

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

For NPS use only

National Register of Historic Places
Inventory—Nomination Form

received

date entered

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

1. Name

historic

and or common Shoop Site (36Da20)

2. Location

street & number East of Enders

not for publication

city, town Jackson and Wayne

vicinity of

state Pennsylvania

code 042

county Dauphin

code 043

3. Classification

Category	Ownership	Status	Present Use
<input type="checkbox"/> district	<input type="checkbox"/> public	<input type="checkbox"/> occupied	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> agriculture
<input type="checkbox"/> building(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> private	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> unoccupied	<input type="checkbox"/> commercial
<input type="checkbox"/> structure	<input type="checkbox"/> both	<input type="checkbox"/> work in progress	<input type="checkbox"/> educational
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> site	Public Acquisition	Accessible	<input type="checkbox"/> entertainment
<input type="checkbox"/> object	n/a in process	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes: restricted	<input type="checkbox"/> government
	n/a being considered	<input type="checkbox"/> yes: unrestricted	<input type="checkbox"/> industrial
		<input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> military
			<input type="checkbox"/> museum
			<input type="checkbox"/> park
			<input type="checkbox"/> private residence
			<input type="checkbox"/> religious
			<input type="checkbox"/> scientific
			<input type="checkbox"/> transportation
			<input type="checkbox"/> other:

4. Owner of Property

name Multiple, 1. [redacted] (See continuation sheet)

street & number RD #1

city, town Halifax

vicinity of

state Pennsylvania 17032

5. Location of Legal Description

courthouse, registry of deeds, etc. Dauphin County Courthouse

street & number Front & Market Streets

city, town Harrisburg

state Pennsylvania

6. Representation in Existing Surveys

Pennsylvania State Museum Archaeological
title Site Survey & Recording Program has this property been determined eligible? yes no

date 2/26/68 federal state county local

depository for survey records Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission

city, town Harrisburg

state Pennsylvania

7. Description

Condition		Check one	Check one
<input type="checkbox"/> excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> deteriorated	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> unaltered	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> original site
<input type="checkbox"/> good	<input type="checkbox"/> ruins	<input type="checkbox"/> altered	<input type="checkbox"/> moved date <u>n/a</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	<input type="checkbox"/> unexposed		

Describe the present and original (if known) physical appearance

The Shoop Site (50BA27), a large Paleo-Indian campsite, is located on a low hill,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Although the floodplains of the creeks are extremely narrow, providing little prime agriculture land, the hilltop is farmed. Most of the area is in crops or pasture, but the soil is very thin and fairly unproductive. The residual soil is 8-9 inches deep, with sandstone bedrock encountered at 12-18 inches (Howard 1942:5). The conditioning influence for the archaeological context is the shallowness of the non-bedrock layer.

The site was discovered by George Gordon in the mid-1930's, while collecting on a farm owned by his father-in-law ([REDACTED]). Gerald Fenstermaker, an interested amateur archaeologist, learned of the site from Gordon, eventually getting Edgar Howard of the University Museum in Philadelphia to make the first professional visit to the site. Howard described the assemblage as "Folsom" related. In 1950, Sam Farver, an amateur archaeologist, who had learned of the site from Gordon, and John Witthoft, the Pennsylvania State Anthropologist, visited the site with Gordon. Witthoft defined the site as eleven slightly elevated areas, each yielding less than ten artifacts (1952:467). The largest collection of material from the site belongs to Dr. Edward Bowser, Sr. of York, PA.

Each location was less than 30 feet in diameter, and usually more than 100 yards apart. In addition, there appeared to be no stratigraphic context to the material. Farver and Witthoft dug several test pits into the site, verifying its deflated nature. Witthoft, with the help of Sam Farver, was the last professional archaeologist to systematically collect the site.

Despite the fact that the Shoop Site had been known to professional archaeologists for over thirty years, the boundaries of the site had never been clearly defined. It was originally described by Howard as an area of 20 acres in the plowed fields on high ground (1942). This view was upheld by Witthoft, with respect to the eleven lithic scatter areas (1952:467), although he suggested that the geographic context of the Shoop Site replicated through the high mountainous country in the vicinity would produce other Paleo-Indian sites and that stray fluted points would eventually be found in the fields around the site. Indeed the definition of the boundary of 20 acres is no longer tenable in that a collector, Paul Frey, has found related Paleo-Indian material in a recently opened field some 600 yards south of the original 20 acre field (Barry Kent, personal communication).

