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newsletter of
The Ontario Archaeological Society INC.
The annual O.A.S. Symposium, this year with the theme

ONTARIO ARCHAEOLOGY AND THE PLANNING PROCESS

will be held at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (O.I.S.E.), 252 Bloor St. West, Toronto, on Saturday and Sunday, October 25 and 26, 1986.

Abstracts and enquiries concerning papers should be addressed to Dr. Donald Brown, President of the O.A.S., who will be Program Convener. Enquiries concerning A/V equipment and Display Space, etc., will be dealt with by Christine Kirby, Symposium Organizing Committee Chairman.

Dr. Donald Brown
39 Weatherell Street
Toronto, Ontario
M6S 1S8
416-769-5078

Christine Kirby
1225 Avenue Road
Toronto, Ontario
M5N 2G5
416-484-9358

If neither of the above are available, O.A.S. Administrator Charles Garrad will be pleased to assist.
On January 8, 1986, the new O.A.S. Executive took office, and so the Presidency of Dr. Mima Kapches transferred to me. Mima had become almost an institution at our monthly meetings - first as Vice-President in 1981, and as President since 1982. Her advice and direction were instrumental in guiding the provincial organization through a period of O.A.S. expansion and maturity and in the consolidation of the O.A.S. into what is possibly North America's single most influential Provincial/State archaeology society, and a model which many envy.

On behalf of the O.A.S. I thank Mima for her past 5 years of dedication to the society.

Although the Executive has lost a principal, stabilizing influence, continuity is maintained through the return of all other 1985 Executive members. We also welcome Mr. John Steckley as our newest Director. To add to our stability Dr. Richard (Dick) B. Johnson has agreed to continue as Editor of Ontario Archaeology and promises issue Number 44 in the near future in a slightly new format which will help defray rising costs of production and postage. Mr. Michael W. Kirby has agreed to continue as Editor of Arch Notes and prefaxes his acceptance with a plea to all Chapters and members that Arch Notes needs their constant input in order to act as the Society's provincial voice. Articles of a provincial interest are continually requested, and prompt turn-around time to contributors is assured. Likewise, we ask chapters to write short summaries of Chapter events or one page abstracts of monthly speakers' talk - perhaps these papers could be the responsibility of chapter recording secretaries or could be requested of speakers so that accurate record of their research could be quickly passed on to others. Dr. Marti Latta will continue as curator of the O.A.S. collections, which are located at Scarborough Campus, University of Toronto. Mr. Charles Garrad continues as our Administrator and Librarian, and is responsible not only for maintaining the expanding O.A.S. library in his house, but also for the daily routine of society business between the monthly Executive meetings (which are hosted at his house).

The year 1985 has been eventful for the provincial Executive. The Society, which reached a membership peak of 798, has been represented on a number of issues by these individuals. An offer by the O.H.F. to move the offices of the O.A.S. to the Heritage Centre, a structure in downtown Toronto donated by the O.H.F. to house provincial organizations, was declined due to the fiscal restraints of the O.A.S. As an initial instigator of the Heritage House concept, it was with regret that it was decided that we could not afford even the subsidized rates for the space and services required by our society. However, we have asked to continue as an affiliate of the Centre. Also, concerning financial matters, a Computer Committee was struck to assess the feasibility of computerization of the O.A.S. services. After costing and assessing the needs of the Society, it was felt that the Society should not purchase a computer at this time.

In respect to the Heritage Act Committee, the Ontario Historical Society, a number of LACACs, and other concerned heritage groups met several times to establish a two day conference, to which representatives of the Provincial

Jan/Feb 1986 -3- Arch Notes
government would be invited, in order for concerned heritage groups to voice suggestions of amendments to the Ontario Heritage Act 1974. This group has been in communication with the Minister of Citizenship and Culture's office, and has been told that MCC will be sponsoring a series of public meetings on this subject throughout the province, starting in the spring of 1986. This is welcome news to the archaeology community, and I encourage all Chapters to attend and to be vocal at their nearest meeting. Considering that all archaeological legilities revolve around three Provincial Acts (The Environmental Assessment Act, the Planning Act, and the Ontario Heritage Act), it is essential that these legislations are representative of the needs and concerns of the archaeology community. It is the Heritage Act which defines the role of the Ontario Heritage Foundation, stipulates the regulations for archaeology licences, and indirectly has caused the creation of the regional archaeologists.

Among the numerous additional activities, the Executive has successfully managed the financial affairs of the Society (under the careful scrutiny of our Treasurer Geoff Sutherland), has responded to calls of written support for specific endangered archaeological sites, has written corrections to newspaper editors concerning misleading references to archaeology, has attended meetings with MCC representatives, has given talks at Heritage symposiums, and has represented the Society in interviews by the media.

In 1986 the Executive will continue to address issues of Provincial concern, as your O.A.S. representatives. More importantly, we will encourage the local Chapters to educate, inform and entertain the interested public in their areas concerning the goals of archaeology. I feel that the provincial Executive must act as the catalyst which brings the interests and findings of each of the local Chapters to all interested O.A.S. members. As a provincial Society we share a common bond - an interest in learning about and preserving our below ground heritage resources. If there are issues which you feel should be addressed by the Society, please feel free to contact your Chapter Executive, the Provincial Executive, or write to Arch Notes. The Society is only as strong as the voices behind the O.A.S. title.

On behalf of the 1986 Executive, I wish each of you a successful year, one in which each of you will learn more about our archaeological heritage, and in which each of you will contribute in some small way to preserve our past.

* * * *

O.A.S. TREASURER'S REPORT 1985

The year 1985 was satisfactory financially. Following our dues increase our membership income increased by over 20% compared with 1984, while our awards fund rose to nearly $1,000 as the result of many donations and the addition of interest earned. Further donations will be most welcome. We did finish the year with a small excess of expenditures over receipts, but final accounting of our 1985 symposium may well help to offset this deficit. General expenses were particularly heavy this year, including the purchase of a new typewriter and the printing of our booklet summarizing the services provided by the Society, both non-recurring expenses.
THE ONTARIO ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY INC.

Statement of Receipts and Expenditures
For the Year Ended December 31st, 1985

Receipts
$11,360
- Life 
500
11,860
9,622

Donations
619
360

Sales of Publications etc.
1,031
656

Tours and Workshops, net receipts
724
233

Bank Interest & Premium on U.S. Funds
2,180
1,984

Ontario Waste Management Corp. (net)
500
-

Government Grants:
Social Sciences & Humanities Research Council
2,500
2,331

Ministry of Citizenship & Culture, Ontario
11,525
12,500

Total Receipts
$30,939
$27,676

Expenditures
Chapter Support
375
1,200

Publications: Ontario Archaeology
$10,200
(Arch Notes
5,493
15,693
6,676

Administrator's Fee
12,000
10,800

Library Rent, etc.
500
600

Symposium: Previous Year
76
(407)

Current Year
150
(320)

General Expenses: New Typewriter
482

Printing & Stationery
851

Other
1,337
2,670
1,104

Total Expenditures
$31,464
$34,974

Excess of Expenditures over Receipts
$ 525
$ 7,298

Assets and Surplus December 31st, 1985

Assets
$30,939

Surplus
$27,676

Audited:
Geoff Sutherland
E. Kruse
Treasurer

Bank Balance
2,844
At
2,525

Term Deposits
20,083
31.12.84
200

22,927
22,927

Awards Fund
961
200

Less:
Memberships in advance
3,486

Life Membership Fund
3,295

Provision for 'Ontario
General Fund
11,969

Archaeology' #44
14,025

A/cs Payable
16
3,200
6,702

A/cs Payable
16

Net Assets
$16,225
Total
$16,225
$16,750

Audited:
E. Kruse
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FROM THE O.A.S. OFFICE.....

