

Field Notes:
A Journal of Collegiate Anthropology

Volume 11

Field Notes:
A Journal of Collegiate Anthropology

Volume 11

Number 1

May 2021

Published by the Anthropology Student Union (ASU)
at the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee, USA

Editor-in-Chief

Ann S. Eberwein

Editors

Ashley Brennaman

Heather Brinkman

Cody Schumacher

Jessica Skinner

Editorial Committee

Karissa Annis	Laya Liebeseller
Bill Balco	Ciaran McDonnell
Sarah Boncal	Cheri Price
Josh Driscoll	Joshua Rivers
Adrienne Frie	Katherine Santell
Kevin Gartski	Katrina Schmidt
Dominic Greenlee	Tony Schultz
Alexis Jordan	

Faculty Advisor

Dr. Bettina Arnold

Cover Design

Ann S. Eberwein

Artist Credit: Sandip Dey - Cave Temple 3,
Badami, Karnataka, India.

[https://commons.wikimedia.org/
w/index.php?curid=21450082](https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?curid=21450082)

Field Notes: A Journal of Collegiate Anthropology
University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee
Department of Anthropology
3413 N Downer Ave
390 Sabin Hall
Milwaukee WI 53211 USA
414.229.4175
fldnotes@uwm.edu
<https://dc.uwm.edu/fieldnotes/>

Table of Contents

About the Contributors	7
Articles	
Head Strong: Gendered Analysis of Human Representations in Western and Central Continental European Iron Age Iconography <i>Christopher R. Allen</i> , University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, USA	10
The Journey of a Hopewell Site Artifact: Bear Canine with Inlaid Pearl at the Milwaukee Public Museum <i>Katrina Schmitz</i> , University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, USA	30
Casas Grandes Ceramics at the Milwaukee Public Museum <i>Samantha A. Bomkamp</i> , University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, USA	50
Digging Through Space: Archaeology in the <i>Star Wars</i> Franchise <i>Karissa Annis</i> , University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, USA	66
Waking the Dead, Speaking to the Living: The Display of Human Remains in Museums <i>Emily R. Stanton</i> , University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, USA	90

About the Contributors

Christopher Allen is an Anthropology Master's student at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. His research is focused on gender and status expressions in Iron Age European iconography. He is also involved in museum studies and experimental archaeology research. His overall interest is in religious/cosmological ideologies, power structures, gender studies, and iconography.

Karissa Annis is pursuing her Master's degree in Anthropology at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, in addition to a graduate certificate in museum studies. She received her BA in Classics and Anthropology from the University of Alabama in 2018. Her research interests include European archaeology, mortuary archaeology, historic cemeteries, and media studies. She is currently writing her thesis, which is focused on the intersection of past and present found in archaeological themes in popular culture.

Samantha A. Bomkamp finished her MS in anthropology at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee in May 2020 with certificates in Museum Studies and Nonprofit Management. She has done archaeology and museum work in the Midwest and Southwest. Her thesis research and interests are focused in the Southwest region, especially in museum collections management. She currently works at the Blackwater Draw Museum at Eastern New Mexico University.

Katrina N Schmitz received her Master of Science in Anthropology and a Graduate Certificate in Museum Studies from the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee in 2020. Her master's thesis was an analysis of the Milwaukee Public Museum's Hopewell site collection from Ross County, Ohio. She is pursuing a career in the museum field .

Emily R. Stanton is an Anthropology PhD candidate at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. She is currently writing her dissertation on gendered grave goods and elite burials in Iron Age Central Europe. Emily is also involved in an experimental archaeology project focused on re-creating a set of Iron Age grave goods. More about this project can be found here: <https://experiarchaeuwm.wixsite.com/deathmetal>.

The Journey of a Hopewell Site Artifact: Bear Canine with Inlaid Pearl at the Milwaukee Public Museum

Katrina Schmitz

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, USA

Abstract: The archaeological excavations conducted by Warren K. Moorehead at the Hopewell site of Ross County, Ohio resulted in the removal of hundreds of thousands of ancient Native American objects. Crafted during the Middle Woodland Period, these objects began a new life in the late 19th century as archaeological artifacts divided into smaller museum collections that were shipped throughout the world. Guided by Arjun Appadurai and Igor Kopytoff's biographical approaches to museum objects, this article will follow the experiences of one of the Hopewell site artifacts, a bear tooth with an inlaid pearl. Discussed in this article is the creation, original usage, discovery, movement, exhibition, and modern evaluation of this object. Although the focus is on a single object, the story of the bear tooth with an inlaid pearl is a mechanism for understanding the shared experiences of the entire collection and other artifacts collected in the late 19th century.

Keywords: archaeology, museums, Ohio Hopewell, object biography

Introduction

Within the hundreds of drawers containing archaeological materials in the Milwaukee Public Museum's (MPM) collection, is a single drawer of artifacts excavated by Warren K. Moorehead from the Hopewell site of Ross County, Ohio. This elaborate and massive mortuary and ceremonial earthwork site is important to archaeologists as it has been used to identify an expansive ancient Native American cultural horizon now referred to as Hopewell. The Hopewellian Cultural Horizon occurred during the Middle Woodland Period from 100 BCE to 500 CE, and spread through the Eastern Woodlands and Plains of North America. In the MPM's Hopewell site collection, amongst the green oxidized copper ear spoons, shining black obsidian blades, and intricately carved faunal bone fragments, is a bear canine tooth with an inlaid pearl (MPM number: A 49107/16082). Although it is small (less than 10 cm in length), this artifact contains within it a larger story about the individuals who created it, and its experiences. This article utilizes a biographical approach to tell the story, journey, and changing state of this object.

