunts, and uncles; Oliver and Mary Phelps’ siblings and first cousins; and their own children.
Genealogical references, including census data, vital records, family histories, and
genealogical compilations, were scoured in the hopes of connecting Phelps with other
Suffield families, and therefore to establish his connection with that town prior to his
residency. However, no such connection was identified. All genealogical data recovered
indicated that Phelps had no prior relations in town, and that economic concerns alone
sent him to Suffield as a boy. It is easy to imagine the difficulty his mother faced, being
the biological mother to nine children, the step-mother to eight others, newly widowed,
with all property entailed to Oliver’s elder brothers (Thomas Phelps’ will reprinted in
Phelps and Servin 1899:1291-1293).

Fictive Kin

While Phelps had no actual kin residing in Suffield, he did develop relationships
with local families that in many ways mimicked kinship patterns. Oliver Phelps
maintained an extensive economic and social alliance with prominent community
members, who, themselves, participated in Suffield’s food-exchange network. These
social ties were described in Leavitt’s diary in the early 1790s:

This day David Tod, Oliver Phelps, Jn° Leavitt Jr., John Kent, Tim° Swan, Gid°
Granger Jr., and Thadd Leavitt with their wifes Rode up to Landlord Morleys and
was then met from Westfield Gen° Parks & Mr. Atwater, also Sam° Fowler &
Roland Parks with their wifes and had an agreeable Interview and repost on some
fatt Turkeys etc. (KML Folder II 2 - Leavitt, Thaddeus).

The individuals listed above were, for the most part, Phelps’ economic peers. David Tod,
and John and Thaddeus Leavitt were among the highest ranked individuals in the 1790
tax list. John Kent and Gideon Granger, Jr. were in the second highest group, however,
they had yet to come into their full inheritance. In both cases, their fathers were ranked
among the wealthiest.
The Leavitt family was particularly important to the Phelps'. The Leavitts were most likely the merchants that apprenticed Oliver during his initial residency in Suffield, and who helped him establish business connections throughout the New England area. The Phelps and Leavitt families maintained a continual communication during Phelps’ time in Granville. They also engaged in an ongoing trade relationship throughout the 1780s and 90s.

Descendents

As previously described, Oliver and Mary Phelps were the parents of three children: Lavinia, born in 1774, who died as an infant; Oliver Leicester, born in 1775; and Mary, born in 1778 (Phelps 1899:1323). Oliver L. married Betsy Sherman in 1795 in New Haven, Connecticut, while Mary married Amasa Jackson, a merchant from New York city (Spear 1987:49). Clearly, Oliver L. and Mary enjoyed the benefits of their father’s great wealth. When Oliver L. was about to make a grand tour of Europe it was joked in Suffield that if Leicester Phelps liked France “his father would buy it for him” (Alcorn 1970:84-85).

Census Data

Unfortunately, census records placing Oliver Phelps in Suffield are available for only 1790. In that year, 407 households were counted in Suffield, with an average size of six individuals. The Phelps household included ten individuals: three free white males sixteen and older, two free white males under sixteen, three free white females, and two slaves. Phelps, his wife Mary, and their two children, both under sixteen, undoubtedly account for four of the eight free individuals. The remaining four free individuals were probably among the multitude of people who were employed by Phelps during his time in Suffield. Beginning in 1788, day books for the town store detailed the comings and goings of individuals outside of the Phelps family, who were frequently sent to pick up
items for Phelps or his wife. These notations could be as vague as “y' black girl” or “y' man,” or as specific as “y' girl Bulah Pommary” or “M' Hyde.” Between 1788 and 1795, a total of twelve different people were listed as picking up merchandise for the Phelps’ household as “p’ y’ Order.”

Of the 28 slaves in Suffield counted in the 1790 census Oliver Phelps owned two. It is unclear whether Phelps’ slaves were African or Native American (see Steiner 1893). In 1790 there was a specific notation in the Leavitt & Hatheway day book regarding “y’ Indian man Aaron,” and in 1795 to “y’ Indians.” However, considering Phelps’ friendly relations with the Indian nations to the west, it seems likely that the Native Americans mentioned in the day books were servants or employees. Throughout Phelps’ residency, frequent mentions were made to “Abram Negro,” “y’ Negro,” “y’ Negro Man Jimmiah,” and “Abraham Wife.” Also, by the late eighteenth century, most New England slaves were African in origin (Steiner 1893:9).

African slavery into Connecticut began in the second half of the seventeenth century. Slavery was never universally received in Connecticut, and in 1712 the first law restricting slaveholders’ rights was enacted. With the Revolution came an increased tide against the continuance of slavery. In the Danbury Town Meeting of December 12, 1774, the following resolution was reached:

It is agreed to import no more Negro slaves, as we cannot but think It a palpable absurdity, so loudly to complain of attempts to enslave us, while we are actually enslaving others, and that we have great reason to apprehend that enslaving the Africans is one of the crying sins of our land, for which Heaven is now chastising us (Steiner 1893: 30 as quoted from American Archives, IV, I, page 1038 [emphasis in original]).

Legislation in 1784 stated that “no negro or mulatto, born after March 1, 1784, should be held as a slave after reaching the age of twenty-five.” However, slave ownership was not prohibited in Connecticut until 1848 (Steiner 1893:9-31).
Land Holdings

In order to further understand Phelps’ means of production, as well as his relative influence within Suffield, a deed and land history search was conducted in order to determine how much of the immediate Suffield area was under his direct control. It was understood that Phelps possessed land all over New England, however, most of this acreage was held only a short time before being turned over for profit. His Suffield homelot in the downtown area encompassed a relatively modest parcel of land. However, a thorough examination of Delphina Hammer Clark’s “Suffield Land History” demonstrated that Phelps not only owned much of the downtown area of Suffield, but also a considerable acreage in the northern part of town.

Phelps began purchasing land in Suffield long before he returned from Granville. As early as 1774 Phelps purchased 65 acres near the center of town, though it is unclear whether this was commercial, domestic, or agricultural real estate. Phelps’ own home was purchased in 1788 from Capt. Shem Burbank. The house and associated buildings were located in the downtown area of Suffield on a lot of roughly 72 acres (Clark n.d. 4:237-238). He also purchased “five acres and buildings” from Leavitt in 1794 only to turn it over again in 1799. This property was once associated with a malt works, however, the portion purchased by Phelps contained only a houselot, which he presumably rented out (Clark n.d. 4:144).

Phelps continued to expand his local property holdings until the middle 1790s. Aside from the homelots already mentioned, he also purchased roughly 130 acres in the northern extremes of Suffield known as the Kellogg Farm. In 1798, his financial reserves weakened, Phelps mortgaged this property to Thaddeus Leavitt and in 1802 finally sold it to John Norris for $3000 (Clark n.d.:6:20-26). It is possible that this tract was the location of Phelps’ slaughtering yard, discussed below.
Tax Records

Suffield tax records were used to define Phelps' relative financial worth, providing another point of comparison between Phelps and his Suffield neighbors. As with the census data, tax records placing Phelps in Suffield were available only for 1790. In preparing her dissertation, Bowen calculated the amount taxed on every household in Suffield. All totals presented here were taken from her calculations. The taxed amount in Suffield for 1790 spanned from just under £2 to over £150. For comparative purposes, taxed individuals in Suffield were ranked according to the amount taxed. They were then divided into five categories, each group with an equal number of individuals. The lowest of these groups was taxed an average of £13.4. The second lowest category was taxed an average of £21.3; the middle group, £32.4, the second most wealthy £47.76. The average tax for the highest ranked families was £85.88. The greatest jump between categories is between the highest ranked individuals and the second highest, demonstrating the relative gap between the richest families in Suffield and those of middle-income. Oliver Phelps was not the wealthiest man in Suffield during his early residency, though he was high in the ranking. Phelps was taxed £100.8 in 1790, while the average tax for the highest group was £85.88 [Figure 4]. It is unlikely that this tax valuation took into account Phelps' land holdings outside of Suffield. If it had, Phelps' taxable holdings would have undoubtedly shown him to be the wealthiest man in town.

While the 1790 tax information was not itemized, the tax list for 1780 registered the amount tax by land and livestock holdings. While Phelps was not included in the 1780 list, it was possible to devise an economic profile of Suffield's wealthiest families. Therefore, an estimate of Phelps' land and livestock holdings could be gleaned. It was determined that every wealthy family in Suffield, even those with market-oriented
livelihoods, owned enough land and livestock to maintain a self-sufficient farm. It can therefore be assumed that Phelps likewise maintained a household-level farm.

**FIGURE 4: Ranked Average Tax, 1790.**
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**Account and Day Books**

Account and day books tabulate like transactions using different formats. In the case of Suffield, the typical account book allowed a two-page spread for any one individual. Debts, including the date the debt was incurred, what was exchanged, and the monetary value assigned to that product, were generally listed on the left page, with details of payment on the facing page. Occasionally a simple reckoning was recorded – a brief statement of payment in cash, signed by both parties, or in the case of a postmortem reckoning, by the individual settling the deceased’s debt.

The format used with day books followed the calendar. Generally, debts and credits were recorded in a stream as they happened. Often nuances can be gleaned from day books that are absent from the corresponding account books. For example, several entries on the same day involving the same account imply multiple trips to the store. Also, in the case of Phelps, the name of the person who actually visited the store was
recorded in the day books, demonstrating that a relatively large number of people were charging to Phelps' account.

The Leavitt store occasionally recorded debts and credits in both types of books – the day book recording the transaction as it happened and the account book keeping track of Phelps' overall debts. The data were compared for such occurrences and duplicate records were omitted wherever identified.

Account and day books have been the primary data sources for the reconstruction of Oliver Phelps' participation in the economic networks operating in Suffield in the late eighteenth century. None of Oliver Phelps' personal account books are stored in Suffield. However, over 100 boxes of Phelps' original papers were located in the New York State Archives (O. Phelps Misc. volumes). Unfortunately, these records do not isolate his dealings with Suffield residents. Rather, they record Phelps' transactions with all of his business acquaintances for a given time period. They therefore include the names of hundreds of associates residing all over the northeast region of the country. It was beyond the scope of this paper to attempt a thorough interpretation of these records. However, during a trip to Albany, Joanne Bowen was able to scan these books and isolate those records involving individuals she knew to be Suffield residents. Therefore, while the monetary figures presented here are a reflection of only those sources available in and around Suffield, details gleaned from Oliver Phelps' own accounts are used to augment their interpretation wherever possible.

All merchant account and day books dating from the early 1780s to 1810 were investigated. Each farm-related account book listing 'Oliver Phelps' as an accountee was likewise examined. The exchanges recorded therein chronicle the rise and fall of Phelps' personal finances, as well as his standing in the community.
Phelps' Economic Rise

The fact that Phelps and Leavitt maintained an economic relationship even before Phelps moved back to Suffield in 1789 is proven by a series of correspondence that took place in the early 1780s. The first letter, dated December, 1781, is a request made by Phelps of Leavitt to pay a debt of £12 in spice to a third party residing in Suffield. These brief notes requesting cash and monetary favors persisted through the early 1780s, often mentioning other trading partners, the price of goods, and their cooperation in shipping goods from one town to another (KML Folder II 2 - Phelps, Oliver - Letters).