News from OTTAWA Chapter

Dr. Stephen L. Cumba was elected President of the Ottawa Chapter for 1986 at the Chapter's first meeting of the year January 8.

Clyde C. Kennedy Receives Awards

The first 1986 meeting of the Ottawa Chapter of the Ontario Archaeological Society was the setting for the recognition of Clyde C. Kennedy's achievements and service to archaeology, the Society and the Chapter, when he was presented with two awards.

Representing the American Association for State and Local History, Mr. Robert G. Bowes, Ontario Chairperson, presented Clyde with a Certificate of Award of Merit. Clyde was nominated for this Award by the Society.

Clyde was also presented with a handsome plaque by the Chapter to mark the occasion of his retirement from Chapter Executive office.

Congratulations to you Clyde for deserving these justly received marks of honour.

Kathy Dandy Replaces Donna McNeil

The position of Archaeology Data Co-ordinator at the Ministry of Citizenship and Culture, left vacant with the departure of Donna McNeil, has now been filled. Kathy Dandy has come to the Province from Municipal Government where she was employed as a Data Co-ordinator for a Planning Department. Although her background is geography and computers, an interest in Canadian history and a childhood obsession with cavemen prompted her to apply for the job. Kathy was hired in mid-December, just in time for the Ministry's busiest time of the year when licence applications are received for the 1986 season. Her predecessor, Ms. McNeil, left everything very well documented and so Kathy assures us that she will be a fully functioning body at head office in no time.

MISSING! HELP! Please re-establish communication between the Society and these missing members.

Nick Adams was at Bath, Ont. Megan Cook was at Lambeth, Ont. Jacqueline M. Dale was at Scarborough, Ont. Roger Eacock was at Mississauga, Ont. Ann O'Sullivan was at Ottawa, Ont. Grant H. Tomlinson was at Toronto, Ont.

* * * * *
The following article is an invited paper which was presented in the Heritage Studies in the Classroom session of the Indian Heritage Conference held at Waippe Island, November 15-16, 1985. It expresses the well known but seldom acknowledged fact (among archaeologists) that there is a communication problem between the discipline and Native peoples. The profession across Canada has begun over the last ten years to place more emphasis on communication with the general public. D. G. MacLeod's (1977) article entitled Peddle or Perish: Archaeological Marketing from Concept to Product Delivery (in Conservation Archaeology: A Guide for Cultural Management Studies) is an early Ontario example, albeit government oriented, of this developing awareness; while J. V. Wright's (1984) Publish or Perish: Archaeology and the Public (The Ottawa Archaeologist Vol. 11 No. 3) reiterates the call for effective communication of the methods and results of archaeology to the general public, including Native groups. As Jim says "Broadly based public support is essential if appropriate legislation and expanded archaeological programmes are to be realized" (p. 11), and what could be more productive and appropriate than Native support for the study of their heritage in Ontario and Canada?

ARCHAEOLOGY AND NATIVE STUDIES IN ONTARIO
William A. Fox

I would like to begin by saying that it is an honour to have been invited to speak before you today. I am not a professional educator, at least not in the formal sense of the term. Thus, I have never been schooled in educational theory, nor am I well versed in the literature of the discipline. I am an archaeologist, and can only speak from my experience in that profession.

As the Southwestern Ontario provincial archaeologist, I am charged with the responsibility of attempting to conserve and manage archaeological sites throughout the region. Our region extends from Niagara in the east to Windsor in the west and Tobermory in the north, and we are provided with a full time staff of two. Because of the obvious imbalance between workload and personnel, our office has been forced to look to the public for assistance. This has led to the establishment of Ontario Archaeological Society chapters and a Ministry volunteer organization known as the Archaeological Conservation Program. Through these and other agencies, and their public events, we have endeavoured to communicate a concern for the past. In this sense, we and other archaeological staff of the Ministry are educators.

One of the most important concepts which we must communicate to all citizens of the province, be they development agency bureaucrats, school students or Native band councillors, is that archaeological resources are delicate and non-renewable. You cannot grow another prehistoric campsite. In the same way that you would not wrench apart the nest of a songbird to look at its eggs, neither should one pluck a diagnostic arrowpoint from the surface of an archaeological site. Just as those birds would die, so dies a little of your history, your heritage with each arti-
fact which is removed from context with no record. Archaeologists collecting or excavating artifacts from a site are destroying the resource just as surely as the curiosity seeker - the difference is in the recording of information. In archaeology or the scientific study of the past, context and artifact associations are paramount to our ability to reconstruct and understand past events. Time does not permit a review of archaeological method and theory, nor would such a presentation be germane to today's session.

What should be explained at this juncture is that the Province of Ontario, through the Ontario Heritage Act 1974, has expressed a concern for the preservation of our heritage. This includes built heritage, as well as archaeological sites reflecting prehistoric and historic Native activities, Euro-Canadian settlements and industry, and even underwater sites such as shipwrecks. Part VI of the Act states that "no person shall carry out archaeological exploration, an archaeological survey or field work without a license therefor issued by the Minister..." (Section 48[1]). The objective of the section is to protect our archaeological heritage by ensuring that only individuals scientifically trained in recording information are allowed to destroy the resource. Consequently, all those directing field projects in archaeology, including student field schools, must be licensed under the Act. Each application for a license is reviewed by a committee of the Ontario Heritage Foundation, a public advisory body to the Minister, and their recommendations for issuance or non-issuance of a license are usually accepted. This has important ramifications for public archaeology in general and the application of archaeology to Native studies in particular.

In Ontario, the major reference source for Native studies in the public school system is a series of documents entitled People of Native Ancestry, produced by the Ministry of Education. The first, subtitled A Resource Guide for the Primary and Junior Divisions was published in 1975. It includes some intelligent and sensitive educational theory concerning the importance of the family, community and tradition to the young Native student and makes suggestions concerning the study and appreciation of their own unique heritage. However, while an archaeological excavation is used as a text illustration (p. 22, 23), the only mention of archaeology is on page 19 where suggested activities include visits to local archaeological sites such as petroglyphs or Serpent Mounds Provincial Park.

In the Midnorthern Ontario Region supplement entitled Touch a Child, archaeological reference works relating to rock painting are included in the bibliographies for the Tell us a Story and Symbols II themes. Yet in the theme segment Craftsmen: Today and Yesterday there is no apparent archaeological input - and this, for a theme (material culture) where archaeology would seem to have its strongest opportunity to contribute.

A Resource Guide for the Intermediate Division was published in 1977 and included a few more references to archaeology. In the unit The Impact of European Cultures on Native Peoples, a work by Dr. Bruce Trigger is cited. On page 26 it is suggested that "students should have a thorough knowledge of native life before contacts with Europeans" before taking this unit, and yet, there is no explanation as to how they are to obtain this information. Surely archaeology
should provide a major data source. A section entitled Curriculum to Meet the Vocational and Avocational Needs of Native Adolescents (p. 32) makes no mention of historical or archaeological studies, yet career opportunities do exist for Native students in these disciplines.

Turning to the Resources section of the publication, we find only seven out of a total of 174 books authored or co-authored by archaeologists. None of the listed periodicals are archaeological, with the exception of the Royal Ontario Museum publication Rotunda, which occasionally includes such articles. Among the reference films, there are three involving archaeology. While one can identify an apparent lack of awareness on the part of the authors, it may also be that this sorry state of affairs reflects Ontario Archaeologists' inability to communicate with the public.