Biographical approaches follow the theories presented by Arjun Appadurai and Igor Kopytoff in *The Social Life of Things* (1986). Kopytoff con-

sidered objects as having lives like humans, which could be investigated and described through a biographical approach. Cultural biographies describe the ways in which meaning and states of objects could change many times during their life (Kopytoff 1986). Similarly, Appadurai (1986) saw objects as possessing social lives that could express their changing nature, including the general deterioration of object materials and the commodification of objects. One common type of object commodification is easily seen in ethnographic and archaeological objects in museums. These objects have been removed from their original location due to some perceived value, and pushed into the realms of academia, science, or exhibition. Appadurai (2006) argued that ethnographic objects were often stripped of their context and social life to present a specific and compact narrative which a museum wished to convey to its audience. Object stories are often minimized and highly edited to create a compact narrative that is easily and quickly read by the museum's audience or researchers. Returning the agency to objects through their social histories and biographies allows recontextualizations, deeper understanding, and innovative viewpoints for the study and understanding of objects now housed in museums (Appadurai 2006).

Although much research has been conducted on the Hopewell site and Hopewellian objects, biographical approaches are not commonly conducted on these materials, and little research has included the Hopewell site collection at the MPM. In using a biographical approach, my goal is to present information on what this object has experienced over time, providing a more holistic understanding of its provenience, and the evolving utilization, meaning, commodification, and interpretation. Although I focus on presenting a single object's story, I am also contextualizing the shared experience of all objects within the MPM's Hopewell site collection, as well as the hundreds of thousands of artifacts removed from the Hopewell site by Moorehead. It should be noted that Moorehead was one of many archaeologists and researchers who have investigated this ancient site, which today forms one of the six sites of the Hopewell Culture National Historical Park. As this article's goal is to present the life story of the bear canine with pearl, attention will be paid largely to Moorehead's archaeological endeavors that affected these objects.

Creation in Ancient Times

The beginnings of the Hopewell cultural horizon occurred around 100 BCE, spreading through the Eastern Woodlands. In the Ohio River Valley region, Native peoples who already lived in the area (referred to as the Adena or Early Woodland groups) chose to expand interactions, intensify earthwork construction, elaborate craftworks, and participate in new activities. These

changes included the construction of earthworks in specific geometric designs, the creation of new designs and object types, and the use of non-local materials on a much larger scale. These exotic materials may have reached Ohio in the hands of locals partaking in long journeys (Spielmann 2009), through trading (Caldwell 1964), or by non-local individuals on pilgrimages to the Hopewell site (Seeman 1979).

Hopewellian peoples are known to have obtained many different types of exotic materials including obsidian collected from Wyoming or Idaho, quartz and mica from the Appalachian Mountains, and Great Lakes region copper (Greber and Ruhl 1989; Lynott 2014). They also procured local materials such as Ohio cherts, sandstone, and animal bones. For the Hopewellian peoples, animals played a significant role symbolically as shapes cut into various objects, and physically as their bones and other parts were used to craft objects and adornments (Greber and Ruhl 1989; Lynott 2004).

Central to this article is a bear canine tooth with an inlaid pearl crafted during the Hopewellian period in southern Ohio (Figure 1). To construct this piece, a Native artist would have begun by obtaining a bear canine tooth. Analysis of the tooth's size, shape, and wear revealed that it is from an adult bear and measures 9.4 cm in length with a worn surface on the exposed enamel and rounding of the tooth's point. Based on descriptions by B.P. Zavatsky (1974, 278), this would place the minimal age of the adult bear at nine years old, as a younger bear would still exhibit a sharp canine point. There are two possible bear species to which this tooth may belong. The American Black Bear's (*Ursus americanus*) habitat would have made it a local predator for the Hopewell peoples of southern Ohio. Meanwhile, the Grizzly Bear (*Ursus arctos*) in ancient North America would have been a more exotic animal prowling as far east as the Great Plains and Hudson Bay Region (Blood 2002). Unfortunately, these two bear species overlap in size and without additional components beyond the canines, the species cannot be determined without destructive DNA sampling of the tooth (Elbroch 2006, 392).

The second component of this object is an inlaid pearl. Visual and comparative analysis of the object determined it was most likely inlaid with a freshwater pearl as it has less luster than a saltwater pearl, with multiple colors and an irregular shape. Historical records indicated that freshwater pearls were present in the nearby Ohio River, however larger quantities of freshwater pearls could be found in the Mississippi or Illinois Rivers (Ohio History Connection 2019). Without further testing it is unknown where the freshwater pearl originated as either option is feasible based on the movement of exotic and local materials to the Hopewell site.



Figure 1: Two views of the Bear canine tooth with pearl object, MPM number: A 49107/16082.

Bears played an important role in Hopewellian iconography. Multiple bear paw shapes cut out of copper were recovered from the Hopewell site and others of this period. From other Hopewellian sites carved pipes were recovered with bear effigies. The design of a bear paw was even etched into a human femur found in Mound 25 of the Hopewell site (Berres, Strothers and Mather 2004; Greber and Ruhl 1989). Beyond iconography, bear regalia may have played a role in Hopewellian ceremonies. A Hopewellian stone figurine recovered from the Newark Earthworks of Ohio depicts an individual wearing a bear mask over their head, and bear claws over their hands. Similar bear regalia is

known to have been in use from the historic to modern period by the Wyandot (Huron), and Munsee Delaware nations during medicinal or health related ceremonies (Berres, Strothers and Mather 2004, 17). Unfortunately, little is known about the meaning or specific use of bear iconography and regalia by Hopewellian peoples beyond ethnographic comparisons.