Evidently, in the early 1780s, Phelps owned an unspecified amount of stock in Leavitt and Hatheway’s Suffield store. This may explain Phelps’ continual requests of the shop for cash advances and favors. In 1786, Leavitt wrote in his personal diary that this financial arrangement between himself and Phelps had concluded:

This day bought Oliver Phelps property in the store – which was put into stock with Leavitt & Hatheway august 1\textsuperscript{st} 1781. sum put into stock by said Phelps was £300. We have given him £550 – and taken a final Discharge from any Demand he has or ever had of ye  Store (KML Folder II 2 - Leavitt, Thaddeus).

Evidently, Leavitt was much more patient with Phelps’ occasionally lengthy delay in payment than some of Phelps’ other creditors. A letter from Suffield resident Deacon Seth Kent to one of his own creditors, dated June 20, 1782, details Kent’s troubles in retrieving full payment from Phelps for cattle. This lag caused Kent to delay payment to the recipient of this note, resulting in Kent’s request for patience as “I am troubled Enough about it as it is a thing of not So Great importance as to make us Discontented” (KML Folder II 2 - Kent, Deacon Seth - Accounts). Once again, Phelps called upon Leavitt to aid him in this dispute. In a letter dated November of that same year, Phelps requested payment to Mr. Kent for his cattle as Phelps was at that time “out of cash” (KML Folder II 2 - Phelps, Oliver - Letters). Despite this minor conflict, Kent continued
to exchange cattle and beef with Phelps at least until the middle 1790s (KML Folder II 2 - Kent, Deacon Seth - Accounts).

With his family's move to Suffield in 1788, the number and variety of exchanges between Phelps and members of the Suffield community increased dramatically. In September he began contracting with laborers for "Work on yr House." He is recorded as paying them in beef, head and pluck (organ meat), sugar, rum, cash, and store credit (E. King; J. Howard). Charges to Phelps' store account made by employees, servants, family members, and slaves also became a frequent occurrence. Itemized entries with subtext to the effect of: "p' M's Phelps Order," "yr black girl," "yr boy Adams," or "yr Taylor" began to occur repeatedly.

The types of goods purchased by Phelps also took on a more varied texture at this time. Items such as sewing materials, grain, and ceramics became more frequent categories of exchange. While for the moment Phelps did not add any cash loans to his list of debts, he continued to repay the store primarily in currency, with only a single entry of a credit for "9 Bu Rye" (Leavitt & Hatheway a, c, e).

Phelps' own account books detail interactions with a wide range of Suffield residents, extending from those of middling income to the town's economic elite. Most of the Suffield residents exchanging with Oliver Phelps offered their services, such as slaughtering, shoe making, repairing ovens, or making ropes, for animal products such as head, pluck, beef, tallow, or even for full meals provided while the services were being carried out. Exchanges with the town's elite were typically on what appeared to be a commercial level, purchasing beef by the barrel or by the tens or even hundreds of pounds (O. Phelps Misc. vol. 191). There is also a single entry outlining Phelps' arrangements for cattle to be driven into Canandiagua "as a present to y' Indians as agreement" (O. Phelps Misc. vol. 152f).
Phelps traded continually with Leavitt’s store in 1790, spending over £500 before the year’s end. For the most part, his purchasing pattern appears as one might expect from a wealthy man. Debts included paper, wool, pipes, brass cookery, ceramics, buttons, thread, sugar, spices, silk, tea cloth, liquor, ribbon, chocolate, and the occasional small loan. All debts were paid either with cash, with services provided (for example, the delivery of Leavitt’s goods to or from another town), or occasionally with beef (Leavitt & Hatheway a, b, c, d, e).

1790 shows the first mention of Phelps’ commercial activity in the beef trade. While it was already evident (through his above-mentioned accounts dating to the 1780s) that he had access to barreled beef, it was not until 1790 that the available account books first made specific mention of his slaughter yard in Suffield. In that year alone, 144 cattle were slaughtered, their meat barreled and sold, some to locals, some to individuals outside of Suffield. In 1793, 156 cattle were slaughtered, however in 1797 only 39 head were processed (O. Phelps Misc. vol. 166 and 153c). At least for these years, Phelps was operating a commercial slaughter yard in Suffield, perhaps in the 130 acre farm located in the north of town, and selling most of the beef in either the settlements to the west or through the urban market towns to the east. Laborers were hired to work in this yard and were often paid in animal products.

The Beef Trade

For a number of decades, upland farmers had been driving their livestock to nearby urban centers to sell on the market. Such endeavors allowed farmers the chance to increase their own cash flow for at-home exchange, as well as the opportunity to purchase specialty items from these larger markets (Garrison 1985:173-183).

Cattle fattened on hay developed slower that those fed grain, therefore a stall feeding system was established whereby surplus grain, particularly Indian corn, peas, and
oats, were mixed in a grist mill, and fed to cattle. This created the opportunity for middlemen to become involved in the trade, buying cattle from farmers and fattening them through stall feeding before finally selling them, live and ready for slaughter, in the urban markets – thus creating networks of exchange that extended well beyond the boundaries of local farming communities (Garrison 1985:174-178). Phelps undoubtedly acted as one of these middlemen. Through his wholesale connections in the markets of Hartford, Boston, New York, and New London, to name a few, he took the process one step further, slaughtering, butchering, and preserving the meat before sale.

It is clear that Phelps paid day laborers at least occasionally with animal products. The data retrieved from Phelps’ own accounts outlines a system in which lower income individuals, including poor whites, Native Americans, and African Americans, worked for Phelps’ in his slaughter yard in return for meat products such as head, pluck, and occasional barreled beef or pork (O. Phelps Misc. vol. 190, 153c, and 192). Even the craftsmen who renovated Phelps’ Suffield home were paid in a combination of beef, head, pluck, tallow, and cash (E. King; J. Howard).

Historians (Garrison 1985, 1991) have claimed that a specialized beef trade was not widely established until the 1820s, however, this evidence indicates that Phelps’ establishment was in operation at least 30 years earlier. It is unknown if his slaughter yard was running before he officially became the beef supply agent for the Continental Army, or if his appointment led to the establishment of this enterprise, but there can be little doubt that these two activities were intertwined. In operation at least through most of the 1790s, this business allowed him mercantile connections to the growing food industry outside of the Connecticut River Valley.

Phelps’ interaction with the Leavitt store remained relatively consistent until 1794 when his purchases increased sharply. During this year, debts were added to Phelps’ account nearly every day. Occasionally, Phelps, or someone authorized to charge to his
account, visited the store two or three times a day. While loans continued to be the chief
debt, totaling over £1100 for the year, items purchased were primarily related to home
activities, including sewing materials, items for Phelps’ office such as paper and ink, and
more architectural renovations to the house itself. These debts were paid exclusively in
cash (J. Howard; T. Leavitt a, b, c).

**Phelps’ Economic Descent**

The year 1795 marked the crest of Phelps’ economic tide. He indebted himself to
the Leavitt store for over £3000, and was yet able to pay this amount in full (T. Leavitt a,
b, c). Changes in this extravagant pattern began to show up in the records dating after
1795. Throughout 1796, Phelps continued to charge the same types of items to his
account in roughly the same measure. Work continued on his house, as recorded in the
personal account book of Joseph Howard, who charged Phelps numerous times in August
and September of 1796 for days of work performed “on y’ House” by himself and his son
(J. Howard). Yet Phelps’ payments fell in to sharp decline. While over £2800 were
charged to Phelps in 1796, only about £530 were paid. It soon became evident that some
of these debts would never be collected.

It appears that Phelps finally realized the seriousness of his financial situation by
the beginning of 1797. His purchases fell off sharply, totaling only about £140 [Figure
5], and the types of goods purchased took on a much less affluent texture. The bulk of
these debts were in the form of cash loans made to Phelps from Leavitt. Gone were the
entries of such items as “Brass Cooks” and “Tea dishes.” The few purchases recorded
included relatively mundane items such as flannel and buttons, with only the rare
occurrence of goods such as tea, sugar, or brandy. Phelps’ payment pattern began to
incorporate a higher percentage of services provided by him, such as the delivery of
messages or goods, though he was able to make one final cash payment on his store
account in April, 1798 for £280 (T. Leavitt a, b; Leavitt & Brunson). The final credit recorded for “Oliver Phelps, Esq.” came in late May, 1800. The entry simply reads “Cash of Oliver L. Phelps,” his son (Leavitt & Brunson). By this time, Oliver Phelps, Sr. was forced by financial circumstances to evacuate his Suffield home and move permanently to Canandiagua.

**Figure 5: Debt / Credit Pattern: 1785 - 1800.**

After his move to New York, Oliver Phelps’ (senior) only documented contact with Suffield residents was through either lawyers seeking restitution for unpaid clients or through his son Oliver Leicester. O.L. Phelps (junior) and his new wife had temporarily relocated to France soon after they were wed in 1795 (Spear 1987:49). Upon their return near the close of the century, O.L. Phelps was confronted with extremely different circumstances than those which he had left. His father’s financial affairs had almost totally collapsed, leaving O.L. Phelps to see to Oliver, Sr.’s rather imposing debts. This is demonstrated not only by the above entry in the Leavitt 1800 account, but by letters between O.L. Phelps and Leavitt. In a note dated June 25, 1806, O.L. Phelps made a humble plea for more cash, and more time to pay previously incurred debts:

I am indured once more to ask the form of a loan of money. I want to make a payment this day & tomorrow and want to obtain four hundred dollars for which I
will give you a draft on New York payable in fifty days the draft to be delivered you on Saturday next, and if possible what is due you on accounts, but in case I cannot do the latter I will pay it in time to meet the payments mentioned in New Haven. My friend if you can accommodate me, you may rest assured you shall not be disappointed, and you will really Oblige me - I shall be willing to allow you a favorable compensation” (KML Folder II 2 - Phelps, Oliver - Letters).

This humble stance was altered by 1810, when O.L. Phelps sent Leavitt a letter discussing Leavitt’s attempt to put a lean against O.L. Phelps’ property in Ohio. This note opens with the following: “Your letter of the 25 Dec was received sometime since, I feel no desire to comment upon the impressions, or insinuations it contains.” The message concludes with the statement: “I apprehend that you can devise no advantage in persisting in the suits you have commended and that you will discover it for your benefit to attend to my wishes” (KML Folder II 2 - Phelps, Oliver - Letters). By this time, each had begun to confer with council to work out their financial differences.

Oliver Phelps (senior) was not able to relinquish his financial responsibilities to his son entirely. From his home in New York, he continued to be pursued by Suffield creditors. The ownership of his Suffield property was called into question in the years just before his death. In July 7, 1807, Henry Champion sued Phelps (senior) for $2000 in unpaid debts. While Phelps attempted to negotiate payment with the assistance of Zachariah Seymour, most likely his brother-in-law, he was finally forced to turn over the property to the State of Connecticut as directed in legal proceedings dated July 25, 1807 (KML Folder IV C - Henry Champion vs. Oliver Phelps). Phelps was sued again in December, 1808 by Seth Phelps (no relation) as an absconding debtor for $1000 (KML Folder II 2 - Phelps, Oliver). It is unknown if these proceedings were ever concluded.

Even after his death in 1809, the Phelps estate continued to be vied for by those creditors who, during his peak years, were willing to extend Phelps more advanced money, goods, and services, than even he could finally repay. In July of 1811, advertisements were posted in several towns in Connecticut and Massachusetts
announcing the upcoming auction of Oliver Phelps Esq.'s property. This auction was held specifically to repay several of his Suffield creditors (KML Folder IV - Phelps, Oliver).
Animal products formed an extremely important component of the eighteenth and nineteenth century diet (see Bowen 1990; Miller 1988; Landon 1996). Being highly perishable, and therefore requiring constant replenishment, relatively extensive networks were needed to insure a regular supply of meat and dairy products.