With the publication of the Curriculum Guideline for the Senior Division in 1981, we see the first substantial reference to archaeology in Native studies. The first unit is entitled Archaeology and Native Peoples (p. 13) and what is more, the first expressed aim of the curriculum itself (p. 5) is to assist students to "acquire and apply skills of analysis, synthesis, organization, interpretation, evaluation, and communication through a study of the history and cultures of Canada's Native peoples". It would be difficult to find a better description of Native archaeological study than this!

The Archaeology and Native Peoples unit is well written, concise and relatively up to date for 1981. Much archaeological insight has been gained, however, since J. V. Wright's 1972 Ontario culture history synthesis which forms the basis of this unit. On the plus side, reference is made to "the laws governing archaeological activities in Ontario". A list of several famous archaeological sites in Ontario is also provided, including a double reference to the same site (Miller alias Pickering) and ironically, in terms of the stated objective of recognizing "the moral issues related to archaeology", there is a reference to the infamous Grimsby site. While sample activities (p. 14) include "a trip to a museum or a recently excavated site", no mention of more direct field or outdoor involvement is made. This is not surprising, as archaeological field schools for high school students were not common at the beginning of this decade. Nevertheless, much has changed since then and the variety of public archaeology programs available to school students of all ages is increasing yearly.

Public archaeology programs usually involve supplementary user fees as a result of the legal requirement for archaeologically trained supervisory staff. Because of this or other logistical factors, some school boards continue to utilize simulated digs as an introduction to archaeological theory and methods. This technique of creating "modern sites" for students to excavate and ponder is still being used by institutions such as Brantford Collegiate (N. McKinnell, pers. comm.) and the Bruce County Board of Education (C. Birchard, pers. comm.), both of which have substantial Native student enrollment. Elsewhere in southwestern Ontario, county school boards and certain Native schools (i.e. Walpole, Standing Stone) have begun to take advantage of existing programs in the London vicinity.
One of the earliest public archaeology programs in the province was established by the Museum of Indian Archaeology, an affiliate of the University of Western Ontario in London. Their direct involvement with Native people and employment of Native students in London has been exemplary and extends back to 1979. A total of 19 Native students have been employed through a variety of Federally funded programs; Dr. Finlayson, the museum director, has lectured on archaeology to members of the University of Western Ontario Journalism for Native Peoples program and presently, there are four Native members in the Museum's volunteer program. Finally, another innovative precedent in Ontario Archaeology involved the employment of 12 Huron Indians from Loretteville, Quebec in a 1978 excavation of the Spang prehistoric Huron Village site, just east of Toronto.

Another early public archaeology program was instituted by the Lower Thames Valley Conservation Authority at their Longwoods Conservation Area in 1980. Prior to this, Ska-Nah-Doht, a prehistoric Iroquoian village reconstruction had been built in 1971 as an educational resource. Its design and subsequently, its interpretative program have been directed by an advisory board including Native representatives from local Reserves. A resource centre was constructed nearby and presently includes displays concerning local Native prehistory. The conservation authority employs Native people in both permanent and seasonal positions and the Longwoods C.A. also hosts the annual N'Amerind Friendship Centre Native Heritage Celebration (POW WOW).

The most creative and educationally stimulating program of which I am aware directed towards public school Native studies was developed at Longwoods by Indian Village Co-ordinator Mr. Robert Kelly during the late 70's. This involved a series of simulation games and traditional Native activities, many of them outdoor; including gardening, stalking game, artifact identification, Native sports and a trading game. Bob received an Ontario Heritage Foundation grant in 1980 to produce a teaching manual, and in 1981 submitted a manuscript entitled Hands on the Past - Learning About Traditional Iroquoian Culture. It is most unfortunate for the educational community that no publication arrangements for this manual have been concluded to date.

The "hands on" public archaeology program got started at Longwoods as a result of salvage excavations conducted by McGill University graduate student Ron Williamson on two early Iroquoian (Glen Meyer culture) hamlets situated within the Longwoods Conservation Area. Both sites were jeopardized by existing and future planned development of the property. Since they both related to Mr. Williamson's doctoral dissertation topic and were located a short distance from Ska-Nah-Doht, Ron and the conservation authority reasoned that these sites provided an excellent opportunity to incorporate real archaeological excavation activity into the existing Native studies program. Thus it was that the Longwoods Experience public archaeology program was initiated in 1980 and has continued to be offered up until the present.

Figures published by the Conservation Authority in 1984 indicate that, over a three month period, 3,300 students participated in the Longwoods Native studies and archaeology programs. In fact, 40 schools had to be turned away because these activities were fully booked for the year. Their year end report states...
that 1984 school program attendance at Ska-Nah-Doht totalled 6,557 students and yet, over the last four years (since 1982), only approximately 950 Native students have participated in their programs (J. Cobban, pers. comm.).

Why is this? Well, there are certainly far fewer Native than non-Native students in the region. A variety of other logistical or economic reasons could also be proposed. Yet, one could also ask why there are no Native professional archaeologists in Ontario. Is it due to lack of Native interest in their heritage or is there ultimately a deeper philosophical reason?

Archaeology, to varying degrees of scientific rigour, has been practised on prehistoric and historic period Native sites in Ontario for well over a century. During this lengthy period, recorded communication between archaeologists and Native peoples has been rare, to say the least. Even during several early excavations (1912 and 1930) of the Middleport prehistoric village and cemetery on the Six Nations Reserve, contact with the Native community seems to have been limited and permission to excavate in 1930 was obtained only from the individual landowner and the federal "Superintendent of the Six Nations Reserve" (Wintemberg 1948: 1).

As a result of this evident lack of communication in an area of often considerable Native religious and moral concern, confrontation was inevitable. So it was that in 1956, staff from the University of Toronto and Royal Ontario Museum participating in a salvage excavation of the Tabor Hill Ossuaries (Churcher and Kenyon 1960) in East Toronto were contacted by Longhouse members from Oshweken. These Native representatives requested the reinterment, with appropriate ceremony, of the human remains; a demand acceded to in part by the archaeologists.

Since that time, there have been periodic confrontations over the archaeological excavation of Native cemeteries, up until 1978, at the Lucier site in Windsor. Native concerns in the latter situation proved unfounded; however, this was not the case at the Beckstead site in Eastern Ontario where National Museum staff exposed prehistoric St. Lawrence Iroquois graves in 1977, or at the infamous Grimsby Historic Neutral Iroquois cemetery excavated by Dr. Walter Kenyon of the Royal Ontario Museum over the winter of 1976/77 (Kenyon 1978). Reburial of the human remains and the return of some artifacts to the St. Regis and Six Nations Reserves, respectively, was arranged ultimately.

It should be emphasized that during the 1970’s archaeological communication with Native peoples was increasing. All was not confrontation and angry words. As mentioned previously, the Museum of Indian Archaeology was soliciting the active participation of Native peoples in their programs. Further, the provincial government archaeological program, first within the Ministry of Natural Resources and then as part of the Ministry of Culture and Recreation, was making a concerted effort to consult and involve Native peoples in their work, particularly in the north. Perhaps the ultimate evidence of this growing rapport is reflected in an event which occurred in 1975, when a Ministry staff archaeologist was requested by the Manitou Rapids band to exhume an erosion threatened grave on the Rainy River. Following a successful excavation which was witnessed by band representatives, our staff were requested to undertake a
survey of the Rainy River to identify additional endangered grave sites and cemeteries. This, unfortunately, could not be followed up at the time. Another more recent positive development has been the band sanctioned Oneida Reserve archaeological survey led by Paul Antone, a Native student. The primary objective of this survey was to obtain information to be used for displays connected with the Reserve's upcoming sesquicentennial celebrations; however, the data generated will also assist in the protection of unmarked graves.