Bear canine teeth were highly prized by Hopewellian individuals. Over one hundred bear canine teeth were excavated from the Hopewell site (Greber and Ruhl 1989), and Mark Seeman (1979) counted over one thousand bear canines recovered from multiple Hopewellian contexts. Canine teeth were commonly modified by polishing, grinding, and drilling of holes. Some of these holes were filled with pearls, while others were likely used to suspend the tooth on a plant or animal fiber string for adornment. If broken, repairs to these teeth included reattaching pieces of teeth, re-drilling holes, or cutting new shapes (Berres, Strothers and Mather 2004; Greber and Ruhl 1989; Moorehead 1922). Additionally, imitations of bear canines were created from wood, stone, antler, and copper. These imitations were similar in size, shape, and modifications including a few examples with inlaid pearls. Some of these imitations were found in the same burials as real bear canine teeth, demonstrating a similar valuation of the imitations as funerary objects (Moorehead 1922).

After the creation of this bear canine object, it may have been a part of everyday life for this ancient culture. The drilled holes on the tooth allowed for the pearl to be fastened and likely allowed for the object to be suspended as adornment for someone to wear in life, and possibly in death. From MPM provenience documentation it is known that the bear tooth with pearl was interred beside a human burial within the largest mound of the site (Mound 25). The canine tooth with pearl was purposefully placed alongside a human burial of unknown sex or age, oriented with their head facing East (burial 278 of Mound 25). One other bear canine with pearl was found in the burial, along with several perforated bear canines without pearls, and an imitation of a bear's canine made from antler. Near the deceased's head was placed an incised portion of a human femur with a bird design, and near their neck was a pair of shell earpendants. Also laid within the burial were multiple small pearl beads, two copper earspools, and a human finger effigy in cannel coal (Moorehead 1922, 111). The many funerary objects placed within this burial demonstrated a symbolic importance to Hopewellian individuals. These objects, including the bear canine with pearl, were chosen to occupy a place within the constructed cultural landscape of the largest mound and became one of the final possessions for a deceased member of their society.

The Hopewell cultural horizon in southern Ohio declined around 400 CE. The decline of Hopewell and rise of other cultural ideas and groups in the

Late Woodland period likely resulted in different interactions within the cultural landscape of the Hopewell site. Construction of new mounds ceased, ritual activities decreased over time, and the site likely became overgrown with new plant life. If the site had been a destination for pilgrimages, as proposed by Seeman (1979), these trips would have become less frequent as new cultural ideas, landscapes, and beliefs grew in popularity. In the Late Woodland period the only known interactions with the Hopewell site were several interments of deceased individuals added to the previously built mounds. The mortuary practices associated with the burials varied from the earlier Hopewellian practices, demonstrating differing ideas about death, funerary practices, and religious-ritual beliefs. It is likely that the way in which the Hopewell site was viewed by pre-contact Native populations shifted with time. Later, the arrival of Europeans to the Americas dramatically altered the way of life of many Native groups, including those living in the Great Lakes and Eastern Woodlands. Subsequent to European arrival in the Ohio River Valley, the Hopewell site and other cultural landscapes were cleared, plowed, and leveled for use as residential and agricultural lands (Lynott 2014, Moorehead 1922).

Excavation

In 1820, maps and information on the Hopewell site of Ross County was first published by Caleb Atwater, who referred to the site as the North Fork of Paint Creek due to its location. The first scientific excavations of the site were conducted in the 1840s by Ephraim Squier and Edwin Davis, who named the site the Clark's Works mound group (Squier and Davis 1848). Five decades after Squier and Davis' investigations, ownership of the site transferred to Mr. Cloud Hopewell, who utilized the area as farmlands. On September 1, 1891, Warren K. Moorehead began excavations at the site he named Hopewell after the current owner. Moorehead wrote that Mr. Hopewell had, "...kindly allowed the [1891] survey to carry on explorations to an unlimited extent" on his property (Moorehead 1892, vii). Moorehead and his excavation team identified twenty-four mounds at the site and followed Squier and Davis' (1848) numbering system. Moorehead's survey did not follow numerical order but was guided by the discretion and convenience of the excavators (Moorehead 1922, 90).

Squier and Davis (1848) had numbered the largest mound 25, and described it as a trio of mounds, later connected to make one single large effigy. Unlike Squier and Davis (1848), Moorehead (1892, 185) concluded it was a single mound in the shape of a human torso. Excavations of Mound 25 began in late October of 1891, leading Moorehead to conclude it was constructed in two phases, beginning with a hard-baked clay and gravel floor, then a layer (less than ten feet) of soil. Afterwards a second layer of boulders and soil had been added to the center of this mound (Moorehead 1892, 1922). The mound

contained multiple areas with ritual offerings not associated with human burials. Two clay basins were discovered, filled with ceremonial object offerings which showed evidence of burning (Greber and Rulh 1989). Following Squier and Davis (1848), Moorehead (1922) referred to these clay basins as altars.

A total of 102 interred individuals were present within Mound 25, demonstrating an array of mortuary practices. Both cremations and extended burials were present, either being placed in the floor, elevated on gravel layers, lying on wood timbers or mats, and under wooden structures that had collapsed. Alongside these burials were a variety of funerary objects, including the bear canine tooth within burial 278. Moorehead (1922, 111) describes burial 278 as oriented with the head facing east, with an additional incised human femur recovered beside the skull. Other funerary offerings with this burial included, shell ear-pendants, copper ear-ornaments, bear canines, an antler shaped as a bear canine, and a human finger effigy in cancell coal (Moorehead 1922, 111).