Generally, wealthy farmers were self-provisioning units. Aside from specialty items, such as dry goods and imports, these families rarely had to look outside of their own farm for their subsistence needs. Affluent households regularly traded subsistence goods for labor, however, they rarely recorded how much meat, grain, and produce was consumed by their own household. Families of all economic levels grew or raised at least some of their subsistence staples. Unfortunately, these mundane households chores were rarely written down.

The thorough analysis of archaeologically retrieved animal bone can furnish a direct link to a given household’s meat diet, thus providing the starting block to deciphering food consumption patterns. Faunal remains, in conjunction with documentary evidence, can also provide information regarding the cultural values, distribution patterns, and socioeconomic status of a particular household. This chapter focuses on the analysis of animal bones recovered from archaeological excavations in the immediate vicinity of Oliver Phelps’ Suffield residence, and provides tentative conclusions regarding the Phelps family diet and associated subsistence system.

**Faunal Analysis**

Over 4000 animal bone fragments were recovered from this site. Using the stratigraphic analysis and artifact descriptions provided in the 1993 site report by Robert Gradie, five temporal contexts were identified (see Appendix). Over 2500 bone
fragments were found in the stratigraphy associated with Oliver Phelps. While fish, turtles, and birds were represented, mammals, particularly cattle and pig, dominated the assemblage.

**Findings**

Over 600 fragments of fish bone were recovered from the archaeological strata associated with the Phelps occupation. However, only two could be identified to family or species, one being from the catfish family, the other identified as codfish. The following dietary analysis will therefore concentrate on mammal and bird remains.

Four bird species were identified: Canada goose, duck, chicken, and ruffed grouse. Chicken far outweighed the other species in both NISP and biomass estimates [Table 1].

**Table 1: Avian NISP and Biomass estimates.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAXA</th>
<th>NISP</th>
<th>BIOMASS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicken</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duck</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruffed Grouse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mammal assemblage was also dominated by domestic species. While squirrel, woodchuck, horse, and rat were all represented, cow, pig, and sheep/goat* were much more prevalent [Table 2].

In assessing the relative dietary importance seen in these tables, zooarchaeologists routinely rely on several different quantification methods. Two are used here (for a discussion on why these two methods were selected see Appendix). The Number of

* Due to the fact that the sheep and goat bones present in this assemblage could not be identified as either sheep or goat, they are discussed as a single species for the purposes of this report.
Individual Specimens (NISP) provides a basic bone fragment count. Biomass relies on actual artifact bone weight to estimate how much meat could have been represented by an assemblage (Reitz et al 1987, 1992). No faunal collection is a direct reflection of every meal consumed by a given household for a given time period, and no field archaeologist is able to collect every bone fragment originally deposited on the site. Therefore, these numeric totals are ordinal values and represent the priority of various kinds of meat over others (Grayson 1979).

**Table 2: Mammal NISP and Biomass estimates.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAXA</th>
<th>NISP</th>
<th>BIOMASS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cow (adult)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>32.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veal Calf</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>9.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep/Goat</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squirrel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodchuck</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td>315</td>
<td>46.097</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above table, the ranking of mammals based on NISP differs from that reflected in the biomass calculations. While more individual pig specimens were recovered than cattle, beef dominates the biomass totals. The distribution of elements (specific bones within the body) was similar for the pig and cow. Both species were represented by virtually every body part, from the skull, through the spine, and down both fore and hindquarters. As cows are larger and heavier animals than pigs, the cattle bones most likely represent a great deal more meat. Since biomass estimates the amount of meat represented on the bone fragments, the biomass percentages most likely depict Phelps' dietary preferences.

Evidently, Phelps relied primarily on domestic fauna, only occasionally supplementing the family's diet with fish and wild fowl. While one squirrel and two...
woodchuck bones were also recovered from this context, it is unknown if these were the result of dietary practices, or if these were intrusive species. Either conclusion is plausible as these animals were occasionally used as a food source. However, their quantified totals, when compared with domestic species, hardly register as a dietary element in the Phelps household.

**Butchery**

Bones recovered from archaeological contexts have several stages through which they pass. They are first part of a living animal, later a carcass, then cuts of meat, and finally rubbish. Through each of these stages, the bones are further reduced. Even after being discarded, agents, including soil acidity and scavenging by rodents and carnivores, further brake down the bone's organic composition (Gifford 1981). Despite these factors, butcher marks survive. As the direct result of human interaction with an animal carcass, they have the potential to offer anthropological insight. The analysis of butcher marks can demonstrate the *nature* of the meat diet, such as preferred cuts, preservation methods, and cooking options.

Butchery data can come in the form of observable marks or scars on the artifacts, or written descriptions of butchery practices. Both points of reference have been considered in this analysis. Several documents were located that diagram late eighteenth and nineteenth century butchering patterns (Hazen 1846; Mess 1843; Periam 1984; Stephens 1851). These references demonstrate how animal carcasses were processed and the scars these processes leave behind. Much of the bone associated with the Phelps occupation exhibited butcher marks.
Professional vs. Domestic Butchering

Commercialized butcher shops have been a part of the urban landscape for hundreds of years, although, it was not until the late eighteenth to early nineteenth century that professional meat cutters began setting up shop in the rural townships along the northeastern coast. Up to that point, livestock were typically slaughtered and butchered domestically, then distributed throughout the socially- or physically-immediate community (Bowen 1990). Professional butchers had the advantage of being able to provide specialty cuts of meat, thus eliminating the question of what to do with less desirable portions. Families could choose to purchase preferred cuts that included the meatiest pieces, or even individual steaks.

Until the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, American butchers used chopping instruments such as an axe, cleaver, or knife to process carcasses. Documentary sources from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries describe only chopping instruments (Diderot Encyclopedia 1713-1784). By the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries saws had joined the list of butchery tools (Pyne 1806; Mess 1843; Stephens 1851). By the early twentieth century butchering saws had become specialized, different styles being offered for different types of butchering (McArthur, Wirth & Co. 1900). Saws allowed for smaller, more even cuts, and were regularly used by unskilled butchers. Axes and other chopping tools, however, generally remained the preferred tool of experienced butchers into the nineteenth century (Bowen and Manning 1994:9.26-9.27). Families who butchered their own livestock continued to use axes through the nineteenth century, and even to today in rural America.

Over 90% of the butchered bones associated with the Phelps occupation had been hacked with an axe or cleaver – less than 10% exhibiting saw marks. This ratio changed dramatically for the later temporal contexts. After 1820 the percentage of bone butchered
with an axe or cleaver dropped to 40%, with nearly 60% having been cut with a saw (Appendix). This evidence is consistent with currently held beliefs that saws became more commonly used as the nineteenth century progressed.

Since farmers continued to use the axe throughout the time period in question, the butchery data retrieved for this study proved only marginally helpful in identifying Phelps’ subsistence strategy. The evolution from axes to saws for the division of large animal carcasses was a gradual shift. It is therefore no surprise that the majority of the Phelps assemblage was butchered using the chopping method.

**Fresh vs. Preserved Meat**

While data concerning the difference between fresh and preserved meat is usually documentary in nature, it is necessary to make the distinction between these two dietary forms at this time. The choice between consuming meat immediately after slaughter or after it has undergone long-term physical preservation can allow for interpretations regarding the consumer’s personal preferences and economic wherewithal. By comparing the available storage options with the recovered animal bone, a picture emerges detailing the dietary propensities of the Phelps household.

Ingold (1983) identified three different types of food storage. The first, ‘ecological storage,’ refers to the actual concentration of nutrients at particular points of the ecosystem, in other words, in the living animal or the human body (Ingold 1983:555). ‘Practical storage’ refers to the physical act of setting aside harvested resources for future use, for example, smoking or salt curing meats for later consumption (Ingold 1983:557). The final type of food storage is ‘social storage.’ This refers to the ownership and subsequent distribution of resources by an individual or group. By storing resources in these three ways fresh resources could be available for an expanded period of time. In Suffield’s temperate climate, the agricultural cycle of growth, harvest, and practical food
storage allowed households involved in the local exchange networks to have access to a variety of foods during times of scarcity (Bowen 1990). Through these exchange networks, resource distribution was usually based on familial or social relationships (Ingold 1983:561). These strategies lead to "the establishment of lasting mutual dependencies" therefore investing relationships "with a quality of durability lacking from societies in which returns on labour are immediate" (Ingold 1983:568).

In Suffield, residents relied upon a combination of storage methods in order to ensure an adequate subsistence for most of the community. The practical storage techniques utilized by Suffield residents encompasses both short term and long term methods. Short-term storage, including cooking, freezing (in winter), and sausage making, would keep different kinds of meat from spoiling for several days to weeks (Bowen 1990:133). Long-term storage included pickling, smoking, and salting, and could keep meat edible for several months (Bowen 1990:114). All types of meat could potentially be stored long-term, however, the effects such preservation practices had on the meat's taste and texture were not preferred for certain species.

The physical reality of different kinds of meat directed the schedule of animal slaughter. Through her examination of Suffield account books, Bowen (1990) identified the cycle of availability of various animal products and was therefore able to identify which animals were prepared for long term storage, which for short term storage, and which types of meat were preferably consumed fresh. Three agricultural seasons were identified. During the fall/winter both cattle and pigs were slaughtered. Their meat made up roughly 90% of the meat exchanges in Suffield account books during these months (Bowen 1990:118-120). In the spring, during the spawning runs of the American salmon and shad, fresh fish was a dietary mainstay. Pork was also exchanged regularly. While the account books rarely specified whether this meat was fresh or preserved, the ease with which pork is salted, and the positive effects such pickling can have on the meat, leads to
the conclusion that the spring exchanges of pork are probably referring to salt pork. Beef entries were minimal in the account book this time of year. However, dairy products such as cheese, butter, and veal were occasionally listed. Domestic fowl and eggs were also sources of fresh meat during the spring season (Bowen 1990:120-122). During the summer months, dairy products took on increased importance in the local diet. Veal alone made up roughly 26% of Suffield's meat exchanges. Other sources of fresh meat included lamb, mutton, shad, salmon, and domestic fowl (Bowen 1990:122-123).

The cycle of meat exchange identified in Bowen's account book investigation, when combined with the breeding and slaughtering schedule used by most farmers, provides incite into which kinds of meat were eaten fresh and which were often preserved. Beef, veal, and lamb appeared almost exclusively during their respective seasons of harvest. These animals were most often consumed soon after slaughter and were regularly overlooked as a long-term preservation option (Bowen 1990:127). Mutton was spread over each of the three seasons, but were more important during the late summer and early fall when there were fewer fresh meat options. Evidently mutton was eaten most often fresh or relatively soon after slaughter, mainly as a supplement during times of limited fresh meat resources (Bowen 1990:123-124). Domestic fowl was likewise present year round. These small animals would not have been a problem to keep alive until desired. Pork, salmon, shad, and milk products were exchanged most often during their seasons of harvest, but continued to be offered on a regular basis throughout the year. While these types of animal products were consumed in large quantities fresh, their relative ease of preservation, and the perceived improvement such long-term storage practices had on their flavor, made them prime sources of nutrition year round (Bowen 1990:127).

