

ENDNOTE 5

Saco (Not Sokoki); Amarascoggin (Not Arosaguntacook)

See Also map for marked locations of all four, respectively designated A,B,C,D.

Gordon M Day [Eastern Canada Ethnologist (Emeritus) at Canadian Museum of Civilization in Ottawa when he died in 1993] researched & published two papers which correct misunderstandings as to the proper names for both the Abenaki-Pennacook sub-tribe on the Saco River (Day 1965:246 quoted here), and the Abenaki sub-tribe on the Androscoggin River (Day 1974:14 quoted here). Day saw (from the perspective of the north, receiving-end) confusion between tribe/sub-tribe/band names used in Canadian primary-source accounts of the Wabanaki peoples **coming to** Quebec missionary-villages, and those group-names used in New England secondary source historical accounts [e.g., William D Williamson (1832) *History Of The State Of Maine*] telling of the Wabanaki peoples **going from** Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, & northern Massachusetts to Canada. After figuring out what was correct & what was incorrect, Day wrote these & other articles about the problems with group names.

Quote from *The Identity of the Sokokis* [from *ETHNOHISTORY Vol. 12 No. 3 (Summer 1965)* pp 237-249]: “**Summary:** Sokoki was a French convention [meaning a customary label]. The native name was probably Sokwaki. No early writer placed either Sokokis or Sokwakis on the Saco River, but our best contemporary witness, [Jesuit missionary] Druilletes, placed them on the Connecticut River. Both English and Dutch writers knew Soquackicks or Squakheags on the Connecticut River north of the Pacomtucks. The idea that the Sokokis belonged on the Saco was proposed tentatively by two writers who were a hundred years too late to know the Saco Indians and two or three decades too early to see the crucial documents in print. It seems probable that they were led astray by the superficial similarity of the names Saco and Sokoki and that the true identity of the Sokokis was obscured by the superficial dissimilarity of Sokoki and Squakheag. Somehow, this erroneous opinion became established in our reference literature with two curious results: New England historians have known a Squakheag tribe, which, like many others, simply fled to Canada and disappeared, and Canadian historians have been at a loss to identify the Sokokis who were prominent in their early history.” [from p.246]

Quote from *Arosagunticook and Androscoggin* [from *Papers Of The Tenth Algonquian Conference*, edited by William Cowan, Ottawa: Carleton University (1979) pp 10-15]: “[**Conclusion:**] Therefore, until and unless I see new evidence to the contrary, I favor the position that (1) the Androscoggin River Indians were the Amarascoggins, not the Arosaguntacooks, that (2) Arsikontegok was the name of the Saint Francis River and village, derived from its [geographical] characteristics, not from the [name of the] founding tribe, and probably given by the Eastern Abenakis from the Chaudiere [River] in 1700, and that (3) the Arosaguntacooks who appear in the Maine treaties [with the English] were merely delegations from Saint Francis, whose ethnic composition at that time was probably predominantly Western Abenaki.” [from p.14]

Day’s Corrections Summarized: (A) **Sacos** were on **Saco** River; (B) **Sokokis** were on mid **Connecticut** River; (C) **Amarascoggins** were on **Androscoggin** River; (D) **Arosaguntacooks** were on **Saint Francis** River. See locations on map, shown as letters A,B,C,D.

Both of Day’s articles cited above here, as well as his article cited in ENDNOTE 7, are reprinted in a collection published 1998 by University of Massachusetts Press, in their *Native Americans of the Northeast* series—*In Search of New England’s Native Past: Selected Essays by Gordon M Day*, edited by Michael K Foster & William Cowan.