Life Post-Excavation: Nineteenth Century

At the end of Moorehead's fieldwork at the Hopewell site he directed the shipping of the recovered artifacts which numbered in the hundreds of thousands (including estimates for individual beads, ceramic sherds, etc.). The bear canine with pearl would have traveled with the Hopewell site collection first to Cambridge, Massachusetts in preparation for the World's Columbian Exposition (WCE) (W. Moorehead to F. Skiff, letter, 11 January 1895, Accession 208 File, Field Museum Anthropology Archives, Chicago). It is likely that the collection was received at Cambridge by Frederic Putnam who was curator of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology at Harvard University (Peabody) in Cambridge. Putnam was also the Director for the WCE Ethnology Department which oversaw the excavations conducted by Moorehead in Ohio. It is unknown what experiences the collection had after arriving in Cambridge around early 1892. It is possible that Putnam and others reviewed pieces of the collection for further documentation, and perhaps worked on designing the layout of exhibit cases for the WCE. Prior to the exposition's opening date on May 1, 1893, most of the artifacts were shipped to Chicago. It is likely that some Hopewellian objects remained in Cambridge for Putnam's assistant Charles Willoughby to study during the run of the WCE, however the number of objects is unknown.

After Cambridge, Moorehead wrote in a letter that the objects were shipped to Chicago, first stopping at the Dairy Building of the WCE (W. Moorehead to F. Skiff, letter, 11 January 1895). Due to the late construction of the Anthropological Building, the Dairy Building served as a temporary stor-

age location for the Hopewell objects. The Dairy building was in the southeastern portion of the WCE grounds (present day Jackson Park, Chicago). A description of the building's plans in 1892 shows it as adjoining the Forestry Building and measuring 100 by 200 feet. The Dairy Building was designed to house dairy tests, butter-making demonstrations, and dairy machinery for the public to witness (World Columbian Exposition, Department Publicity and Promotion 1892).

The Anthropological Building was the final building erected for the WCE, as the Manufactures and Liberal Arts Building was too small to house the ethnographic department's collections (W. B. Conkey Company 1893, 89). Before the opening ceremonies of the exposition, the Hopewell site objects experienced their third move, this time only the short distance between the Dairy Building and the Anthropological Building next door. When finished, the Anthropological Building was 415 by 224 feet, with 105,430 square feet on the ground floor, and an additional 52,804 square feet of second floor galleries. The ground floor contained the Bureau of Charities and Corrections, the Bureau of Sanitation and Hygiene, Archaeological Exhibits, Ethnological Exhibits, and a laboratory of Physical Anthropology (Palmer et al. 1893, 104-05).

The Hopewell site collection presented by Moorehead and Putnam was located on the first floor, near collections from other Ohio ancient sites, including a diorama of Serpent Mound. Countess of Aberdeen, Mrs. Potter Palmer and others wrote in an exposition guidebook detailing the contents of the building. It contained American collections amassed by Putnam and additional collections on loan from State boards, historical societies, and museums (Palmer et al. 1893, 105). While in the Anthropological Building the Hopewell objects would have been prepared for exhibit: probably unpacked from crates, examined and organized, possibly cleaned then placed into exhibit cases. Due to delayed construction, the building was not open to the public until July 4, 1893, two months and three days after the initial opening of the exposition (Hinsley 2016, 50). The prepared exhibit and Hopewell site collection were on public view from July 4th until October 30th, 1893 (Hinsley 2016).

Within a February 1895 letter to Mr. F. J. V. Skiff, Moorehead described from memory the size of the Hopewell collection in storage and on display for the WCE. Within WCE storage Moorehead remembered 122 trays of human skeletons and other items belonging to the Hopewell collection. On display, Moorehead stated that the anthropology building held eight double width cases full of Hopewell site objects, one stone grave reconstruction with a human burial, and one case containing a pile of discs (W. Moorehead to F. Skiff, letter, 29 February 1895, Field Museum Anthropology Archives, Chica-

go). Figure 2 is a photograph taken during the WCE by an assistant to Putnam, Harlan Smith. It is described as the reconstructed grave from southern Ohio, most likely the stone grave reconstruction mentioned by Moorehead. Greber and Ruhl (1989, 3-4) described this image as the Turner site grave, reconstructed by Harlan Smith, with Hopewell site material cases shown in the background of the photograph.



Figure 2: World's Columbian Exposition of 1893 reconstructed stone grave from Southern Ohio (Peabody Museum Collections Online, Peabody number: 47-41-10/99955.1.1).

In his 1922 publication on the Hopewell site, Moorehead reminisces that, “[t]he [Hopewell] exhibits of copper, obsidian, shell, bone, and clay artifacts attracted the attention of thousands of visitors at the Exposition” (80). There are notations that the Hopewell exhibit won several awards at the WCE (Greber and Ruhl 1989), but specific names or listing of these awards has not been uncovered. Over the six months in operation, the WCE welcomed over 25 million visitors (Field Museum 2014).

At the close of the WCE, there were many uncertainties. Putnam had proposed in 1890, that the collections amassed for the exposition should remain in Chicago in public view, forming a new museum (Field Museum 2014). This would not include most exhibits loaned to the WCE from states, historical societies, museums, and other institutions. More than 50,000 objects were donated or purchased at the end of the fair to establish a new museum, including the Hopewell site objects. WCE directors and organizers even transitioned over to the proposed museum, becoming the first board members and curators (Field Museum 2014; Hinsley 2016). In less than two years the site of the

WCE would become the new home of a Chicago museum created to commemorate the fair. The Field Columbian Museum opened to the public on June 2, 1894, housed in the Palace of Fine Arts constructed for the WCE (Field Museum 2019a). However, at the new museum opening, the Hopewell collection-based exhibit had dramatically shrunk in size.