In response to Native concerns, there has not been an academically oriented Native cemetery excavation in Ontario since 1978. The only licensed archaeological excavation of Native remains, and for that matter Euro-Canadian remains, has occurred in the rescue context - that is, only when human remains have been exposed by development, looting or natural erosion and there is no logical course but exhumation and removal. This has always been done in consultation with the closest band council, when the remains have been identified as Native, and also has been carried out to the letter of the law.

The foregoing historical sketch has been provided to illustrate two facts: first, that there has been an unfortunate lack of communication between the archaeological profession and Native people in Ontario and, second, that the situation is improving. Returning to the topic of our session, I feel that this improving climate bodes well for the future of both Native studies and archaeology. While it may be that the last thing Indians need is "whites telling them their heritage", archaeology, and particularly prehistoric studies, have much to offer Ontario's Native people in developing a much longer historical perspective on their cultures. Beyond the purely philosophical aspects of such knowledge, recent legal history has shown that archaeologically derived information can be of considerable value in court cases involving Native land claims and hunting and fishing rights. On the other hand, Ontario archaeology and archaeologists have much to gain, in terms of enhanced understanding of their data, through increased communication with Native groups; and, dare I suggest it, the training of Native professional archaeologists in Ontario and across Canada.

While archaeological information cannot be equated in importance with the maintenance of Native language skills in retaining traditional values and culture, I do feel that it can offer a significant vehicle for communicating a deeper appreciation of traditional culture to Native students, while at the same time helping to dismantle the Indian stereotypes which continue to be perpetuated particularly in Euro-Canadian society.
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LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Dear Sir:

I am writing to direct attention to an oversight which is slowly becoming entrenched in the history of Ontario Palaeo-Indian research. Recent articles in Ontario Archaeology have created a misleading impression of originality in use of a caribou-reliant model in interpreting Palaeo-Indian sites.

The theoretical concept of focal reliance on large cervids has actually been in circulation over the past three decades. George MacDonald's (1968) Debert site report was the first clear articulation of this model in Canada. His landmark study has permeated our thinking about Northeastern Palaeo-Indians to the present day.

As Darwin and Wallace might have agreed, it is sometimes difficult to say where an original idea came from. However, in the context of theoretical development in Ontario, it is clear that we owe a debt to a prominent pioneer.

Sincerely,

Laurie Jackson, Northeastern Archaeological Associates
P. O. Box 493, Port Hope, Ontario, Canada L1A 3Z4

* * * *

Dear Sir:

Ontario Marine Heritage Committee

In 1975, the Ontario Marine Heritage Committee was formed to "support the research, interpretation and preservation of Ontario's marine heritage." Since its formation, members of the committee have conducted the following major projects:

2. A 5 year study on the Hope Island Wreck, since identified as the barque Marquette. Part of this study detailed the impact that sport divers have on a newly discovered wreck site.
4. A Rudder Survey of Great Lakes Sailing Vessels. The first portion of this ongoing study was published in 1985.

Projects have been conducted under license from the Ministry of Citizenship and Culture and supported by the Ontario Heritage Foundation. Reports are on file at 77 Bloor St. W. Toronto. In addition to these major projects, members are involved in research and study of various topics related to Great Lakes Maritime History.
At present, the committee is investigating the wreck of a two-masted schooner in Lake Erie. Preliminary research indicates that the schooner may be from the early nineteenth century. Next summer, work will continue on this project. Members will also examine the wreck of another sailing vessel in Georgian Bay.

We welcome correspondence from others who share a similar interest.

David Gilchrist
Box 61
Niagara-on-the-Lake
Ontario L0S 1J0

NATIVE ART STUDIES ASSOCIATION OF CANADA/
L'ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE DES ETUDES D'ART AUTOCHTONE

We wish to announce the formation of the "Native Art Studies Association of Canada/L'Association Canadienne des Etudes d'Art Autochtone" (NASAC/ACEAA). On Tuesday, October 29, 1985, a group of art historians, curators, and artists met informally in the cafeteria of the National Gallery of Canada with the purpose of founding a society that would bring together all those across the country who have a special concern for native art.

The society is founded to promote research, teaching, and understanding of native art history - prehistoric, historic, and contemporary Indian and Inuit art - and to establish and maintain communication among all those concerned with native art study and practice. Membership is open to all, but those especially encouraged to join are historians of native art, artists of native heritage, curators of native art collections, art critics, dealers and collectors of native art. Archaeologists and ethnologists with special research interests in prehistoric and historic native art are also especially invited to become members.

Communication among members will take the form, initially, of a bi-annual (or quarterly, if funds allow) newsletter and annual meetings to be held in conjunction with the "Universities Art Association of Canada/Association des universites du Canada". The first conference of NASAC/ACEAA will therefore be held in November of 1986 in Victoria, British Columbia, at which time nominations and election of a slate of officers will take place. A call for papers will be issued early in the New Year with the first Newsletter.

Membership Fees: $ 15. regular
5. artists of native background
5. full-time students

Payable to: Native Art Studies Association of Canada/L'Association Canadienne des Etudes d'Art Autochtone,
c/o Jean Blodgett, Acting Treasurer,
Department of Art History
Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario K1S 5B6

* For further information, write Joan Vastokas, Dept. of Anthropology, Trent University, Peterborough, Ontario, K9J 7B8, or call her at 705-748-1325 or -1291.

Letters to the editor
Ron Williamson received his B.A. from the University of Western Ontario and his M.A. from McGill University where he is currently a Ph.D. Candidate researching the Early Iroquoian peoples of Ontario. Williamson has had extensive archaeological experience in Ontario working at the Draper, Bruce-Boyd, and the Robin Hood (Monographs in Ontario Archaeology No. 1, 1983) Sites. Williamson also helped found Archaeological Services, Inc. and is a founding Director of The Foundation for Public Archaeology.

Ron Williamson discussed his seven years of research on the Early Iroquoian peoples of eight excavated sites on the Caradoc Sand plains of southwestern Ontario. The purpose of his research was to look at a region's population through time as to their settlement systems in regard to the ecology of the area and in comparison to similar ecological regions. Williamson tried to collect data from as many types of sites as possible in order to uncover a complete settlement system. In addition to this, he compared the locations of the sites to the plain's soil types, past vegetation patterns and physiographic regions (noting their faunal and floral resources) to see if there was any correspondence between them and the sites. Williamson found that villages (5) (e.g. the Roeland Site) were occupied year round and tended to be located on the west side of the sand plain on loam soils which had supported maple-beech forests in the past. Hamlets (20) were also studied, and some like the Kelly, Yaworski and Berkmotet Sites were excavated. Williamson found that 40-60% of the hamlets had been located in oak forests on sandy soils. He has also excavated a possible deer drive enclosure (Little Site) which had one feature that contained deer bone (almost all skeletal parts were present and they belonged to individuals ranging from the youngest to the oldest in a herd). Williamson summed up his talk with the following conclusions. He said that the Early Iroquoian (1100-1200 A.D.) population of the Caradoc Sandplain can be distinguished by their ceramics from other contemporary groups. These Early Iroquoian peoples were also still relying a lot on naturally recurring resources but were increasingly becoming more dependent on maize for their subsistence. The living patterns found on the different sites also indicate that these peoples were still developing the social-political system of the Late Iroquoian peoples. Williamson said that the last two conclusions are at odds with the conclusions drawn by earlier researchers. They thought that the Early Iroquoian peoples were living a lifestyle (economically, socially and politically) that was nearly identical to that of their Late Iroquoian descendents.