When combined with the faunal evidence recovered from the Phelps homelot, the cycle of seasonal availability and consumption identified in Bowen's study demonstrates
the nature of the Phelps family diet. Beef made up over 70% of the biomass for this assemblage. Bowen’s 1990 study concluded that beef was most often consumed fresh. Exchanges of beef occurred almost exclusively in the fall and winter – the season when cows were typically slaughtered. Had beef been an important source of preserved meat, the distribution of beef exchange would have appeared year round as did pork (Bowen 1990:129). Veal, lamb, and mutton made up another 10% of the biomass. These species were likewise consumed almost exclusively during their seasons of harvest (Bowen 1990:142-144). The remaining 20% of the biomass was pork. This meat could have been consumed either fresh or salted. Pork tends to spoil quickly, however, it also has excellent preservation qualities. Many families even preferred the taste of salt pork to fresh. This 20% could therefore have represented either fresh or preserved meat (Bowen 1990:138-139).

Summary

Bowen’s analysis found that there were significant differences in the diet and subsistence strategies of wealthy farmers and those less fortunate. Through her analysis of Suffield’s food exchange system, she was able to determine that fresh meat was generally more desired than preserved. Affluent households enjoyed a varied diet including a relatively consistent supply of fresh meat, the type or species of which varied with the season. On the other hand, the poor subsisted mainly on a diet of preserved meat and cheese, supplemented only occasionally with fresh meat (Bowen 1990:80-81). Those of middling households fell somewhere between these two extremes (Bowen 1990:155-158).

As a wealthy member of the Suffield community, Phelps consumed a relatively varied meat diet, including a regular supply of fresh meat. The species list associated with his occupation shows that his meat diet focused primarily on domestic species,
namely chicken, beef, and pork. However, his household did occasionally enjoy a dinner of wild fowl, mutton, or veal. The predominance of beef, veal, lamb, and mutton, demonstrate that Phelps was probably relying almost exclusively on fresh meat or meat preserved using only short-term storage techniques for the day-to-day subsistence of himself and his family.
FOOD ECONOMY

Though they are often put in opposition to one another, archaeological and documentary sources do not represent the opposite ends of an information spectrum. Each data set has strengths which can be used to augment the weaknesses and biases of the other. Bowen’s examination of Suffield, Connecticut demonstrated that historical documents can be used to address anthropological questions. Recent edited volumes have provided similar examples (ie. Little 1992; Beaudry 1988).

No single data set offers a complete record of past activities – both archaeological and documentary sources have inherent biases. Documents are strongly biased towards literate society. They also reflect the prejudices and assumptions of the author. In Suffield, account books were kept by individuals involved in some sort of business. Therefore, the account book sample, from the onset, was biased in favor of entrepreneurial households. These households were generally from the middle to upper income group. Therefore, poor families were only represented indirectly through the lens provided by their economic betters (Bowen 1990:58; Little 1992; Beaudry 1988).

Written sources also tend to be biased against the mundane aspects of everyday life. Subsistence practices generally fall into this category, particularly for members of the wealthy class, for whom the search for food was not a day-to-day struggle. Documents do occasionally describe purchased food items, but sources outlining domestically produced foodstuffs are incomplete at best. It is rare to find any written record of household-level food procurement practices for affluent families.

The strengths of documentary sources lie in their ability to outline the alliances connecting households – alliances that form the nexus of exchange relationships. Through these relationships, individuals without land or livestock could have access to
fresh meat in exchange for their own labor, thus defining the mutual dependencies of these distinct social strata.

Archaeological collections have inherent biases as well. Differential preservation, recovery, and identification techniques, as well as the quantitative methods used by faunal analysts can all effect the accuracy of a given assemblage. Taphonomic processes must be examined in order to compensate for differential preservation. Field archaeologists must accurately record how an assemblage was recovered, and take the necessary steps to assure that these artifacts are collected in a systematic fashion. It is up to the faunal analyst to use proper identification techniques and to select the quantitative methods best suited to a given assemblage.

Despite all of these variables, faunal remains continue to provide the nearest link to a given household’s meat diet. Unlike documentary sources, archaeological collections are not biased towards status or ethnicity, and therefore provide the most accurate record of historic meat consumption (Bowen 1990:179-180). In order to construct an accurate picture of Oliver Phelps’ subsistence economy, both archaeological and documentary sources were consulted. Historical documents allowed for the construction of Phelps’ subsistence options, while the archaeological evidence demonstrated which of the available options were actually utilized by his household.

**Phelps’ and the Mercantile Food Trade**

The name “Oliver Phelps, Esq.” was regularly listed in the account and day books of the Leavitt store. Members of the Phelps household frequently purchased food items, as well as other household goods, from this shop. No data was recovered listing Phelps as a debtor for foodstuffs in any other Suffield account book.

The only meat debts recorded in Phelps’ name were in the late 1780s and early 1790s. These include mainly bulk purchases from the Leavitt and Hatheway store of beef
and barreled pork, which were probably turned over commercially through one of Phelps’ many merchant connections. Phelps’ food-related debts were dominated by animal products. Evidently Phelps acted as an occasional agent for Leavitt, purchasing bulk meat and grain and delivering it, along with his own inventory, to larger urban markets. These recorded debts tended to obscure Phelps’ personal subsistence strategies in Suffield. However, it was possible to separate his commercially-based food purchases from those associated with his household. These sellable goods were typically grouped together and contained notations describing them as “contracts” (Leavitt & Hatheway, e). By removing these charges, Phelps’ purchases take on an entirely different texture [Figures 6 and 7].

**Figure 6: Total Food Purchases.**

---

* Alcohol was not included in these charts, though it was a consistent entry in his debts. Rum and brandy were frequently purchased, along with the occasional quart of wine or hard cider. Rum was often purchased in quantities upwards of 2 gallons, and one entry lists a single purchase of 15 gallons. Two of Phelps’ Suffield creditors frequently listed rum as a form of payment for services or goods, and Phelps, himself, listed rum as a mode of payment for laborers in his slaughter yard (E. King; Leavitt & Hatheway, a; O. Phelps).
Only two day book entries show Phelps being indebted for small amounts of meat (less than £1). These were both accompanied by notes indicating that they were actually purchased by employees or servants of Phelps (T. Leavitt c). It is possible that he was allowing small creditors to charge goods in his name as a form of payment for their services.

Phelps’ food-related credits were dominated by animal products [Figure 8]. This is not surprising considering his commercial meat business. Clearly, Phelps used meat processed in his slaughter yard to purchase home necessities such as sewing materials and dry goods.

* Economically, sugar was Phelps’ principal household-level food purchase, followed by grain, primarily wheat and rye, and then by stimulant beverages such as tea, coffee, and chocolate. Sugar played an interesting role in the social and economic development of the eighteenth century. Sugar, along with other exotic imports, such as tea, coffee, and chocolate, evolved from being the rare luxury of the super-rich in the seventeenth century, to being considered a necessity even by the poor of the nineteenth century. In the late 1700s, sugar was generally considered an item of occasional indulgence to most rural families (Mintz 1985:148).
Diet

Bowen’s research found that roughly 90% of food products were exchanged down the socioeconomic scale. Poor families regularly exchanged for subsistence supplies. Affluent families, on the other hand, were generally on the offering end of these exchanges, as only wealthy farmers could actually afford enough farmland and livestock to sustain a household.

The average agricultural holdings of Suffield families was available through historic tax inventories. While the 1790 tax list shows only the name of the head of household and the total amount taxed, the 1780 tax list was itemized, delineating the amount and types of acreage being taxed, as well as individual livestock holdings. While Oliver Phelps was not included in Suffield’s 1780 tax assessment, it was possible to use this list to profile Suffield’s wealthiest households. In 1780, Suffield’s top economic group owned, at a minimum: one to two pair oxen, six to 33 cows, two to seven horses, and one to six pigs. They were also taxed for 20 to 60 acres of plowland, 24 to 95 acres of mowed pasture land, 15 to 250 acres of brush pasture, and five to ten acres of undeveloped land, adding up to an average of 178.2 acres of total land (Bowen 1990:69-
During the 1790s, Phelps owned roughly 200 to 250 acres in Suffield, placing him slightly above the 1780 average for his economic group. As reflected in the 1780 list, all of Suffield’s wealthiest families owned enough land and livestock to maintain a self-sufficient farm. Even the Leavitt family, who were Phelps’ prime economic influence during his developing years, and who acted as his kin group throughout his life, owned at least some livestock and plow/pasture land. It is highly likely that, only ten to 15 years later, Phelps’ agricultural holdings would have been more than enough for the maintenance of a self-sufficient farm.

Animal/meat exchanges between wealthy farmers were only occasionally observed by Bowen. These entries generally recorded the exchange of substantial quantities of meat, such as a quarter of veal, lamb, or mutton, or weighty pieces of beef or pork. When trading with poor laborers the amounts were smaller and consisted of a combination of pork, cheese, and butter, with only occasional entries of beef, veal, mutton, eggs, or milk (Bowen 1990:155-158). Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that Phelps, like every other person of means in Suffield, produced food for his own household plus a surplus with which to pay laborers working in his slaughtering business.

Suffield’s wealthy families enjoyed a more varied diet than their less affluent counterparts.

A wealthy individual’s diet would have included a variety of foods that changed with the seasons. Throughout the year these households would have used preserved meats, cheese, and butter. They also would have had some type of meat that had not been salted down: beef in the winter, fish for a brief period during the spring, veal and lamb throughout the summer and mutton in the late summer and early fall (Bowen 1990:157).

While the documentary data provided abundant evidence concerning Phelps’ social and economic position in Suffield, it provided little information about the actual consumption patterns of himself and his family. Because most of his documentary history...
dealt with commercial endeavors, Phelps’ food procurement strategies were likewise unavailable except through analogy. Therefore, the archaeo-
logical evidence of the Phelps’ household was vital to the interpretation of his family’s diet. The animal bones recovered during excavation were primarily of domestic species – cow, pig, sheep/goat, and chicken. Roughly 80% of the biomass represented by this collection was of species that rarely underwent long-term preservation, indicating that the Phelps family enjoyed a diet of predominately fresh meat. This evidence, coupled with his absence from Suffield’s farm-related account books, leads to the conclusion that Oliver Phelps was supplying most of his subsistence needs himself. While Phelps had an almost infinite source of cash and cash-based credit to draw from, he chose to participate within Suffield’s local food-exchange networks, thereby encouraging and perhaps enforcing existing social relationships.

**Commercial vs. Agrarian Strategies**

Nearly every wealthy household in Suffield traded subsistence items for labor specific to their own business ventures. As a member of Suffield’s wealthiest social group, Phelps rarely, if ever, traded for basic subsistence needs. He did, however, regularly exchange barreled meat and byproducts of his cattle business for labor. This labor was usually performed in his slaughtering yard, or as renovations to his Suffield home. While Phelps’ large-scale land speculating and mercantile activities may have set him apart from most of his economic peers, his domestic-economy strategies followed the same pattern as the rest of Suffield’s wealth group.

An examination of the Leavitt store accounts showed that Phelps used cash, rather than kind, for nearly all of his mercantile exchanges. Both his overall purchasing pattern and his crediting pattern were dominated by cash transactions [Figures 9 and 10]. While members of Suffield’s wealth group were more likely to use cash as a medium of
exchange than poor to middling families, this practice set Phelps apart from the greater Suffield community.