Through the exposition and into 1894, Willoughby of the Peabody worked with a select number of objects from the Hopewell site that likely were not taken to Chicago. Additionally, a large number of Hopewell artifacts from the WCE were shipped back to Cambridge sometime between the fall of 1893 and June 1894. Moorehead mentioned noticing Hopewell objects had begun to disappear from exhibit shelves during the last days of the exposition. Moorehead asked Putnam where the objects had gone, Putnam replying that he had begun to pack some away in his office fearing they would become broken or stolen (W. Moorehead to F. Skiff, letter, 11 January 1895). In a letter to Director Frederick Skiff, Putnam explained that he had taken Hopewell site specimens from the Anthropological Building of the WCE back to Cambridge for further study. Putnam expressed that he wanted some objects for reference while he wrote his final report to the Director General, and additionally would have illustrations drawn of the objects. In the letter Putnam proposes that the drawings should be completed around July of 1894, and that he would ship the objects back to Chicago once his finished writing descriptions (F. Putnam to F. Skiff, letter, 2 June 1894, Field Museum Anthropology Archives, Chicago).

On February 29, 1895, Moorehead expressed concern in a letter that the Field Columbian Museum only possessed two single cases on display and nine trays in storage now mixed with one case worth of Fort Ancient, Ohio materials. This was a shockingly low amount of materials as Moorehead had witnessed eight double width cases, two dioramas, and 122 trays in storage during the WCE. The Hopewellian bead estimate alone demonstrated the enormous lack of Hopewell materials at the Field Columbian Museum. Moorehead stated 590,000 beads were shipped from Chillicothe, Ohio in 1891 (to Cambridge), yet only 25,000 beads were present in Chicago (W. Moorehead to F. Skiff, letter, 29 February 1895). In this same letter Moorehead wrote that 200 to 250 bear and panther teeth, many with pearls, were missing from the collection. It is possible that the bear canine with pearl was one of the objects shipped back to Cambridge after the WCE, although it was not drawn nor described in detail by Willoughby (Greber and Ruhl 1989; Moorehead 1922).

Certainly, Moorehead knew that Putnam and Willoughby were working to analyze some of the Hopewell site materials back in Cambridge. However, the Hopewell site collection had been promised to the Field Columbian Museum, and Putnam's 1894 correspondence to Director Skiff did not mention a

seven month delay in returning the objects. Tensions mounted, and in truth, Moorehead and Putnam's relationship had not been the easiest. N'omi Greber and Katharine Ruhl (1989, 2) described their relationship as strained by Moorehead's enthusiasm to share findings with the public, and his tendency to overlook details. For his part, Moorehead did not seem to trust Putnam. In the same February 1895 letter describing his concern about the missing pieces, Moorehead recalls that a Dr. Hilborn T. Cresson, a former assistant to Putnam, had been caught trying to steal copper and stone objects from Moorehead's camp at the Hopewell site, and was promptly fired. Later, in May of 1895, Moorehead had visited the University of Pennsylvania Museum where he found Hopewellian materials within their collection: one flint disc, two humeri, and a few human bones. A curator, Mr. Culin, said the objects had been sent by H. T. Cressen in 1891 directly from the Hopewell site (Field Museum 2019b: Correspondences: W. Moorehead to H. Higinbotham: May 9, 1895). Within the January 1895 letter Moorehead remembered that he feared trouble in submitting his field report to Putnam in 1892, making a carbon copy of the report to maintain within his own records (W. Moorehead to F. Skiff, letter, 11 January 1895, Field Museum Anthropology Archives, Chicago).

Part of Moorehead's distrust of Putnam was likely deserved. At the close of his excavations, Moorehead turned over his records to Putnam who was "...expected to write the report [on the site], but failed to do so..." (1922, 81). While Putnam was unable to dedicate time to this large undertaking, Willoughby analyzed and organized the collection, documentations, and even ran experimental tests focusing on Hopewellian objects. Moorehead gave Willoughby a kind mention and thanks for his work on the Hopewell site, describing Willoughby's 300 pages of notes and drawings being unselfishly provided for his (Moorehead's) later publication on the site. Nevertheless, there are many items that Moorehead (1922, 81) had given to Willoughby and Putnam in 1892 but were missing by the 1920s: ground plans, drawings, and the original notebook. It is important to note that Moorehead's publication on the Hopewell site was in 1922, thirty years removed from the excavations. This time lapse only increased the risk of missing documentation, likely causing unclear memories of the details of the excavations and the site itself.

The letters mentioned above from Moorehead to Director Skiff of the Field Columbian Museum describe a moment of apprehension and contestation over the Hopewell collection. These objects were highly valuable as they were the largest collection from this site remaining in the United States (Squier and Davis' earlier collection had been sent to England). They held enormous research potential, could easily be turned into a popular exhibit, and some pieces were rarities with high academic and monetary value. Within the preliminary list of missing objects Moorehead provided, he noted a missing piece described

as a, “Duck-on-fish pipe. This is made of graphite slate and considered the most artistic precontact sculpture found in the Mississippi Valley. To give an idea of its value, a man offered me \$200.00 for it” (W. Moorehead to F. Skiff, letter, 29 February 1895). Today this would be the equivalent of nearly \$6,000. According to Moorehead, other missing objects included pieces that were “very elaborately carved, very magnificent, rare, and as fine as any brought from Mexico” (W. Moorehead to F. Skiff, letter, 29 February 1895). As they had been part of the Hopewell collection excavated by Moorehead and promised to the Field Columbian Museum, it is understandable that the museum would desire all objects to be returned to Chicago.

By April 23, 1895, Moorehead had journeyed to Cambridge, on the invitation of Putnam, to aid in the review of Hopewell site objects. For this visit, Moorehead was also acting as an advocate for the Field Columbian Museum, attempting to secure the speedy return of the collection in its entirety to Chicago. Moorehead and Putnam’s relationship seemed to reach a breaking point during this trip once Putnam understood that Moorehead’s role was to verify the count on the Hopewell collection and secure its return to Chicago. Moorehead reported to Director Skiff that Putnam said harsh things about the Field Columbian Museum, was very sore, and felt Moorehead’s presence was “an insult to his honesty” (Field Museum 2019b: Correspondences: W. Moorehead to F. Skiff: 23 April 1895). In this same letter, Moorehead described the anger and displeasure he experienced with Putnam by stating, “I must confess that it was with great difficulty that I kept my temper during the interview” (Field Museum 2019b: Correspondences: W. Moorehead to F. Skiff: 23 April 1895).