---

Toronto Chapter's Members' Meeting: Wednesday, October 16, 1985
Reported by Annie Gould

"AN OVERVIEW OF ANTHROPOLOGICAL RESEARCH IN THE MACKENZIE DELTA" BY RICHARD STROMBERG

Richard Stromberg received his B.A. in economics from George Washington Univer-
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Richard Stromberg described his Ph.D. research which has been sponsored principally by the Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre. He is looking at the little studied Eskimo populations of the Mackenzie River Delta to ascertain the details of the history of their occupation of the area. Stromberg's research has revealed that Alexander Mackenzie (in 1798) was the first European to see Mackenzie Eskimo sites (but not their occupants). It was not until Sir John Franklin's visit in 1826, that Europeans began regular contacts with these Eskimo bands. Unfortunately, later contacts with American whalers and European traders resulted in the spread of diseases among the Mackenzie Eskimo who had little immunity to them. As a result, these peoples were wiped out by the turn of the century. Stromberg noted that because of this the Mackenzie River Delta Eskimo are only known from a) journals of six explorers that were written between 1789 and 1850; b) trading records and artifacts collected by the Hudson Bay Company's factors at the nearby trading post of Fort Anderson (1861-66); and c) archaeological research by Richard MacNeish (1956), Brian Yorga (1972), Bryan Gordon (1974) and Bob McGhee (1974).

In 1983, Stromberg began excavating the Cache Point Site, which had been investigated by the aforementioned archaeologists. The site is located on a low (eroding) bluff on Richards Island, which is along the eastern channel of the Mackenzie River Delta. Stromberg's excavations uncovered semi-subterranean houses, artifacts, faunal and floral remains, and one burial belonging to the Thule Culture that have been dated stylistically to 1350-1450 A.D. Four and one half houses were totally excavated and six were tested of the twenty-one that have been found so far. The houses were located in two lines of 9-12 near the edge of the bluff. Each house had driftwood supporting the walls and the moss-covered roof of an entrance tunnel, a main chamber (with a log floor), and an alcove. A storage pit was located near each house. Stromberg said that these houses differed from the 19th century Mackenzie Eskimo ones that were described by the explorers. However, they still shared many similarities in regards to the construction materials and the general appearance. The artifacts, on the other hand, were even more similar to those of the 19th century Eskimo. One third of them were made of wood while the rest were made of bone, antler, ground and chipped stone, and clay (pottery). Stromberg noted that there is some evidence (artifacts made of soapstone, copper and jade) that the Cache Point occupants were trading with peoples to the east and west of them. The 19th century Europeans saw Mackenzie Eskimos engaged in a similar trade network. The faunal remains (mostly Beluga Whale and fish bones with some caribou) showed that the Cache Point people had a fishing and whaling economy similar to the 19th century Mackenzie Eskimo. Stromberg concluded by saying that, since the artifacts, subsistence economies, architecture and trading patterns of the Cache Point Site's peoples were similar to the 19th century Mackenzie River Delta Eskimo, the former were the ancestors of the latter. He also noted that current and future work by archaeologists in the area will expand on the afore-
Dr. Maria Shaw's talk reviewed the results of ten years (1976-1985) of excavation that have taken place at the three acre site of Kommos. She said that the site was first researched by Dr. Joseph Shaw, who was looking for early harbours on Crete. The site was the location of a harbour on the south shore of Crete at the edge of an agriculturally rich area. The excavations have looked at three areas on the site: a hilltop, its southern slope and an area to the south of it, all of which are found beside the sea. The southernmost area of excavation revealed three superimposed temples. The oldest temple was Minoan and has been dated to the 10th century B.C. The next temple has been dated to the late 8th and early 7th centuries B.C. It contained an uniconic shrine that suggested the temple had been built under Phoenician influence or by the Phoenicians themselves. The youngest temple was built by the Greeks and dates between the 4th century B.C. and the early 1st century A.D. The excavations showed that the temple was of Cretan design and not of the Classical Greek type. Dr. Shaw did not concentrate on the results of the excavations of the Minoan houses on the hill top which were not settled before the 2nd millennium B.C. However, she did describe the ceramics that have been recovered from that part of the site. Finally, Dr. Shaw described the roads and buildings found between the hill top and the temples. A wide, paved road was found to go inland from the sea eventually branching into north and south routes. Before it branched, the road ran beside the north facing facade of a building which had at least two stories on its seaward side, a stoa, a large corridor and a courtyard to the south of it. The building has been dated to the 16th century B.C. and may have been a palace. Southeast of this building are four open-ended rooms which may have been used to store ships. Dr. Shaw concluded by saying that the excavations at Kommos have shown that the site was a harbour which through time was the site of increasing Cretan contact with foreign cultures such as Cyprus, Syria and Italy.
by John Steckley

There is evidence suggesting that burbot (Lota lota (Linnaeus)) may have been an important food fish for the Huron at the time of early contact. The purpose of this short paper is twofold:

1) to present the evidence; and
2) to ask archaeologists whether their faunal data supports my interpretation of the written evidence.

THE EVIDENCE

In the writing of Recollect Brother Gabriel Sagard, who stayed in Huronia in 1623-4, we find three references to a fish named Einchataon. The first two we find in his journal:

"But the fish, of which they lay in a supply for winter after it is smoked, they store in casks of tree-bark which they call Acha, except Leinchataon, which is a fish they do not clean and which they hang with cords in the roof of the lodge, because if it were packed in any cask it would smell too bad and become rotten at once." (Sagard 1939: 95)

"Some weeks after the catch of the big fish/atsihiendo/, the savages to to catch the Einchataon, which is a fish rather like the barbel/ catfish/ here, about a foot and a half or a little less. This fish is used to give a taste to their sagamite during the winter, and for this reason they make much of it, as well as the big fish; and in order that it may make their soup smell better they do not remove the viscera, and the fish keep hanging in bundles on the poles of their lodges. But I can assure you that in Lent, when the weather begins to be warm, it stank and has such a frightfully bad smell that our gorge rose at it, while to them, it was musk and civet." (op. cit., pp230-31; additions mine)

The third reference is in Sagard's dictionary or phrase book, under the heading of "Poissons" (Sagard 1865):

"Autre comme barbeaux. Einchataon."

In the French/Huron/Onondaga dictionary of the mid 1650's (see Steckley 1982: 29), there are two entries that appear to refer to Einchataon. In the list of fish names we find the following: "du bord de l'eau/on the edge of the water/. Annentrata,on." (FH017)

Elsewhere, in the listing of the months of the year, as an alternative name for what may be either October or Novemberl, is the entry:

"du bord de l'eau. Annentrata,on e,ârok." (FH0 "lunes")
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That the Annentrata, on of these entries is the Einchataon of Sagard's writing can be more readily seen if it is kept in mind that Sagard often used -ein- where the Jesuit missionary linguists of later times wrote -en-, and sometimes used -ch- to represent what the Jesuits wrote as -tr-. Examples are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sagard</th>
<th>Jesuits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Tu pleures, pleure.</td>
<td>sarenta³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sareinta. &quot;2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Il demeure,...</td>
<td>hentrontaqué.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hainchontaqué.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The word Annentrata, on is comprised of the noun -nnentrat- meaning 'shore' (Pot450 "annenta / annentrata / anentara") and the noun suffix -on- meaning 'on' or 'in' (Pot163 #11 "a, on"), and means 'on the shore'.