**FIGURE 9:** Purchasing Pattern (How Phelps indebted himself) 1785 - 1800.

**FIGURE 10:** Crediting Pattern (How Phelps paid his debts) 1785 - 1800.

While Phelps' financial status and extensive mercantile connections gave him the wherewithal for a cash-based domestic economy, it is likely that his background also allowed him a measure of comfort with cash exchanges. Not everyone in the rural New England countryside applauded the influx of retail goods. For many, cash was reserved
as a medium between strangers, as a means to guarantee immediate payment for goods and/or services. This being the case, cash was often considered a cold, almost rude form of exchange (Clark 1990:69). Some of the more traditional families in Suffield may have shared these views – Oliver Phelps clearly did not. Though he was born into a farming family, the arena in which he grew up was the merchant’s shop. There was no reason for him feel uncomfortable with a heavy reliance on abstract currency.

Eighteenth century Suffield was a rural agrarian town. Most inhabitants were at least part-time farmers and, by participating in open-ended exchange with their neighbors and kin, were able to remain primarily outside of commercial markets for their day-to-day subsistence. During the late eighteenth century, only a few Suffield households were beginning to experiment with commercial farming as an economic strategy. In many ways, Phelps’ slaughtering business was a form of commercial farming. As previously defined, this term refers to the focus on a cash crop to the exclusion of other subsistence crops for the purpose of turning a profit. By focusing on a single subsistence product, namely salted beef, Phelps was able to earn enough cash to purchase other household essentials as well as a number of luxury items.
CONCLUSIONS

Several research questions were proposed at the onset of this paper. As a whole, these questions were helpful in directing documentary and archaeological inquiry. However, their answers were only the beginning to examining the economic shifts occurring in the New England countryside in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The story of Oliver Phelps provides an excellent example of an early capitalistic pioneer using both the traditional practices of his agrarian neighbors and the profit-oriented techniques of his mercantile peers. While he cannot be taken as a stereotype of New England's rural populace, his rise and fall, and the associated reactions of his fellow townspeople, demonstrate the general attitude of New England's farming community to their world's changing economic circumstances.

Phelps was a member of the emerging class of wealthy merchants springing up in most of New England's urban centers during the eighteenth century. Throughout this time period, consumer outlets multiplied in number and kind, eventually becoming more specialized (Bushman 1994:237). Due to the nature of retail operations, merchants rarely, if ever, refused to do business with anyone based on class affiliation alone. While non-commercial exchange relationships, particularly the exchange of food for labor, goods, and/or services, were generally carried on between families of roughly equal economic worth, merchants traded with individuals of variable financial standing. As stated by Bushman (1994), shopkeepers offered an invitation to every level of society.

Overtly it was an invitation to buy, but implicit in the act of purchasing was a transforming relationship. Within the walls of the shop, the purchaser became a gentleman or a lady. The goods themselves held that promise in the first place; they were meant to dignify the person, or the house, or social rituals in the house, by conferring gentility. But beyond the goods themselves, the shopkeeper treated customers as ladies or gentlemen, for the moment transforming their social identities into more exalted ones (Bushman 1994:251).
Locally, Phelps established economic relationships with anyone who could provide him with useful goods or services without regard to family affiliation or economic endowment. This is perhaps the result of his own humble beginnings. Phelps was born into an average-income household, but raised in the blossoming commercial world of the merchant’s shop. This atmosphere certainly broadened his own personal aspirations.

Phelps’ economy was divided into two distinct spheres: subsistence-oriented exchange and mercantile trading. Phelps traded commercially with many of his wealthy Suffield neighbors. These clients tended to purchase beef in multiple barrels or by the hundreds of pounds, offering cash in return. Like his economic peers, Phelps used the surplus of these pursuits as a means of exchange. However, his neighbors were using their own agricultural products primarily for personal consumption and local exchange, while Phelps’ beef business allowed him to convert this product into numerous forms of capital. Phelps undoubtedly used some of the beef for personal consumption. Some was offered to laborers who worked in his slaughtering yard. However, most of the meat was exported to nearby urban centers and there converted into cash. His food-trade connections to the Revolutionary Army also allowed Phelps to convert the barreled beef into political capital, providing an avenue for the personal and financial relationships that ultimately determined the direction of his political and commercial endeavors.

Phelps exchanged with a wide spectrum of individuals in order to fulfill his subsistence goals. Phelps’ Suffield work group included men such as Elisha Granger, taxed at £101.7 in 1790, as well as those such as Thomas Pemberton, taxed at only £9 in the same year. This exchange pattern is reflective of Phelps’ economic standing in the community. Wealthy farmers generally offered foodstuffs to those of more limited financial wherewithal, receiving services in exchange.
While Phelps undoubtedly exchanged with members of his fictive kin group, his labor pool included individuals of lower financial means. For many of the entries concerning middle- to upper-income individuals, only the debt was recorded, perhaps implying payment in cash. Middle-income accountees with specifically credited entries generally made payments through craft- or domestically-produced items such as rope, butter, or new barrels. Those of lower economic standing typically received subsistence items such as beef, head, pluck, and tallow in exchange for their labor in the slaughter yard (O. Phelps). His own accounts show that Phelps used not only poor whites, but also Native Americans and freedmen as base laborers, offering barreled meat and occasionally cash in return.

**Consequences of Market Expansion**

While natural rhythms dictated farmer's activities, the seasonal constraints of agrarian life could easily be as imposing as the factory clock (Garrison 1991:16; Bowen 1990). Various strategies were used in the rural countryside in order to compensate for these seasonal realities. These include the scheduling of livestock harvest, preserving certain kinds of meat for future use, and exchanging both fresh and preserved meat for either cash or kind (Bowen 1990:112-113). Each agricultural season provided its own variety of fresh meat options, as well as the opportunity to preserve harvested meat for future seasons. The continual exchange of perishable foodstuffs provided most townspeople with a regular supply of these subsistence requirements (Bowen 1990).

The seasonal nature of agrarian life was ultimately disrupted by a combination of social and technological innovations. Improved trade networks eventually subsumed the bulk New England under a single-market system, converging prices and broadening the availability of most trade goods. The railroad further disrupted this seasonal cycle by removing traveling constraints, thereby reducing profit margins for farmers, both
commercial- and subsistence-oriented, by increasing intra- and extra-regional competition (Garrison 1991:218).

By the late eighteenth century New England’s rural townships were just beginning to enjoy regularly accessible imports. This ultimately led to a drastic shift in how individuals and families provided for themselves and their dependents. Early manifestations of these changes came in the form of professional merchants and tradesmen. These individuals operated by performing, as a business, tasks that had previously been part of everyone’s household chores. The merchant/client relationship was originally a symmetrical one. Merchants would bring desired goods into rural communities and exchange these for resources gathered or cultivated in the hinterlands – resources that were in increasing demand in the growing urban centers (Wolf 1997:306-307; Parkerson 1995:58; Garrison 1991). During the early settlement of the Connecticut River Valley, traders would pass through rural towns only occasionally, bringing with them goods, as well as news and evolving social attitudes from larger urban centers. The market economy crept into farming communities in part through these traders who set up permanent shops. Retailers’ business connections to merchants in other towns ultimately pulled local residents into the outside commercial economy. This expanding contact between households and tradesmen, and the increased dependence on imported goods, provided a foundation for a new generation of merchants who would come to dominate the domestic economy of the region as well as the rest of this country (Clark 1990:173).

Under such circumstances, the development of social relations was increasingly carried out through the practice of consumption, with goods replacing persons as the “key medium of objectification for projects of value” (Miller 1995:154). Personal possessions were becoming a reflection of changing relationships between social groups (Carr and Walsh 1980:83). Luxury goods acted as a ‘register’ of consumption. These types of goods were generally restricted to the elites through price, and possessed the capacity to
send complex social messages through the specialized knowledge necessary either to acquire or to use them properly (Appadurai 1986:38). The rising merchant class was central to the introduction of non-essential retail items, as well as the increased dependence upon cash as the prime medium of exchange.

The shift toward commercial production led to an organizational shift of labor. With the upsurge of hired labor in Suffield, the number of kin listed in the accounts of the families addressed in Bowen’s study dropped from 50-to-60% to 20-to-30% of all accountees (Bowen 1990:84). The increased reliance on hired labor often isolated farmers from the rest of the community, as they no longer needed the labor that had been supplied through the reciprocal exchange networks (Bowen 1990:165).

Despite these innovations, commercial and household strategies of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries were not mutually exclusive. New market-oriented practices were used in conjunction with traditional approaches (Bowen 1990; Garrison 1991:60). While the commercial market slowly grew to become the exclusive local source for many household goods, subsistence items continued to be regularly exchanged among neighbors and kin. It was perhaps the reciprocal exchange of foodstuffs that kept these networks alive. Even today these types of networks continue to be revived during periods of economic stress (Bennett 1968).

**Commoditization of Subsistence Items**

Up until the late eighteenth century, most rural farmers in Suffield cultivated crops and livestock primarily for their own consumption. Surplus was then distributed throughout the physically- or socially-immediate environment. This type of exchange was based on the assumption of reciprocation. Blau defined these situations as the "voluntary actions of individuals that are motivated by the returns they are expected to bring and typically do in fact bring from others" (Blau 1964:91 as quoted in Bennett
1968:280). These expectations expose the assumed set of social rules between trading partners, thus implying preexisting social relationships.

Goods and services produced as commodities, on the other hand, can be compared and exchanged without reference to the social matrix in which they are produced (Wolf 1997:310). The term “commodity” generally implies an exchange of goods for currency, while money plays little to no role in a “bartered” exchange (Appadurai 1986:10-11). While forces such as desire, demand, and sacrifice determine an object’s cost, bartered value is often more complex. In this system, two parties must come to an agreement as to the worth of two or more disparate items. Commodity-level cash exchanges, on the other hand, serve to buffer trading across social boundaries by reducing the need to establish value equivalence (Koptoff 1986:89).

As stated by Miller, the more everyday or mundane an item is, the greater the significance of its second-nature ideological assumptions (Miller 1995:142). The introduction of commercial farming and livestock husbandry ushered in new ways of thinking about food items. The shift of control of food distribution from producer to merchant had a lasting effect on the exchange networks that had dominated rural economies for centuries. As the demand for imported goods expanded, rural populations became increasingly dependent on capitalistic markets. While these early markets were ultimately guided by the capitalistic modes of production operating in New England’s urban centers, they included those outlying areas, such as Suffield, which were embedded in traditional, non-capitalistic organizational forms (Wolf 1997:296-307). Through their own influence and that of their goods, merchants altered the organization of labor for these producing communities (Wolf 1997:120; Gudeman 1978). Traditional producers were forced to confront the reduction in their ability to “control their means of production, especially as widening exchange eroded their ability to reproduce these means through the mechanisms of kinship or power” (Wolf 1997:306-307).
Lessons from Oliver Phelps

Throughout his tenure in Suffield Phelps’ maintained multiple societal roles including that of merchant, land speculator, politician, and local exchange-network member. These roles overlapped, ultimately allowing him a number of privileges. Not only did he have access to all levels of society, he also had immediate access to fashionable items that were being used to articulate social and economic status. While merchants gave the general impression of possessing an attitude of social equivalence, economic and political elites were “the custodians of restricted exchange, fixed commodity systems, and established tastes and sumptuary customs” (Appadurai 1986:33 [emphasis added]). As both merchant and politician, Oliver Phelps was able to dominate the economic scene of late eighteenth-century Suffield. These roles combined with his personal relationships in town, allowing Phelps to operate on two levels – one the kin-based social environment of late eighteenth century Suffield, the second New England’s expanding economic and political arena.