From April 23rd until May 1st Moorehead conducted an inventory of the collection and prepared it for shipment from Cambridge to Chicago. Based on this inventory, Moorehead noted in multiple letters to Director Skiff that there was a discrepancy in the object count from when the collection had been sent from Chillicothe, Ohio. However, this discrepancy seemed to be with the smaller objects, and objects described as “generally termed unimportant things” (Field Museum 2019b: Correspondences: W. Moorehead to F. Skiff: 23 April 1895). These unimportant or less valued objects included pearl beads, pipes, and human skulls, which Moorehead believed Putnam took under the assumption that would not be noticed as missing. In preparation for shipment, Moorehead wrapped objects in paper, placed them on trays, and packaged them into large wooden crates. Also, during his time in Massachusetts, he negotiated with Putnam for the release of Hopewell site excavation documents, notes, and illustrations to the Field Columbian Museum. Some of these documents were sent along with the collection.

On May 1, 1895, Moorehead had the collection shipped by Adams Express to the Field Columbian Museum. The collection was insured for \$200 through this company. He explained in a letter to the Museum's President Harlow N. Higinbotham that, "[n]o insurance company would list it, for they claimed that these things had no real commercial value and were considered as bad risk" (Field Museum 2019b: Correspondences: W. Moorehead to H. Higinbotham: 2 May 1895). Clearly the objects held a large amount of value for the archaeologists and museum professionals involved, be it research potential, estimated monetary worth, or the prestige of possessing a collection from such an important ancient site. Luckily for the safety of the collections Moorehead was seemingly adamant that they be shipped with insurance and even provided a document containing instructions for the unpackaging of the objects to ensure against damages or lost provenience for the objects he had sorted and packaged. Upon reaching the museum, the collection would be unpacked, possibly inspected for damage, and then organized into storage or exhibit cases. While some of the collection was placed on public display, it is unlikely that the bear canine with pearl joined them, it likely remaining in storage.

Life Post-Excavation: Twentieth Century

At the turn of the twentieth century the Hopewell site collection (now excluding any pieces missing since the original shipment from Chillicothe) was housed together. The Field Columbian Museum had begun to transition its mission away from commemorating the WCE, to becoming a natural history museum. The museum renamed itself in 1905 to honor its first major benefactor Marshall Field and this designation reflected new institutional goals. The new name was the Field Museum of Natural History (Field Museum 2019a). While the Museum had a new name and new mission, the Museum's building (The WCE's Palace of Fine Arts) was beginning to feel old and restricting in size. The Museum's collections were swelling, and quickly expanding past the dimensions of the building's storage spaces. In 1915 construction began on a new museum, located about six miles north near Grant Park, Chicago (Field Museum 2019a).

On March 20, 1920, transportation of the collections of the Field Museum of Natural History to the new facility began. Around this time the Hopewell collection would have experienced the effects of this move. It was recounted that, "[s]pecimens were loaded into crates and transported by rail and horse-drawn carriage" to the new location (Field Museum 2019a). This new building opened to the public on May 2, 1921, with some Hopewellian objects exhibited in new displays. The Palace of Fine Arts remained closed to the public until 1933 when a new Museum of Science and Industry opened.

Today the Museum of Science and Industry still occupies the Palace of Fine Arts; it is the last remaining building from the 1893 WCE on the original grounds of the exposition (Museum of Science and Industry Chicago 2019). Over the next four decades, some objects from the larger Hopewell collection of the Field Museum of Natural History were given in object exchanges to other museums, universities, or individuals. In these exchanges Hopewellian objects became commodified as reciprocal gifts or trade items of similarly perceived value. Received objects included many archaeological specimens from diverse locations and periods, and a small group of ethnographic materials from the Aleutian Islands of Alaska (Field Museum Accession 2325).

On March 15, 1945, a group of Hopewell site objects were shipped by express mail from Chicago to Milwaukee, about a 95 mile journey. The pre-paid value of the objects was listed at \$200 (Memo No. 1142, 15 March 1945, Accession 2354, Field Museum Anthropology Archives, Chicago). The objects, including the bear tooth with pearl, were destined for the Milwaukee Public Museum (MPM). The MPM had opened as a public natural history museum in May of 1884, prior to Moorehead's Hopewell site excavations, WCE, and founding of the Field Columbian Museum. By the early twentieth century, the MPM housed vast archaeology, botany, geology, ethnographic and historic collections. In exchange for the Hopewell site objects, the Field Museum of Natural History received four reconstructed pottery vessels from the Woodland period of Wisconsin prehistory, which would be immediately placed on exhibit in a new American Archaeology hall (O. Goodson to W. McKern, letter, 9 March 1945, Accession 2354 File, Field Museum Anthropology Archives, Chicago). It is interesting to note that the Field Museum of Natural History listed only 46 Hopewellian objects as being part of the exchange, while the MPM listed the number of objects received as 61. Each museum used different criteria when determining how to number smaller groups of objects such as pearl beads, broken earspools, and fragmented animal bones.