The elusive nature of the definition of the Shoop Site boundaries, or that of any other open-air Paleo-Indian Site, is most certainly due to the settlement system adaptation of the populations that created the site, not the inability to recognize Paleo-Indian lithic material as such. William Gardner, on the basis of his work in the Flint Run area in Virginia, defined five Paleo-Indian settlement types, of which two - periodically revisited hunting sites and sporadically visited hunting sites - may also describe the Shoop Paleo-Indian land-use pattern (1977:262). Periodically revisited hunting sites tend to be located in areas where favorable long-lived microhabitats occur. The location of the Shoop Site on a high knoll, overlooking two small streams, may have been ideal for hunting Late Pleistocene ungulates, such as caribou, and would have been chosen as a hunting station more than once during the 3000 year Paleo-Indian Period (Cox 1972). Robert Funk, in writing about the West Athens Hill Site in New York state, suggested that "occupations were probably brief, confined to no more than a few weeks, and seasonal in nature (1973:36)", a description that appears to aptly fit the posted Shoop adaptation. What the Shoop Site and the Debert Site in Nova Scotia (MacDonald 1968), share is the spatial separation and clustering of lithic material. At Debert "eleven living floors were distinguished, of which 8 clustered within a nuclear area, about 3 acres in extent (p.131)."

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Inventory—Nomination Form

For NPS use only

received

date entered

Continuation sheet Shoop Site, 36Da20, Dauphin co item number 7

Page 1

This intra-site separation probably represents recurring occupation on the same location, by peoples with the same subsistence and settlement adaptation. At Shoop, this is evident in the widely separated (100 yards) loci. Given the presence of Paleo-Indian material in the recently opened field, plus reports of finds in adjacent fields, it appears that the area originally defined as the Shoop Site is too limited, and simply an artifact of access and visibility. The entire hilltop is internally homogeneous with respect to those topographic and hydrological variables noted by Gardner as important for a hunting location. Therefore, it must be expected that the entire "level" portion of the hilltop will produce Paleo-Indian material related to the Shoop adaptation, in similar densities and patterning. On the basis of current knowledge of artifact distributions at Shoop and other similar Paleo-Indian sites in the Northeast, it is impossible to delimit an area smaller than this as containing all or even most of the expected related Paleo-Indian loci.

[REDACTED SECTION]

Although there are few remaining artifacts expected from the originally defined 20 acre portion of the Shoop Site, a large amount of material has been preserved, in the form of three major collections. The Farver and Witthoft collection is currently stored at the William Penn Memorial Museum, and numbers approximately 900 pieces, including 53 fluted points. The Gordon collection consists of 343 artifacts and chips and is housed at the Smithsonian (Cox 1972). The Soday collection is in the possession of Dr. Frank Soday of Oklahoma City, and numbers 120 tools and a large number of chips. These three collections are estimated to be 75 per cent of the material ever collected from the site.

At the time of its discovery and subsequent reporting by Witthoft (1950; 1952; 1954; 1962), the Shoop Site provided archaeologists with one of the few clear pictures of a Paleo-Indian lithic industry.¹ The vast majority of artifacts from the Shoop Site were made of Onandoga chert, a fine quality raw material which comes from western New York and the Ontario Peninsula, some 200 miles from the site. The extreme age of the artifacts showed in the deep weathering of the chert, which had developed a patination 0.5-1.0mm thick. The other material from the site consisted of small amounts of a heavily weathered Pennsylvania jasper and a fine-grained black chert. Material other than Paleo-Indian that has come from the site included fifteen projectile points, dating from the Archaic to Woodland periods, and a late 18th century musket ball and rifle hair trigger (Witthoft 1952:470).

¹ The Shoop Site is a single component site whose artifacts and other lithics consist almost solely of Onandoga chert, which resembles no local material, and is highly identifiable.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Inventory—Nomination Form

For NPS use only

received

date entered

Dauphin Co.