The e,a,rok in the entry for the calendar of months is comprised of the noun -aar- meaning 'net' (pot446 "araa") and the verb -0- meaning 'to be (in) water' (Pot401 #1* "o"). The particular combination presented above means 'one will put a net in the water' (see Pot402 and Steckley 1983:12). The term for the month thus means 'when one will put a net in the water from the shore'.

Was the term 'on the shore' the name for the fish, or just an abbreviated version of the phrase for the method of catching it? The fact that the term is not present in the version of the list that appeared in the dictionary at the end of the 17th century (FHL), and two new names appear might give us a clue. The two new terms are: "Morue. /cod/ Sanguietsia."

"Saumon. /salmon/ honn'Chionch." (FHL232, additions mine)

Annentrata, on could not have been the salmon as the Jesuits would have early recognized it. Could Sanguietsia then have been the name for the fish earlier recorded as Annentrata, on? There is a distinct possibility, although the evidence is far from conclusive.

The burbot is a member of the cod family, and is sometimes referred to as the 'freshwater cod' (Scott and Crossman 1973:645). Its range includes the waters of historic Huronia. A tentative translation of the name Sanguietsia can be seen as presenting evidence that points to it referring to the same fish as Annentrata, on.

The name clearly has the verb -es- meaning 'to be long' (Pot385 #47 "etsi"). The noun is more difficult to determine, but it could be a shortened version of -ngwira- meaning 'fish tail'. Some Huron nouns drop final -r- when in composition with verbs. An example is "entara" meaning 'red fur', which becomes "enta" in composition (Pot455). If such is the case here, then the noun plus verb combination would mean 'long fish tail', possibly a reference to the long dorsal fins of the burbot.

How does the rest of the evidence relate to the burbot? We can answer this...
question by grouping the evidence into five basic points. The fish we are looking for:

a) is caught some weeks after the atsiihendo;
b) is something like a catfish;
c) is typically a foot and a half or slightly less in length when caught;
d) is not eviscerated after it is caught; and
e) is caught by a net that is cast or stretched out from shore.

When these points are looked at more closely, the burbot seems the most logical candidate for the fish being described.

A fish that is caught some weeks after atsiihendo.

A term for October that appears in all Huron calendar lists is "atsiihendo a, anna,oha", a phrase that can be translated as '(when) the atsiihendo come or run' (Steckley 1983:12). When Sagard went fishing with the Huron in 1623 to catch atsiihendo they left in October and stayed until some time in November (Sagard 1939: 185-86). If Annentrata, on was caught some weeks after this period, then the reference to Annentrata, on e,arok as a month term would probably be to November rather than October.

The burbot is unusual in being a winter spawner. Scott and Crossman tell us that:

"It spawns from November to May over the whole of its world distribution, but mainly from January to March in Canada."
(Scott and Crossman 1973: 643)

The only other local fish that spawns around that time is the whitefish. But it has a different name in Huron. The usual term for November was "chionh8a a, anna,oha. pesche du poisson blanc" (FHL244), meaning '(when) whitefish come or run' (Steckley 1983:13).

In his attempt to identify Sagard's Einchataon, Heidenreich looked at a number of fish (including the burbot) and concluded:

"Of these, the catfish comes perhaps the closest. The fact that the Huron caught the Einchataon in the late fall after the trout and.../atsiihendo/...had gone corresponds to the habits of the catfish, who seek out the spawning areas to feed on the eggs."
(Heidenreich 1971:211)

One weakness in this conclusion is that the Huron had a different term for catfish, "tonn8a Ctont" (see FHL232).

A fish that is something like a catfish.

It is useful here to look at what exactly was written in the original French. The phrase was:

"vn poison quelque peu approchant aux Barbeaux de par-deca" (op. cit.)

The expression quelque peu is better translated as 'slightly, to a slight extent' (see Dubois 1979:534) than the 'rather like' of the published English transla-
tion. With its long slender barbel on the tip of its chin and the similar bar-
bel-like extensions from its nostril openings (Scott and Crossman 1973:641) the
burbot is 'slightly' like a catfish. Bullheads (black, yellow or brown) are
too much like catfish to qualify according to strict reading of this transla-
tion. In addition, they are early summer spawners, and are too short to answer
to the description in Sagard (op. cit., pp 591, 595 and 598).

A fish that is typically a foot and a half or slightly less in length when
caught.

The evidence here again points to the burbot. The average length of the burbot
is 15 inches or 381 mm (op. cit., p 641). They reach sexual maturity, thus being
part of the spawning, during their third or fourth year (op. cit., p 643). At
that time, the female at least is 11.0 to 18.9 inches (280 - 480 mm) in length.
In a 1954 study of Lake Simcoe burbot reported in Scott and Crossman (op. cit.,
p 643), burbot were recorded as reaching an average of 432 mm at age three, only
slightly less than the 457.2 mm or the reported foot and a half.

A fish that is not eviscerated after it is caught.

Why would a fish not be eviscerated? There is a good reason in the case of the
burbot. The liver of the burbot has a high nutritional value. According to
Scott and Crossman:

"The vitamin A potency of burbot liver oil is stated to be about
500 units or more per gram and analyses of the vitamin D potency
of the oil obtained from the large liver have shown it to be as
good as that obtained from cod liver." (op. cit., p 645)

Unfortunately, the way the non-eviscerated fish was processed may make it dif-
ficult for the significance of the burbot to show up clearly in the archaeologi-
ical record. When Champlain wrote of the corn soup of the Huron he claimed that:

"When it is all cooked they take out the fish, and crush it very
fine, not caring whether they take out the bones, scales or en-
trails as we do, but putting it together into the same pot, which
usually gives it its bad taste." (Champlain 1929: 127)

A fish that is caught by a net that is cast or stretched out from shore.

The burbot spawns in shallow waters, so it would appear that it could get
caught in this way. Scott and Crossman tell us that:

"...the spawning site is usually in 1-4 feet of water over sand
or gravel bottom in shallow bays, or on gravel shoals 5-10 feet
deep." (op. cit., p 643)

That burbot can be profitably fished using nets during winter spawning can be
seen by the fact that in the winter of 1964 in Manitoba researchers netted
50,000 pounds of burbot in 3 days, using trap nets (op. cit., p 644).
CONCLUSION

It would seem that burbot is the Einchataon of Sagard's writing and the Annentrataon of the Jesuits. It remains for the archaeological record to support or question this hypothesis.

FOOTNOTES

1. The problem here is that although "du bord de l'eau. Annentrataon e,arok." appears to be the second entry for October, "Ora, eniat Aratso ok&etonx8a" equally appears to be the second entry for November in this dictionary, while in other dictionaries (see FHL244) it is given as the first entry for December.

2. Sagard 1865 "Pleurer".

3. Pot173 #77.

4. Sagard 1865 "Demeurer, ne bouger".

5. Pot392 #17.
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1985 SITE-TESTING AT THE BAUMANN SITE:
A 15th CENTURY PRECONTACT SITE IN HURONIA

By Marianne P. Stopp

INTRODUCTION

This is intended as a summary of the results of 4 weeks excavation in June, 1985. The Baumann site was previously excavated in 1980 (Stopp 1985) with the intention of developing a cultural data base for this time period beyond that of rimsherd collection. The 1985 excavations took place in the same field as those of 1980 but the goals were of a surveying/site-testing nature. The intent remains to develop a data base, but more specifically, the 1985 search was for further structures as well as to test beyond the modern-day property boundaries.