By birth, upbringing, profession, and lifestyle, Phelps was outside the greater Suffield society. As a young adult, Phelps evidently knew that he could never satisfy his own ambition among those who could only see him as an inferior. In the new setting of Granville, Massachusetts Phelps thrived, making a name for himself both in business and politics. There must have been a measure of satisfaction on his part to finally return to Suffield, to the same families who had known him only as an indentured servant. While Oliver Phelps had undergone a dramatic transformation during the two proceeding decades, Suffield had remained relatively in stasis. Upon his return, Phelps not only purchased one of the grandest homes in town, he immediately doubled its size, undoubtedly impressing some and inciting the resentment of others.
Once back in Suffield, Phelps fell into the pattern originally laid out for him by his fictive-kin group, exchanging surplus foodstuffs for business-related labor. As a member of Suffield’s wealth group, Phelps traded with rather than for dietary mainstays. Aside from his basic subsistence, Phelps used cash for most household necessities. While the action of exchanging cash for retail items may sound familiar to us today, the attitude reflected by Phelps’ debt and payment schedule was more akin to approaches taken during his own lifetime. The seasonal nature of agrarian life laid the groundwork for the locally based exchange economy. The time-lag between the physical act of planting crops or breeding livestock and the final extraction and use of these products set the stage for the delay most agrarian communities expected between these reciprocal exchanges. Farmers would become indebted to each other and would pay these debts as the agricultural seasons permitted (Ingold 1983:566).

The pattern of delayed payment was the accepted, expected form of economic interaction within rural agrarian communities. Phelps operated under these expectations. However, his use of the system often fell outside his neighbors’ general designs in that his multiple societal roles allowed him the opportunity to use money borrowed under traditional arrangements for financial rather than agrarian interests. Phelps evidently took advantage of the delayed payment schedule, borrowing money, investing it, often in land ventures, and repaying the original sum only after his own profits were gleaned. This does not necessarily imply any malicious intent on his part, rather it demonstrates his opportunistic eye for business.

By operating in such a manner Phelps distinguished himself from his neighbors. Most Suffield residents worked in conjunction with each other – the trading advantage passing back and forth between economic partners. As Phelps’ payment schedule fell within the expected parameters of agrarian exchange, his economic methods did not initially cause any alarm. However, as his personal display of wealth grew, so did the
length of his payment schedule. This must have seemed a bitter irony to his Suffield
creditors, perhaps acting as a causal factor in the devastating nature of his economic fall
in the early nineteenth century.

**Summation**

A rising commercial orientation ultimately contributed to the erosion of lineage as
the main expression of social organization, as kin dependants give way to wage earners
(Meillassoux 1978:167-168; Bowen 1990). The shift in the agrarian labor system
reflected changes in the social realm. Decisions and actions, both inside and outside the
financial world, became increasingly independent of community ties (Counihan
1997:283). This was seen as both a burden and a blessing to those directly involved. The
commercial economy offered more choices not only in what to buy, but in how to make a
living. However, the control over basic staples was ultimately turned over to wealthy
owners, rather than to the original producers (Wolf 1997:354; Gudeman 1978:137-140).
The breakdown of socially-based economies led to the disintegration of the safety nets
that had been provided through these mutually beneficial relationships. This culminated
in the early part of this century when government institutions officially took over the task
of aiding households in need.

In the late eighteenth century, Suffield’s system of community sufficiency was
just beginning to make room for cash-based mercantilism. This change emanated from
forces outside the immediate area. While Suffield had existed for several decades on the
margins of capitalism, it was not until the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries
that these economic practices began to make their way into Suffield’s domestic arena.
Surely, Oliver Phelps was influential in this shift, through his own mercantile ventures,
through his instrumentation in getting wealthy Suffield families to invest their money and
their trust in his land speculating ventures, and probably through his own ostentatious lifestyle.

To many, Oliver Phelps' quick financial rise, followed by his devastating fall, probably served as a warning against the temptations of the coming era. Though to others, his opulence and reportedly boundless energy must have appeared as a tantalizing window into their own future possibilities. Oliver Phelps was a man in two worlds. Domestically, Phelps operated in much the same way as his wealthy Suffield neighbors, using the same set of assumptions and exchanging within like socioeconomic boundaries. The roles he played in New England's political, economic, and social arenas, however, demonstrate his versatility and potential adaptability to the new forms of economic thinking washing over the rural communities of the northeast. And while his final days were spent repenting for his financial sins, the values behind his rise to fortune are a part of everyone who has accepted this nation's current economic system.
APPENDIX: FAUNAL ANALYSIS
Site Specific History

The current Hatheway House lot consists of all or part of three ca. 1670 land divisions (Gradie 1993: 7). Over the following ninety years, these lots were reshaped and resold. Around 1761 Abraham Burbank constructed a central chimney two story house with a gabled roof on the lot. It is believed that this house was constructed for Abraham’s son Shem Burbank.

In 1788 Shem Burbank sold the house to Oliver Phelps. During the Phelps’ occupation, the house was altered and enlarged. By the end of this occupation it was roughly doubled in size. Phelps abandoned the house ca. 1801/2. It is unclear who owned the house for the next seven to eight years, but is believed that the State of Connecticut repossessed the house for unpaid taxes as of Oliver Phelps’ death in 1809.

In 1810 the state of Connecticut sold the house to Asahel Hatheway, Sr., who in 1816 gave it to his son Asahel, Jr. (Gradie 1993: 8). Asahel Hatheway, Jr. died in 1829, presumably leaving the property to his widow Nancy and possibly to his eldest son Henry. Henry Hatheway died in 1851; Nancy continued to live on the property until her death in 1875. For the following 35 years, the house was occupied by Asahel and Nancy Hatheway’s unmarried daughter Louise and her maid. House alterations continued throughout the Hatheway family’s occupation of the lot.

Louise Hatheway died in 1910 leaving the estate to her doctor. However, due to the opposition of a male cousin, the doctor never received the estate. This unnamed cousin died during the proceedings, and the estate ultimately wound up in the possession of Daniel N. Carrington, a distant relative of Nancy Hatheway. In 1924 Carrington sold the property to Sumner Fuller.

Fuller undertook the renovation of the house. In 1928 Sumner Fuller died leaving the property to his nephew Charles, a minor, with the understanding that his wife Emma would remain resident until her death. Emma remained in Suffield, living in the Hatheway House in the summer months. Upon her death in 1956, the property’s ownership again went into litigation. Charles Fuller had already died and it was not until 1958 that the property was deeded to his sisters. In 1962, the property was given to the Antiquarian and Landmarks Society by the Fuller heirs. Following repairs, the house was opened to the public in 1971.

In the fall of 1992, the Antiquarian and Landmarks Society began an extensive renovation of house. Backhoe excavation revealed a large concentration of artifacts along the foundation wall and the possible remains of garden planting beds on the lawn. Archaeological salvage excavations were immediately begun. Based on the findings from this operation, further excavations were proposed. This proposal was approved in the spring of 1993 and a total of 25 units were opened. All material was removed by stratigraphic level, under the supervision of either Robert Cless or Robert Gradie (Gradie
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1993:12). In the summer of 1995, all recovered bone was pulled from the collection and sent to the Colonial Williamsburg faunal laboratory for analysis.

Robert Gradie’s 1993 site report included an inventory of diagnostic artifacts by stratigraphic unit. Using these descriptions, five temporal contexts have been identified in this site. They are as follows: (1) from ca. 1930 to the time of excavation, (2) ca. 1870-1930, (3) ca. 1820-1870, (4) ca. 1770-1820, and (5) ca. 1770 and earlier. Period 1 accounted for 562 NISP, 81 of which were at least partially identifiable. Period 2 contained only 12 bone fragments. Period 3 contained 735 NISP, 122 of which were at least partially identifiable. The vast majority of bone was recovered from period 4. This collection accounted for 2565 NISP, 366 of which were at least partially identifiable. Period 5 did not contain any bone.

**Methodology**

All faunal remains were identified through direct comparison with known faunal specimens using the zoological comparative collections located in the Colonial Williamsburg faunal laboratory and the Smithsonian Institution Museum Support Center. Bones were first grouped into identifiable and unidentifiable categories. Unidentifiable bones were classified to the nearest possible taxon (ie. fish, amphibian, large mammal, or small mammal), and to element where possible. Identifiable bones were listed in taxonomic order by element, side, location, and tooth type and wear, noting any evident modifications (butchering, gnawing, burning, etc.). Age estimates have been based on size differentiation, the presence/absence of deciduous teeth, and tooth wear.

Zooarchaeologists routinely rely on several different quantification methods as a basis with which to compare the relative import of different species within the diet. Number of individual specimens (NISP), minimum number of individuals (MNI), meat yield, and biomass estimates have all been compiled through the FoxPro CWBONE Version 4.0 computer database system (Brown and Bowen 1995). Each method has benefits and drawbacks. These will be outlined below.

NISP provides a basic ordinal scale of species distribution. Such scaling has several drawbacks. One of the major disadvantages is that smaller or less dense bones tend to fragment into many more pieces than do larger bones. This taphonomic effect has the potential to artificially inflate the relative importance of the taxa that those smaller bones represent. For example, a cow bone and a bird bone submitted to equal post-depositional pressure could result in a cow bone that remains relatively intact but a bird bone broken into dozens of pieces. A simple examination of the NISP could then over estimate the relative importance of bird versus the relative importance of cow in the diet. This method also assumes equal recovery across species and elements and does not account for the reality that smaller bones are often not described or collected in the field due to the simple fact that they slip through the sifting equipment.
Butchery methods can also effect the NISP of a given site. The outer compact layers of long bones are much stronger than the inner cancellous material. Once this inner material has been exposed, the bone deteriorates at a much greater rate. Bones that have been butchered will often degrade at a faster rate than those deposited with the exterior compact bone intact. In this case, the NISP may tend to overestimate the bones of these animals as smaller individuals are more likely to be cooked, consumed, and deposited whole.

MNI counts, first used by Theodore White (1952), cut through many of the problems of NISP. This technique attempts to tease out the absolute minimum number of individuals that could be represented in a given assemblage. This is performed by observing and comparing all of the same elements for each species, and estimating which ones could have come from the same individual based on size differentiation and fusion rates. Findings are then compared across elements within a given species to arrive at the minimum number of animals represented. This allows one to compare the relative importance of each taxa and therefore how much meat is represented (White 1952; Grayson 1979).

Like NISP, the MNI technique does not get around the problems of differential preservation or differing recovery methods. It also does not discuss the relative significance of different species to the overall diet. However, the primary problem with this method is that of aggregation. MNI values vary depending upon the grouping techniques utilized; a zooarchaeologist is dependent upon the excavating archaeologist for this compilation. MNI is critically dependent on sample size. Small samples will lead to an exaggeration of low-represented species. Only through large assemblages can any statistical results be viable (Grayson 1984; Reitz and Scarry 1985, Wing and Brown 1979). MNI, like NISP, is of ordinal value only.

Once MNI has been calculated, this measure of abundance can be used to estimate the meat weight that would have been associated with those specimens. There are problems associated with calculating meat weight, primarily because meat weight figures currently available are based on average live weight or average meat weight as taken from modern individuals. These calculations are, as stated, averages and do not take into account individual variation in animal size due to stature, seasonal fluctuation of weight, or which body parts are considered edible (Needs-Howarth 1996:96). While these figures allow examinations to be made on relative distributions of meat weight, this does not provide accurate estimates for the actual meat consumed, or the actual non-dietary contributions of a given taxa. Possibly its biggest problem, particularly within historical contexts, is that it does not account for the occurrence of a single cut of meat. With this method a single fragment of bone is equated with the usable meat for an entire animal.