Continuation sheet Shoop Site ,36Da20,

Item number 7

Page 2

The Paleo-Indian material from the Shoop Site was dated through both the degree of weathering of the chert, and by the stylistic affinities of the fluted points to those found at Clovis sites in the southwest. The entire Paleo-Indian assemblage was considered by Witthoft to represent a single Paleo-Indian industry, which he termed the Enterline Chert Industry. Sharing affinities to assemblages at the Williamson (Virginia) and Hardaway (North Carolina) sites (later the Hardaway site was removed by Witthoft because of its temporal lateness), the Enterline Chert Industry was characterized by a core and blade technology, a small number of tool types, and triple-channel fluting in the projectile points. It was also characterized by a lack of more expertly fluted points, spokeshaves, a spall industry, bifaced gravers, and narrow fluted points, all of which were found in other Paleo-Indian sites, such as the Parrish Site (Kentucky). This constituted a separate industry, which he termed the Parrish Industry. Although lacking radiocarbon information which would date the Shoop, Williamson and Hardaway Sites, Witthoft placed the Enterline Chert Industry as prior to the Parrish Industry, on the basis of the similarities of the blade technology to that of the Upper Paleolithic Asian sites, and the assumption that more poorly made points and fewer tool types indicated greater age.

Witthoft's argument drew criticism for both making a distinction between blade and spall technology, when such distinctions were likely semantic, and in arguing the temporal relationships of Upper Paleolithic tools with the Enterline Industry on the basis of stylistic similarity (Krieger 1954). After 1954, much research was done on Paleo-Indian, and through radiocarbon dating, statements were made about the age of the sites. In a reanalysis of the Shoop Site material, Cox (1972) assigned Shoop to a time period between that of Clovis (11,200 BP) and Debert (10600 BP) (in Nova Scotia). Cox's developmental sequence for Paleo-Indian in the Northeast went from Clovis to Shoop to Bull Brook (Massachusetts) to Debert, on the basis of "increasingly elaborated forms of basal preparation (p.83)." The artifacts at Shoop appeared to have been used primarily for bone or woodworking, in addition to the use of fluted points for hunting.

Recent sound evidence for an early Paleo-Indian or pre-Paleo-Indian occupation in Western Pennsylvania has thrown the theories of early man in the New World into question especially in reference to the origins of the fluted point technology and even of the Paleo-Indian tradition.² Without firm chronological control, the future interpretation of the Shoop Site in prehistoric context will likely depend on the work done at other sites. Still, the existence of a large artifact inventory in a single-component assemblage assures the potential for future reassessment.

² Adovasio et al 1977

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service
**National Register of Historic Places
Inventory—Nomination Form**

For NPS use only

received

date entered

Continuation sheet Shoop Site, 36Da20, Dauphin Co Item number 9

Page 1

Adovasio, J.M. et al

"Progress report on the Meadowcroft Rockshelter—A 16,000 year chronicle."
Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 288 (1977): 137-159.

Cox, Stephen L.

"A re-analysis of the Shoop Site." 1972 Manuscript on file at the William Penn
Memorial Museum, Harrisburg, PA

Funk, Robert E.

"The West Athens Hill Site (Cox 7)." In Ritchie and Funk, Aboriginal
Settlement Patterns in the Northeast, (Albany 1973) pp. 9-31

Gardner, William M.

"Flint Run Paleo-Indian complex and its implications for Eastern North American
prehistory." Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 288 (1977):257-263.

Howard, Edgar B.

"A Fluted point site in Pennsylvania." Pennsylvania Archaeologist. 12 (1942):4-6

Kreiger, Edgar B.

"A comment of 'Fluted Point Relationships' by John Witthoft."
American Antiquity 19 (1954):273-275.

MacDonald, G.F.

"Debert: A Paleo-Indian Site in Central Nova Scotia." National Museum of Canada,
Anthropological Paper 16. (1968)

Ritchie, William A. and Robert E. Funk.

"Aboriginal settlement patterns in the Northwest." New York State Museum and
Science Service Memoir 20 (1973).

Witthoft, John B.

"A Paleo-Indian site in Eastern Pennsylvania: An early hunting culture."
Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society 96 (1950):464-495

Wilmensen, Edwin M.