On the same day, March 15, 1945, the Hopewellian objects and a few pieces of documentation arrived at the MPM and were given accession number 16082 to identify them as a distinct collection of objects within the MPM's archaeology collections. These collections fell under the MPM's Department of Anthropology, which in 1945 was under the direction of Acting Curator Towne Luther Miller. In the MPM's Annual Report for March 1944 to March 1945, the exchange of objects with the Field Museum was noted. The report reads, "[t]hrough an exchange with the Department of Anthropology, Chicago Natural History Museum an outstanding collection of archaeological specimens illustrating the famous Hopewell mound culture of Ohio were secured. Eventually this will make a fine exhibit" (Milwaukee Public Museum 1945). This collection was desirable to the MPM for its direct connection to the

Hopewell site, Hopewell culture, and was further complemented as being “outstanding”. Additionally, the Anthropology Department justified their acquisition by proposing that these pieces would make a fine exhibit, meaning the pieces were presentable and intriguing enough to the public to warrant a new exhibit (Milwaukee Public Museum 1945).

While the justification to exchange the piece had been to eventually put them on exhibit, only a few pieces of this collection are known to have been given this opportunity, not including the bear canine with pearl. In January 1964 a new building opened for the Milwaukee Public Museum, just a block north of its former home (currently the city’s central library branch). The bear canine tooth with pearl would have been moved across the street, and downstairs into Anthropology storage. At the end of the twentieth century the bear canine experienced more attention due to the passing of the 1990 Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA). For the museum field, NAGPRA set a federal precedent that all human remains should be treated with respect and acknowledged that overwhelming numbers of Native American human remains, and objects had been unlawfully given to U.S. museums. In compliance to the new act, Native American collections such as the Hopewell site collection were inventoried and information on the collection was prepared and submitted to the Federal Government and to affiliated Native groups. During the inventory process, provenience information would have been crucial for identifying this object as a funerary object to human burial 278 during Moorehead’s excavations, although the human remains of burial 278 were never part of the Field Museum collection (Accession File 16082, Milwaukee Public Museum Anthropology Department, Milwaukee, WI). No other objects within the MPM’s Hopewell site collection were linked to this burial, although twenty-one other MPM objects were recovered from Mound 25. It should be noted that no human remains or objects from the Hopewell site or the Ohio Hopewellian culture have been repatriated under NAGPRA.

Conclusion

The most recent chapter of bear canine with pearl’s history has been my work with Hopewell site materials now housed at the MPM. During my thesis research starting in the summer of 2019, I inventoried the collection and reviewed related documentation at the MPM and Field Museum. From this archival research I learned that the object’s post-excavation life was dynamic, including multiple shipments across America. Additionally, reading letters describing theft, professional rivalries, and historical opinions on the value of the collection aided in my process of contextualizing the object’s experiences in museum settings, and filling two sections of this article. This archival re-

search helped to account for, both gaps in provenience information and the likelihood of missing objects from the original excavation. After the archival research was completed, I measured, weighed, photographed, and described each object in the MPM's collection. Additionally, I selected the bear canine with pearl and four other objects for a 3-dimensional photogrammetry project in which 3-D images were created for the MPM. Finally, I displayed research on this artifact and its 3-D image in a research poster presented at the Wisconsin Federation of Museums conference in 2019 (Schmitz 2019). Although there were many other objects within the MPM's Hopewell site collection, this object was chosen for the imaging and poster due to its composite nature, high level of human modification, smaller size, photogenic qualities, and because it is easily recognizable as a tooth from an animal.

By utilizing a biographical approach to tell a large portion of this object's journey, I have been able to provide deeper context to the piece. This article has described the bear canine with pearl from its creation in prehistory, to its inclusion within the Hopewell site, excavation, shipments, exhibition, and exchange between museums. During each phase of its life, this object has been viewed through different lenses. Hopewellian peoples likely saw this object as a symbolic representation of bears, and as a valued adornment. Later, archaeologists used the bear canine with pearl as an example of the artistic skill and desire for exotic materials of an ancient culture. Nineteenth and twentieth century museum professionals likely viewed the object based on its merit as a display piece to educate and excite audiences or as a subject for research. This very article has transformed this piece into a focal point through which I have presented a broad narrative of this object and others from Moorehead's excavations of the Hopewell site. Although this object has been seen and valued in a variety of ways, its experiences can be recounted as facts, allowing a closer look at the life it has lived, and informing the way that archaeologists can better account for artifact histories when conducting analyses of museum collections.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dawn Scher Thomae of the Milwaukee Public Museum and UW-Milwaukee Graduate Museum Studies Program for suggesting this project, allowing me access to the collections, and providing guidance. I would also like to thank Dr. Patricia Richards for her aid and many edits as my advisor. Finally, I would like to thank the staff members of the Field Museum and Hopewell Culture National Historical Park for answering questions and providing access for my research.

References

Appadurai, Arjun.

1986. "Introduction: commodities and the politics of value." In *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*, 3-63. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____.
2006. "The Thing Itself." In *Public Culture* (18)1. Duke University Press. Atwater, Caleb.

_____.
1820. "Descriptions of Antiquities Discovered in the State of Ohio and Other Western States." In *Transactions and Collections of the American Antiquarian Society* 1:105-267.

Berres, Thomas E., David M. Stothers and David Mather.

2004. "Bear Imagery and Ritual in Northeast North America: An Update and Assessment of A. Irving Hallowell's Work." *Midcontinental Journal of Archaeology* 29(1): 5-42.

Blood, Donald A.

2002. *Grizzly Bears in British Columbia*. Province of British Columbia: Ministry of Water, Land and Air Protection. <https://www.webcitation.org/6b0QXEAwb?url=http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/wld/documents/grizzlybear.pdf>

Caldwell, Joseph R.

1964. "Interaction Spheres in Prehistory." In *Hopewellian Studies, Scientific Papers* 12(6): 133-143. Illinois: Authority of the State of Illinois.

Elbroch M.

2006. *Animal Skulls: A Guide to North American Species*. Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania: Stackpole Books, pp. 392.

Field Museum.