Biomass estimates use bone weight, rather than MNI counts, as the base for the calculation. An individual's skeleton changes as the individual grows. Bone mass initially increases faster than body mass. Once the skeleton reaches its adult size, the
body mass continues in the short term to increase, eventually leveling off. The biomass technique recognizes the allometric relationship between bone weight and body weight, and as a result, is a vital innovation to zooarchaeological research (Reitz et al 1987; Reitz 1992). However, because biomass uses bone weight in its calculations, it can become skewed by a high proportion of dense bones that support little meat, such as large mammal metapodials.

Each of the available quantification methods has strengths and weaknesses. MNI and meat weight calculations are particularly vulnerable to low sample sizes. While over four thousand bones were recovered from the Hatheway House, only about 15% could be identified to species. This led to a site-wide MNI count of only 35. Even the largest assemblage within this collections, that of the Phelps occupation, had an MNI total of only 19, far too small to be statistically reliable (Grayson 1984; Reitz and Scarry 1985, Wing and Brown 1979). Biomass totals, on the other hand, are particularly useful in cases where MNI estimates are low. In showing the estimated kilograms of meat available based on the weight of bones recovered, biomass avoids the problem of aggregation and sample size.

Small sample sizes are a common problem for all archaeologists, both generalists and specialists. Limited assemblages are often the only remaining evidence of an otherwise unknowable past. The only way around this problem is to continue to search for and excavate new sites and to try to glean all the information we can reasonably attain from the available ones. This requires archaeologists to make judgement calls on what is “reasonable” and to carefully select those methods that will most closely reflect past lifeways. For this faunal assemblage, MNI and meat weight calculations have a greater chance of providing a skewed picture of past activities. While their totals have been presented in the following tables, only the biomass and NISP totals have been used for interpretive purposes.

**Faunal Analysis**

A total of 4221 bone fragments were recovered from the grounds surrounding the Hatheway House. Unfortunately, only 635 were identified to the species level. Fish, amphibians, birds, and mammals were all represented in this assemblage. Of the 702 fish bones recovered, only 3 were partially identifiable. The following species were identified: catfish (Family *Ictaluridae*), codfish (Family *Gadidae*), and perch-like fish (Order *Perciformes*). Only a single turtle fragment was recovered, this bone resembled that of a wood turtle (cf. *Clemmys insculpta*). One hundred and fifty bird bones were recovered, 75 of which were identified to species. Species identified include: Canada goose (*Branta canadensis*), chicken (*Gallus gallus*), ruffed grouse (*Bonasa umbellus*), robin (*Turdus migratorius*), and unidentified duck (Duck spp.). Of the 2193 mammal
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* Twenty-six bones identified as bird or small mammal are included in this count.
bones recovered, 559 were identified to species. Ten different species were identified in this collection: squirrel (Family Sciuridae), woodchuck (Marmota monax), Old World rat (Rattus spp.), Norway rat (Rattus norvegicus), domestic cat (Felis domesticus), horse or ass (Equus spp.), pig (Sus scrofa), white-tailed deer (Odocoileus virginianus), cow (Bos taurus), sheep/goat (Ovis aries/Capra hircus), and human (Homo sapiens).

While humans continually act upon and deposit bone artifacts, indigenous species often occur naturally in the same assemblage. Intrusive faunal remains continue to be a problem for zooarchaeologists. The historical archaeologist has a slight advantage in this situation. Historical cookbooks, account books, and even traveler’s journals can provide insight into the varieties of animals being consumed, as well as information about what species are not considered edible (Jolley 1983; McMahon 1981). Species may be considered forbidden for a variety of reasons. Religious restrictions, such as that against shellfish for practicing Jews; personification of a species, as when an animal is a family pet; or the general social conception of a species as unclean, for example mice or insects in modern Western society, can all be powerful motivators against certain otherwise edible species. The absence of butcher marks, completeness of the skeleton, and any lack of heat exposure can also provide clues as to the question of which species are naturally occurring. Those species that have been determined to be intrusive for this analysis are the robin, rat, horse, and cat.

Butchering and taphonomic data were retrieved through direct observation. Taphonomy involves all processes that act upon faunal remains between the time they are part of a living animal until they are examined through zooarchaeological analysis (Gifford 1981). Butchering is a form of taphonomy. However, unlike rodent gnawing or soil acidity, butcher marks are the direct result of human interaction with an animal, and, as such, have the potential to offer much in the way of anthropological data. This will be discussed further in the butchery section of this report.

Carnivore and/or rodent activity played only a slight role in the taphonomy of this assemblage. 0.5% of the bone recovered from the Hatheway House exhibited carnivore gnaw marks. Bones scared by rodent scavenging amounted to only 0.3%. Both of these types of animal activity were scattered randomly through the assemblages identified in this excavation. Extensive exposure to either carnivore or rodent scavenging can wreck havoc on a faunal collection, leading to an underrepresentation of smaller or thinner bones with a corresponding overrepresentation of heavier, thicker bones (Gifford 1981). The small percentage of chewed material recovered from the Hatheway House is a positive signal that this site has not been severely disturbed by scavenging animals.

**Period 1: ca 1930 - 1993**

Only bird and mammal were represented in the period 1 assemblage. The NISP for bird was 22. A minimum of two individuals were represented: one chicken and one
goose. The total meat weight for these individuals was 9.5 pounds, and the biomass totaled 0.352 kg.

The mammal NISP for period 1 was 373, however, only 71 fragments could be identified to species. Squirrel and woodchuck were each singly represented, four cat and five rat bones were recovered, as well as seven sheep/goat, 24 pig, and 29 cow bones. These bones represented an MNI of 10, accounting for 1125 pounds of meat weight and 22.114 kg of biomass.

Of the food-related mammal species (pig, cow, sheep/goat, squirrel, and woodchuck), a total of 60 fragments of bone were recovered. 48.3% of this total was cow (n=29), 40.0% was pig (n=24), and 11.7% was sheep/goat (n=7). Seven individuals were represented by these species: two pig, two sheep/goat, and three cow. Cow accounted for 75.9% of the meat weight (850 pounds.), while pig made up 17.9% (200 pounds.), followed by sheep/goat with 6.2% (70 pounds.). The biomass calculations show similar proportions. Cow represents 76.1% of the biomass for these three species (9.201 kg), pig accounted for 14.1% of biomass (1.701 kg), and sheep/goat represented 9.2% (1.108 kg). Squirrel and woodchuck were each singly represented. It is unknown if these species represent dietary patterns, or if they are an example of the intrusive local fauna [Table 3].

**Table 3: Period 1 (ca. 1930 - 1995)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAXA</th>
<th>NISP</th>
<th>MNI</th>
<th>MEAT WEIGHT</th>
<th>BIOMASS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cow</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>9.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1.701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep/Goat</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squirrel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodchuck</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1120</td>
<td>12.077</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Period 2: ca. 1870 - 1930**

Twelve fragments of bone were recovered from the period 2 assemblage. Only a single bone could be identified to species. This species was chicken [Table 9, at the end of Appendix].

**Period 3: ca. 1820 - 1870**

Seven hundred and thirty-five bone fragments were recovered from the period 3 assemblage. Fish, bird, and mammal were all represented, with a total MNI of 15, 1362.5 pounds of meat weight, and 38.279 kg of biomass.

---

* See Table 8 at the end of Appendix for a full summary of Period 1 faunal remains.
Ninety-eight fish bones were recovered, however, these were all unidentifiable spine fragments. They represented 0.8% biomass for the period 3 assemblage (0.326 kg).

Birds were represented by 38 individual specimens. Chicken accounted for 23 of these fragments, with a MNI of 3. Chicken represented 7.5 pounds of meat weight and 0.215 kg of biomass. Other birds identified were swan/goose/duck (Family Anatidae), and grouse/partridge/pheasant (Family Phasianidae).

A total of 451 mammal bone fragments were recovered. Species included rat, pig, deer, cow, and sheep/goat. Of the food-related species, cow made up 52.1% of the NISP (n=51), followed by pig with 40.8% (n=40). Sheep/goat represented only 6.1% of food-related species (n=6), while deer accounted for only 1.0% (n=1). Ten individuals were represented by these remains. Pig and sheep/goat each accounted for three individuals, representing 300 and 105 pounds of meat weight respectively. Three cows were identified, two adults and one veal calf, together comprising 850 pounds of meat weight. Only a single deer was identified. This individual accounted for 100 pounds of meat weight. Cow represented 78.0% of biomass (17.167 kg) for these four species. Pig followed with 15.7% (3.463 kg). Sheep/goat represented 4.8% (1.060 kg), while deer made up only 1.5% (0.328 kg) of the biomass for the food related mammal species [Table 4].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAXA</th>
<th>NISP</th>
<th>MNI</th>
<th>MEAT WEIGHT</th>
<th>BIODIV</th>
<th>BIOMASS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cow</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>17.167</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>3.463</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep/Goat</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1.060</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1355</td>
<td>22.018</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Period 4: ca. 1770 - 1820**

More bone was recovered from period 4 than from any other temporal context. The NISP was 2565. Fish, amphibians, birds, and mammals were all represented.

Over 600 fragments of fish bone were recovered from this context. Unfortunately only two could be identified. The catfish family and codfish were each represented. A single wood turtle bone was also recovered.

The following bird species were identified: Canada goose, duck, chicken, ruffed grouse, and robin. These species made for an MNI of six. Discounting the robin as a

* See Table 10 at the end of Appendix for a full summary of Period 3 faunal remains.
food source, the following breakdown can be observed. Chicken dominated the assemblage comprising 88.5% (n=23) of the avian NISP. Goose, duck, and ruffed grouse each represented 3.8% (n=1 each). While goose was only singly represented, it comprised 44.5% (6 pounds) of the meat weight for food-related bird species. Chicken followed with 37.0% (5 pounds.). Duck represented 14.8% (2 pounds.), and the grouse followed with 3.7% (0.5 pounds.). The biomass calculations show a different proportion, however. Chicken represented 85.1% biomass (0.206 kg), while goose represented only 9.1% (0.022 kg). Duck followed with 3.7% (0.009 kg), and grouse with 2.1% (0.005 kg) [Table 5]. Based on the extremely low MNI totals, the biomass estimates are considered more accurate representations of the diet for this assemblage.

**Table 5: Period 4 Birds (ca. 1770 - 1820)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAXA</th>
<th>NISP</th>
<th>MNI</th>
<th>MEAT WEIGHT</th>
<th>BIOMASS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicken</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duck</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruffed Grouse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>0.242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eight different mammal species were identified in the period 4 assemblage. Squirrel, woodchuck, and horse/ass were each singly represented. Thirteen rat bones were identified, as were 25 sheep/goat bone fragments. Pig was represented by an NISP of 140, cow with an NISP of 150. Three human teeth were also recovered within this context. A minimum of three pigs were identified making for a total meat weight of 300 pounds. (18.5% of the food-related species). A minimum of two sheep/goat individuals were identified comprising a total meat weight of 70 pounds (4.3%). A total of four cows were identified, three adults and a single veal calf. Together these accounted for 1250 pounds of meat weight, making up 77.2% of the meat weight for food-related species. Biomass calculations reflected similar proportions. Cow made up 73.4% of the biomass for these three species (33.864 kg), pig comprised 20.3% (9.374 kg), while sheep/goat only accounted for 6.2% (2.843 kg) [Table 6]. It is unknown if the squirrel and woodchuck bones represent dietary refuse or intrusive local fauna.