"Lithic Analysis & Cultural Inference: A Paleo-Indian Case."
Anthropological Papers of the University of Arizona, 16. (1970)

8. Significance

Period	Areas of Significance—Check and justify below					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> prehistoric	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> archeology-prehistoric	<input type="checkbox"/> community planning	<input type="checkbox"/> landscape architecture	<input type="checkbox"/> religion		
<input type="checkbox"/> 1400-1499	<input type="checkbox"/> archeology-historic	<input type="checkbox"/> conservation	<input type="checkbox"/> law	<input type="checkbox"/> science		
<input type="checkbox"/> 1500-1599	<input type="checkbox"/> agriculture	<input type="checkbox"/> economics	<input type="checkbox"/> literature	<input type="checkbox"/> sculpture		
<input type="checkbox"/> 1600-1699	<input type="checkbox"/> architecture	<input type="checkbox"/> education	<input type="checkbox"/> military	<input type="checkbox"/> social/		
<input type="checkbox"/> 1700-1799	<input type="checkbox"/> art	<input type="checkbox"/> engineering	<input type="checkbox"/> music	<input type="checkbox"/> humanitarian		
<input type="checkbox"/> 1800-1899	<input type="checkbox"/> commerce	<input type="checkbox"/> exploration/settlement	<input type="checkbox"/> philosophy	<input type="checkbox"/> theater		
<input type="checkbox"/> 1900-	<input type="checkbox"/> communications	<input type="checkbox"/> industry	<input type="checkbox"/> politics government	<input type="checkbox"/> transportation		
		<input type="checkbox"/> invention		<input type="checkbox"/> other (specify)		

Specific dates 9,500-9,000 BC

Builder/Architect N/A

Statement of Significance (in one paragraph)

On the basis of current information from collectors on the distribution of Paleo-Indian material on the Shoop Site, it is expected that as much as 75 percent of the area nominated retains its integrity for the total range of lithic material. The Shoop Site thus represents the largest known single "site" for Paleo-Indian occupation in the Northeastern United States. This complex of loci presents the research potential to archaeologists to elucidate settlement within a site, and to reconstruct the nature of social organization for this early time period. The focus on intra-site settlement patterns has been emphasized recently by William Gardner: "Intrasite spatial separation, as for instance between different types of clusters within tool-kit areas, or between 'hot spots' which have turned out to be the loci of structures, is giving us the basic raw data for discussing intrasite tool kit variation and social distinction (1977:262)."

In addition to spatial analysis, the collections from the 20 acre portion of the Shoop Site have demonstrated the site's importance in technological studies (Witthoft 1952; Wilmensen 1969; Cox 1972). It can be expected that the remaining 70 acres will provide the same degree of richness of data for the study of early hunting and food processing activities. Although the 20 acre portion has been heavily collected, there is a bias toward pieces larger than one centimeter in diameter, as evident in the collection at the William Penn Museum. It can be expected that a large portion of the lithic assemblage smaller than this, consisting of shatter and retouch flakes, remain in the plow zone, disturbed only by plow drag. This could be an important data base for the interpretation of an intra-site settlement pattern. With further refinements in the dating of cherts and other cryptocrystalline quartzes through hydration analysis, it will eventually be possible to date chronometrically the artifacts from the Shoop Site. This will further enrich the site's research potential for technological studies, including that of long-distance lithic resource acquisition strategies.

In summary, the Shoop Site is one of the few documented Paleo-Indian Sites in the Northeastern United States. It is unusual in its size, and that most of the lithic material from the site comes from a source 200 miles away. The richness of the collected data has afforded archaeologists the opportunity to do detailed technological studies. Portions of the site, undisturbed by collectors, including currently wooded areas, and the remnant of very small lithic debris, may allow intra-site settlement research on a level unapproachable by any other known Paleo-Indian site in Pennsylvania, and possibly in the northeast.

9. Major Bibliographical Reference:

(see Continuation Sheet)

10. Geographical Data

Acreeage of nominated property 90
Quadrangle name Enders, PA

Quadrangle scale 1:24,000

UTM References

A	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
	Zone	Easting	Northing
C	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
E	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
G	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]

B	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
	Zone	Easting	Northing
D	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
F	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
H	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]

Verbal boundary description and justification

(see Continuation Sheet)

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

state	<u>N/A</u>	code	county	code
state	<u>N/A</u>	code	county	code

11. Form Prepared By

name/title Ira Beckerman

organization N/A date 1980

street & number 630 Humphrey Court, #202 telephone (717) 545-5698

city or town Harrisburg state Pennsylvania

12. State Historic Preservation Officer Certification

The evaluated significance of this property within the state is:

national state local

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

State Historic Preservation Officer signature _____ date _____

title Larry E. Tise, State Historic Preservation Officer

For NPS use only

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

Keeper of the National Register _____ date _____

Attest: _____ date _____

Chief of Registration _____