The lands to the south and west of the Baumann property belong to two different landholders, both of whom farm their fields. Neither landholder granted permission to test trench, due to crop growth, although testing just inside the fence lines to the limits of the crop was permitted. In one case, excavation could only have gone ahead if payment for crop loss were made. Testing along the fence lines did reveal that the site does continue beyond the modern-day field boundary.

Test trenches placed within the Baumann field resulted in evidence of 3 new structures and possibly a fourth, all located in the south end of the field. A total crew of 4 with occasional volunteers required the month to excavate trenches, collect and process the data. Evening labwork ensured the cataloguing of all finds, and mapping of the trenches. Time was not available to properly test trench the north half of the field. In 1980 and 1985 1x1 m, or smaller test squares were occasionally excavated in this north end, but no evidence of cultural activity has been found here. These test squares are not to be trusted however, in that they can easily bypass cultural evidence; a function of their size.

SITE DESCRIPTION

To avoid unnecessary repetition this information is available in the first report of this site (Stopp 1985).

EXCAVATION METHODS

Testing was done judgementally, rather than by any statistical sampling method. In the case of the south end of the field the former method had the advantage over the latter in that test units were placed where previous test pitting had uncovered postmould activity. With the time and money available to the project, it was advantageous to begin with the known as opposed to excavating in randomly selected possibly sterile units.

Trenching, in turn, was chosen over test squares because a continuous length of excavation would allow more conclusive results when looking for structural evi-
dence. Test pits "... are not the way to find out about structures larger than the test pit. In some cases pits may be the best way to locate features, but they should then be expanded to reveal more or less the entire feature" (Cowgill 1975: 266-7).

Four trenches were opened, one of these with a backhoe. The trenches were labelled E, F, G, and H, trenches A-D having been opened in 1980 (Fig. 1).

Methods of excavation were as follows: Sods were carefully removed and placed aside. Topsoil was then removed by shovel-shining, and in the case of Test Trench (T.T.) G, by backhoe. Once the cultural (yellow sandy loam) layer became visible trowelling began, and this layer was exposed entirely before mapping and measuring.

In order to avoid sun-baking the excavation surface, large sheets of plastic were used to cover dormant sections, and were kept on at night to trap moisture for the following day. This proved very effective and prevented loss of data due to drying up of surface soils. Clay patches which are part of the original soil matrix did, however, pose a problem, particularly in T.T. E.

All housewall postmoulds were sectioned for depth measurement, and a percentage of interior postmould depths were taken. All mapping was done using a plane table. Features were sectioned, profiles drawn, and the feature contents screened through 1/8 inch wire mesh. Detailed information was kept for all features excavated. In the case of T.T. G, time did not allow the excavation of all features.

ARTIFACT ANALYSIS

As this is a summary, the artifacts will not be dealt with per item. Table 1 presents the artifact classes recovered according to quantity and find location. Excavation only took place within living areas and this is the reason for the scarcity of artifacts. Living structures appear to have been kept relatively free of debris.

The lithic and bone artifacts differ in no way from those reported previously (Stopp 1985: 12-15), except in their meagre quantity. Pipes are fragmented and non-diagnostic. A single copper fragment was recovered 40 cm below surface in a large feature in House 4. It measures 1x1 cm and is beaten flat. One edge has been folded over to a distance of 2 mm. An x-ray fluorescence analysis indicates this copper fragment to be of North American origin (Dowling 1985).

Twenty-four ceramic rimsherds were recovered and these exhibit certain parallels with the 1980 rimsherds. Seven attributes were previously (Stopp 1985: 17-22) introduced which may prove to be temporally relevant to 15th century assemblages in Huronia. Table 2 presents the attribute frequencies of the 1985 collection. In comparing these frequencies with those of the 1980 collection an attempt is being made to determine if certain frequencies can be directly associated with particular attributes, thus resulting in a characteristic representation for
BAUMANN SITE

BdGv-14
Figure 1
Location of excavation trenches

Arch Notes

Jan/Feb 1986
this time period, and for particular attributes. The scarcity of comparative data for the 15th century puts the testing of this hypothesis at a preliminary stage in that further attributes may become significant with more comparative data, and some of the seven attributes presented below may require deletion.

By comparing the 1980 and 1985 attribute results it will be noted that Simple Collar motif remains the best represented primary ground pattern, characteristically in association with a variation of remaining motifs. The Opposed Collar motif representation remains close to the 25% frequency representation established for the 1980 rimsherd (Stopp 1985: 19). Horizontal Collar motif appears to remain low in its representation, a trait seemingly characteristic of the Baumann site, when compared to the higher representation on other sites of the period (Stopp 1985: 19). Neck decoration is a trait which peaks during the 15th century, being low before and after this time. The 50% representation for this analysis is significantly higher than the 33.3% determined by Latta (1976: 79), and the 27.2% determined for the 1980 collection from Baumann (Stopp 1985: 19). Horizontal overscore is a trait which decreases from Middleport towards contact times. In this collection it only occurs over the Simple Collar motif, differing with previously reported results where it appears on 12 different backgrounds with a frequency representation of 16.3% (Stopp 1985: 20). The 1985 result remains consistent, or, seemingly within the correct range, at 21% representation. Castellation types and their frequencies are another trait highly distinctive to this time period, however, none were recovered during 1985. The most frequent types are present and continue in the characteristic frequency sequence: High Collar Lalonde, 26%; Huron incised, 17%; Black Necked, 9%.

FLORAL AND FAUNAL REMAINS

Faunal analysis is presently being done at the University of Toronto and these results cannot yet be given. Floral data is summarized in the following paragraphs.

All seeds and wood samples were collected from features within the longhouses. One complete bean seed and the sumac seeds are uncharred.

Analysis of the charred wood samples indicates the following hardwoods to have survived: Black ash (Fraxinus nigra); elm (Ulmus americana); american beech (Fagus grandifolia); yellow birch (Betula alleghaniensis); trembling poplar (Populus tremuloides); and slippery elm (Ulmus rubra). Softwoods are not represented probably due to the fact that they break down quickly during firing. It is quite possible that their use during cooking, etc. was minimized due to increased spark activity, characteristic of softwood, as well as to the greater speed of breakdown - a chunk of hardwood burns better.

Table 3 summarizes seed sizes of the complete specimens.

TEST TRENCHES

Figure 1 indicates the direction in which the structures are aligned. In the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>House 2 Feature</th>
<th>House 2 Other</th>
<th>House 3 Feature</th>
<th>House 3 Other</th>
<th>House 4 Feature</th>
<th>House 4 Other</th>
<th>House 5 Feature</th>
<th>House 5 Other</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decorated rims</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorated body</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecorated body</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipe fragments</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chertdebitage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quartz crystal debitage</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2
BdGv-14 Attribute Frequencies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple collar motif</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-as primary ground pattern</td>
<td>16/24</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-as only pattern</td>
<td>10/24</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed collar motif</td>
<td>7/24</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal collar motif</td>
<td>2/24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck decoration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-necks missing</td>
<td>12/24</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-no decoration</td>
<td>9/24</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal overscore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-only occurs over the simple collar motif</td>
<td>2/24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castellations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Following those attributes suggested as possibly significant for the development of regional chronologies (Stopp 1985: 17-22).