* See Table 11 at the end of Appendix for a full summary of Period 4 faunal remains.
Table 6: Period 4 (ca. 1770 - 1820)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAXA</th>
<th>NISP</th>
<th>MNI</th>
<th>MEAT WEIGHT</th>
<th>BIOMASS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cow</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>33.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>9.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep/Goat</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squirrel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodchuck</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td>315</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>46.097</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Butchery

Butchery data can be an extremely useful indicator of human interaction with the animal kingdom. The analysis of butcher marks can demonstrate the nature of the meat diet, such as preferred cuts and preparation methods. Specialty cuts of meat, such as small individual-size portions, are typically the result of professional butchering, while the presence of large butchered bones, or butchered axial elements (elements along the spine), are often indicative of home or on-site butchering. This information can come in the form of observable marks or scars on the artifacts, or written descriptions of butchery practices. Both points of reference have been considered here.

While direct observation of artifacts provides specific information about the assemblage, historic documentation of butchery practices can provide a base from which to interpret this data. Several documents were located that diagram late eighteenth through early twentieth century butchering patterns (Hazen 1846; Mess 1843; Periam 1984; Stephens 1851). These references demonstrate how animal carcasses were processed and what clues these processes might have left behind.

Three types of butchery scars were identified in this collection: knife marks, hack marks, and saw marks. Knife marks are generally shallow, straight cuts into the bone, usually made with a slicing motion during activities such as skinning or meat removal. Hack marks are usually attributable to a cleaver or ax and represent the striking of the bone with a sharp edge. This can be used during the initial stages of butchery, including the dividing and quartering of a carcass, or during later stages as roasts and soup bones are pulled for cooking. Saws leave straight, serrated scars running roughly perpendicular to the bone. Like hacking, sawing can represent anything from the dividing and quartering of a carcass to the removal of single-meal portions. Unlike hacking, however, saws allow for careful, precise cutting, making it possible to remove individual steaks from the larger meat cut.

* See Table 11 at the end of Appendix for a full summary of Period 4 faunal remains.
The late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries witnessed a shift in the local domestic economy throughout the entire middle-Atlantic and northeast region. While the market system had been comfortably in place for many years in urban America, the rural townships were just beginning to enjoy regularly accessible imported goods. This ultimately led to a profound shift in how individuals and families provided for themselves and their dependents. Early manifestations of the coming changes came in the form of professional merchants and tradesmen. These individuals operated by performing as a business tasks that had typically been part of everyone’s household chores. Up until the early twentieth century, slaughtering and butchering were generally accomplished by the same household that bred and raised the animal. This is particularly true for rural areas.

Commercialized butcher shops have been a part of the urban landscape for hundreds of years, however, it was not until the late eighteenth to early nineteenth century that professional meat cutters began setting up shop in the rural townships along the northeastern coast. Up to that point, livestock was typically slaughtered and butchered domestically and then distributed throughout the socially- or physically-immediate community (Bowen 1990). Professional butchers had the advantage of being able to provide specialty cuts of meat thus eliminating the question of what to do with the less desirable portions. Families could choose to purchase the meatiest pieces, or even individual steaks.

It is believed that professional butchers used different techniques and tools from their domestic counterparts:

Butchering techniques were changed by professional butchers working in a highly commercialized meat production and distribution system.... Whatever the vehicle for these changes, the association of sawing with commercialized butchering in the United States is clear. (Bowen and Manning 1994: 9.27)

There are several avenues available to zooarchaeologists examining professional vs. household butchering. One is the dominance of meaty cuts over the more boney areas. The second is the presence of individual or steak-sized cuts. The third is the dominance of saw marks over chops or hacks, particularly in the primary and secondary butchering phases.

In examining the butcher marks observed in the Hatheway House assemblage, a marked contrast becomes clear, particularly during the first half of the nineteenth century. The trend away from axe or cleaver butchering and towards the use of a saw is obvious [Table 7].
In the period 1 assemblage (ca. 1930 - present), thirty-six bones showed evidence of butchery. Of this 33.3% (n=12) had been hacked, while 58.3% (n=21) had been sawn. Only two bones from period 2 (ca. 1870 - 1930) showed any evidence of butchery. One bone had been sawn, while another showed only shallow cut marks. Seventy bones from period 3 (ca. 1820 - 1870) showed evidence of butchery. 40% (n=28) had been hacked, while 57.1% (n=40) had been sawn. In the period 4 assemblage (ca. 1770 - 1820), butchered bone numbered 121. Hacked bone accounted for 90.1% (n=109), while sawn bone accounted for only 9.1% (n=11).

The most striking difference is between the period 3 and period 4 assemblages. During the early nineteenth century many New England towns underwent a revolution in consumerism. The domestic economy was being rewritten from one focused on household sufficiency and reliance upon neighbors and kin to one based on cash exchanges. The network of food sharing was breaking down in favor of relationships with professional butchers.

Throughout the northeast, a steady increase in population led to the rise of the commercial market place. Even “traditional” farmers were drawn into selling their surplus for profit. The increased availability of goods was associated with increased purchases. Farmers would go to market to sell their surplus and would inevitably pick up consumer goods themselves (Parkerson 1995: 7-12). A recognizable market economy had emerged in the urban centers of New England by the middle of the eighteenth century. Most farmers were not full participants, though a majority had occasional contact with markets. In the early nineteenth century, rural New England farmers began moving toward this economy. By mid-century most were producing a marketable surplus (Parkerson 1995:55-6).

**Conclusions**

In early nineteenth century Suffield, the upsurge of a commercial economy began to overshadow the local exchange networks that had been operating successfully for over one hundred years. In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century a form of community-sufficiency provided the populace with meat and dairy products. However, the consumer revolution of the middle nineteenth century heralded a drastic change to this system. In general, the butchery information retrieved from this assemblage support this shift. Between the first and second halves of the nineteenth century, the butchery scars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME PERIOD</th>
<th>BUTCHED</th>
<th>HACKED</th>
<th>SAWN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (1930 - 1993)</td>
<td>36 (12%)</td>
<td>12 (33.3%)</td>
<td>21 (58.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (1870 - 1930)</td>
<td>2 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (50.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (1820 - 1870)</td>
<td>70 (28%)</td>
<td>28 (40.0%)</td>
<td>40 (57.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (1770 - 1820)</td>
<td>121 (109)</td>
<td>109 (90.1%)</td>
<td>11 (9.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
identified shifted from those generally associated with domestic production, and those often indicative of professional butchering. While further research needs to be conducted on other rural New England domestic sites, the change exhibited in the Hatheway House assemblage offers a glimpse into these shifting economic conditions.
## Table 8: Period 1, Summary of Faunal Remains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class Aves (Bird)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Aves/Mammalia III (Bird/Small Mammal)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Anatidae (Swan, Goose, or Duck)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anser spp. (Goose)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallus gallus (Chicken)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf. Gallus gallus (Chicken)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Mammalia (Mammal)</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.558</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Mammalia I (Large Mammal)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.234</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Mammalia II (Medium Mammal)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.649</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Mammalia III (Small Mammal)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Sciuridae (Squirrel)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marmota monax (Woodchuck)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rattus spp. (Old World Rat)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felis domesticus (Domestic Cat)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order Artiodactyla I (Sheep, Goat, Deer, or Pig)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order Artiodactyla II (Sheep, Goat, or Deer)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.374</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sus scrofa (Domestic Pig)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>1.470</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf. Sus scrofa (Domestic Pig)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bos taurus (Domestic Cow)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>850.0</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf. Bos taurus (Domestic Cow)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.201</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovis aries (Domestic Sheep)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf. Ovis aries (Domestic Sheep)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.583</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovis aries/Capra hircus (Domestic Sheep or Goat)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep or Goat</td>
<td>cf. Ovis aries/Capra hircus (Domestic Sheep or Goat)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subphylum Vertebrata (Other)</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 8 (Continued): Period 1, Summary of Faunal Remains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vertebrate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1134.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>22.476</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 9: Period 2, Summary of Faunal Remains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class Aves (Bird)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Aves/Mammalia III (Bird/Small Mammal)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallus gallus (Chicken)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Mammalia (Mammal)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Mammalia I (Large Mammal)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Mammalia II (Medium Mammal)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order Artiodactyla I (Sheep, Goat, Deer, or Pig)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Osteichthyes (Bony Fish)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Aves (Bird)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Aves/Mammalia III (Bird/Small Mammal)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Anatidae (Swan, Goose, or Duck)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Phasianidae (Grouse, Partridge, or Pheasant)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallus gallus (Chicken)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf. Gallus gallus (Chicken)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Mammalia (Mammal)</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.711</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Mammalia I (Large Mammal)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.564</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Mammalia II (Medium Mammal)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.612</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf. Class Mammalia II (Medium Mammal)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Mammalia III (Small Mammal)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rattus spp. (Old World Rat)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order Artiodactyla I (Sheep, Goat, Deer, or Pig)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order Artiodactyla II (Sheep, Goat, or Deer)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sus scrofa (Domestic Pig)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>300.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>3.399</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf. Sus scrofa (Domestic Pig)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odocoileus virginianus (White-Tailed Deer)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bos taurus (Domestic Cow)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>850.0</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>16.751</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf. Bos taurus (Domestic Cow)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovis aries (Domestic Sheep)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovis aries/Capra hircus (Domestic Sheep or Goat)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subphylum Vertebrata (Other Vertebrate)</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals                                                | 735  | 100.0 | 14 | 1  | 15 | 100.0 | 1362.5      | 100.0 | 38.279       | 100.0 |
## TABLE 11: Period 4, Summary of Faunal Remains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class Osteichthyes (Bony Fish)</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order Siluriformes (Sea Catfish or Pout)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Gadidae (Codfish)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf. Clemmys insculpta (Wood Turtle)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Aves (Bird)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Aves/Mammalia III (Bird/Small)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branta canadensis (Canada Goose)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duck spp. (Duck)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Phasianidae (Grouse, Partridge, or Pheasant)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallus gallus (Chicken)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf. Gallus gallus (Chicken)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonasa umbellus (Ruffed Grouse)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turdus migratorius (Robin)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Mammalia (Mammal)</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.155</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Mammalia I (Large Mammal)</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.505</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf. Class Mammalia I (Large Mammal)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Mammalia II (Medium Mammal)</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.960</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf. Class Mammalia II (Medium Mammal)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Mammalia III (Small Mammal)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order Rodentia (Rodent)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Sciuridae (Squirrel)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marmota monax (Woodchuck)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rattus spp. (Old World Rat)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rattus norvegicus (Norway Rat)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Canidae (Dog, Wolf, or Fox)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equus spp. (Horse or Ass)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>400.0</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order Artiodactyla (Even-Toed)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ungulate)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order Artiodactyla I (Sheep, Goat, Deer, or Pig)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sus scrofa (Domestic Pig)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>300.0</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>9.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf. Sus scrofa (Domestic Pig)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bos taurus (Domestic Cow)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>1250.0</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>32.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf. Bos taurus (Domestic Cow)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovis aries (Domestic Sheep)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovis aries/Capra hircus (Domestic Sheep or Goat)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bos taurus/Equus sp. (Domestic Cow, Horse, or Ass)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf. Homo sapiens (Human)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subphylum Vertebrata (Other Vertebrate)</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>2565</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2045.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>72.291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRIMARY SOURCES
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