2014. Opening the Vaults: Wonders of the 1893 World's Fair. Accessed October 10, 2019. <http://worldsfair.fieldmuseum.org/>

_____.
2019a "Field Museum History." About/History. Accessed October 10, 2019. <https://www.fieldmuseum.org/about/history>

_____.
2019b. "World's Columbian Exposition Expedition to Southern Ohio." Field Museum Library Digital Collections. Accessed April 1, 2019. <http://cdm17032.contentdm.oclc.org/cdm/landingpage/collection/p17032coll2>

Greber, N'omi and Katherine C. Ruhl.

1989. *The Hopewell Site: A Contemporary Analysis Based on the Work of Charles C. Willoughby*. Boulder, Colorado: West View Press.
- Hinsley, Charles M.
 2016. "Anthropology as Education and Entertainment: Frederic Ward Putnam at the World's Fair." In *Coming of Age in Chicago: The 1893 World's Fair and the Coalescence of American Anthropology*, edited by Curtis M. Hinsley, and David R. Wilcox. University of Nebraska Press, Nebraska. <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/uwm/detail.action?docID=4337951>
- Kopytoff, Igor.
 1986. "The Cultural Biography of Things: Commodities and the Politics of Value." In *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*, edited by Arjun Appadurai, 3-63. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lynott, Mark J.
 2014. *Hopewell Ceremonial Landscapes of Ohio: More than Mounds and Geometric Earthworks*. London: Oxbow Books.
- Milwaukee Public Museum.
 1945. Annual Report for March 1944 to March 1945. Milwaukee Public Museum Archive, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
- Moorehead, Warren K.
 1892. *A Report Upon the Work Done in Southern Ohio*. Accessed April 1, 2019. <http://cdm17032.contentdm.oclc.org/cdm/compoundobject/collection/p17032coll2/id/792>
-
1922. *The Hopewell Mound Group of Ohio*. Chicago: Field Museum of Natural History Publication 211 Anthropological Series Volume VI, No. 5: 76-179.
- Museum of Science and Industry.
 2019. "About the Museum." Accessed October 15, 2019. [msichicago.org/explore/about-us/about-the-museum/](https://www.msichicago.org/explore/about-us/about-the-museum/)
- Ohio History Connection.
 2019. "5b.37 Hopewell Trade." *Virtual First Ohio ans*. Accessed October 10, 2019. http://ohsweb.ohiohistory.org/gallery2/main.php?g2_itemId=668
- Palmer, Potter Mrs., Mrs. Schuyler Van Rensselaer, D.H. Burnham, W.E. Curtis, Alder Messrs, Sullivan Messrs, S.S. Beman, W.W. Boyington, Henry Ives Cobb, W.J. Edbrooke, Frank W. Grogan, Sophia G. Hayden, Jarvis Hunt, W.L. B. Jenney, Henry Van Brunt, Francis Whitehouse.
 1893. *A Week at the Fair: Illustrating the Exhibits and Wonders of the World's Columbian Exposition*, 104-05. Chicago: Rand, McNally and Company. Living History of Illinois and Chicago. Accessed October

15, 2019. http://livinghistoryofillinois.com/pdf_files/A%20Week%20at%20the%20Fair;%20Exhibits%20and%20Wonders%20of%20the%20World%27s%20Columbian%20Exposition.pdf

Peabody Collections Online.

n.d. "Peabody number: 47-41-10/99955.1.1." Accessed October 12, 2019. [https://pmem.unix.fas.harvard.edu:8443/peabody/view/object/asitem/search\\$0040/0?t:state:flow=32216bc7-c7fe-4671-b898-f53c8c418c67](https://pmem.unix.fas.harvard.edu:8443/peabody/view/object/asitem/search$0040/0?t:state:flow=32216bc7-c7fe-4671-b898-f53c8c418c67)

Schmitz, Katrina N.

2019. *Journey of a Hopewell Site Artifact: Bear Canine with Pearl*. Presentation, Wisconsin Federation of Museums, Horicon Marsh Education & Visitor Center, Horicon, WI, November 2019.

Seeman, Mark F.

1979. *The Hopewell Interaction Sphere: The Evidence for Inter-Regional Trade and Structural Complexity*. Prehistory Research Series 5, Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society.

Spielmann, Katherine A.

2009. "Ohio Hopewell Ritual Craft Production." In *In the Footprints of Squier and Davis: Archeological Fieldwork in Ross County, Ohio*, Special Report No. 5, edited by Mark J. Lynott, 179- 88. Nebraska: United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Midwest Archaeological Center.

Squier, Ephraim George and Edwin Hamilton Davis.

1848. *Ancient Monuments of the Mississippi Valley: Comprising the Results of Extensive Original Survey and Explorations*. Contributions to Knowledge I. Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.

W.B. Conkey Company.

1893. *Conkey's Complete Guide to the World's Columbian Exposition*. W.B. Conkey Company, Chicago. Living History of Illinois and Chicago. Accessed October 15, 2019. http://livinghistoryofillinois.com/pdf_files/Conkeys%20Complete%20Guide%20to%20the%20Worlds%20Columbian%20Exposition.pdf

World Columbian Exposition, Department Publicity and Promotion.

1892. *Official Guide to the Grounds and Buildings of the World's Columbian Exposition During Construction*. Chicago: Rand, McNally & Co. Living History of Illinois and Chicago. Accessed October 15, 2019. http://livinghistoryofillinois.com/pdf_files/Official%20Guide%20to%20the%20Grounds%20and%20Buildings%20of%20the%20Worlds%20Columbian%20Exposition%20During%20Construction.pdf

Zavatsky B.P.

1974. "The Use of the Skull in Age Determination of the Brown Bear." *Third International Conference on Bears*, Paper 25: 275-78.