TABLE 3
BdGv-14 SEED SIZES (mm)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Length Mean</th>
<th>Length Range</th>
<th>Width Mean</th>
<th>Width Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(mm)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>8.77</td>
<td>5.5-10 (8)</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>4-6.5 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>10-11.5 (2)</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>6-6.5 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumac</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3-4 (112)</td>
<td>-irregular-shape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House</th>
<th>Mean Range</th>
<th>Mean Range</th>
<th>Mean Range</th>
<th>Mean Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.48</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>12.96</td>
<td>5.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>10.16</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not all interior posts were excavated for depth. 256 out of 842 posts (34%) total were excavated.
case of T.T. F no housewall post alignment was discernible although numerous postmoulds and features were present. This part of the field has been disturbed by plow cutting, and historic sherds were recovered alongside Iroquoian features in this trench. This section may be evidence of outside activity but the possibility that it could still turn out to be a house has not been ruled out.

Table 4 summarizes postmould measurements and Table 5 the feature data. As with House 1 (Stopp 1985: 8) there continue to be two distinctive groups of features: ash-filled, basin-shaped in profile, and midden-like oval/bell-shaped. The unknown category consists of those features which have a darker brown colour than the surrounding sandy loam matrix and without the ash contents. They have inconsistent profiles, have charcoal bits (as do all features), and are suspected to have been filled-in storage features.

An irregularly shaped orange-stained feature in T.T. F could have been a hearth base. There was some ash associated with it, and charcoal bits. The sandy loam had taken on the orange colouring probably due to high heat oxidation. The orange-stained features generally associated with hearth evidence on Iroquoian sites are rare on the Baumann site. They are not consistently associated with the postmould/feature clusters in the houses when they do occur. Hearth evidence criteria require re-evaluation for this site.

CONCLUSIONS

This summary report presents further cultural information collected in order to build up the lack of such for study of the precontact period in Huronia.

The goal of the 1985 field season was site-testing, not full-scale excavation, which has considerably altered the nature of the data obtained as compared to 1980. For instance, there are very few artifacts, floral or faunal remains because these do not occur in abundance within longhouses.

The 1985 longhouse sections are similar to House 1 of 1980 in that the dense postmould/feature clusters are present. There are consistencies in house orientation that the 3 structures located in 1985 are aligned northwest-southeast, House 1 being northeast-southwest.

Future research at the Baumann site should include testing the north end of the field as well as uncovering and examining further house structures, including the areas adjacent to and between houses.

Combined with settlement data collection should be an effort to determine the environmental exploitation patterns of this group and whether these changed over time. Such a research orientation would permit reconstruction of the economic system from the archaeological data, as opposed to our present assumptions of precontact environmental adaptation based solely on contact ethnographic information. That adaptive patterns, and as a result the economics of the society changed with the advent of the contact period is a given, yet this also has to be tested archaeologically. These endeavours would require systematic midden excavation, the results of which would be worthwhile.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N/S diameter</th>
<th>E/W diameter</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ash-filled</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.T. F (1)</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.T. G (4)</td>
<td>41.63</td>
<td>16.5-92</td>
<td>14-128</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.T. H (-)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Midden-like</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.T. E (5)</td>
<td>24.20</td>
<td>10-60</td>
<td>3-20</td>
<td>16.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.T. F (3)</td>
<td>31.33</td>
<td>24-44</td>
<td>20.36</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.T. G (9)</td>
<td>20.22</td>
<td>17-27</td>
<td>17-35</td>
<td>22.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.T. H (1)</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unknown</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.T. E (3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5-20</td>
<td>4-16</td>
<td>4-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.T. F (3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12.42</td>
<td>16-58</td>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.T. G (5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22.5-200</td>
<td>23.5-160</td>
<td>14-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.T. H (-)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not excavated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.T. G (11)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15-30</td>
<td>21-36</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Where did the populations that ultimately became the Seneca and Cayuga tribes come from? How did they evolve into the historic tribes? Did they share a common origin or any other part of their developmental sequence?

In *THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE SENeca AND CAYUGA TRIBES OF NEW YORK STATE*, Mary Ann Palmer Niemczycki provides a thorough examination of archaeological data from both tribal territories in an effort to answer these questions.

To organize known sites in the Seneca-Cayuga region into a general chronological sequence, Dr. Niemczycki analyzes both published and newly collected ceramic data, using certain ceramic types and attributes as markers or indicators of phases of cultural development. From an analysis of ceramic similarity, she concludes that at least part of the historic Seneca population originated in the Cayuga Lake region, while the Cayuga developed largely in situ, within their historic territory.

Dr. Niemczycki considers these findings in conjunction with additional archaeological and ethnohistorical data to reconstruct the sequence of population movement and cultural development that culminated in the formation of the Seneca and Cayuga tribes.

"No support was found for the theory that the Seneca entered their historic homeland from the southwest via Dansville or that the Cayuga immigrated to Cayuga Lake from the Seneca territory. Quite the opposite appears to be the case," she concludes.
In addition to describing the evolution of the Seneca and Cayuga into discrete tribal societies, Dr. Niemczycycki provides a model of tribal evolution that may be applied to and tested against data from the rest of the north-eastern United States and elsewhere.

Mary Ann Palmer Niemczycycki obtained her Ph.D. from the State University of New York at Buffalo. She has been a Research Fellow of the Rochester Museum & Science Center since 1980 and currently teaches anthropology at SUNY/Brockport.

* * * * *
Museum of Indian Archaeology

RESEARCH REPORTS
Recent Publications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Title, Author</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>A Preliminary Report on the 1980 Archaeological Survey of the Catfish Creek Drainage, East Elgin County, Ontario, by Dana R. Poulton. vii + 42 pages (18 figures)</td>
<td>$ 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>An Analytical Approach to the Seriation of Iroquoian Pottery, by David G. Smith. x + 103 pages (44 tables, 12 figures)</td>
<td>$ 5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The Windermere, Ronto, and Smallman Sites: Salvage Excavations of Prehistoric Iroquoian Hamlets, by Robert J. Pearce. iii + 65 pages (8 tables, 6 figures, 5 plates)</td>
<td>$ 8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Report on the Salvage Excavations at Pincombe 2, Pincombe 5, and Pincombe 6, by Robert J. Pearce and Joni Catsburg. vii + 54 pages (10 tables, 8 figures, 11 plates)</td>
<td>$ 8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>An Analysis of the Draper Site Chipped Lithic Artifacts, by Dana R. Poulton. viii + 101 pages (23 tables, 13 plates)</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Analysis of Intrisite Artifact Spatial Distributions: The Draper Site Smoking Pipes, by Alex von Gernet, xx + 271 pages (108 tables, 22 figures, 19 plates)</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Draper Site Ground and Rough Stone Artifacts, by Robert J. Pearce. vii + 70 pages (26 tables, 2 figures, 7 plates)</td>
<td>$ 8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Draper Site Miscellaneous Ceramic Artifacts, by Robert J. Pearce. vii + 37 pages (5 tables, 5 plates)</td>
<td>$ 5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>An Analysis and Interpretation of Radiocarbon Dates in Iroquoian Archaeology, by Peter A. Timmins. x + 178 pages (12 figures)</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cheques or Money Orders Payable to:
Museum of Indian Archaeology
1600 Attawandaron Road
London, Ontario, Canada
N6G 3M6
(519) 473-1360

Arch Notes -38- Jan/Feb 1986
GRAND RIVER/WATERLOO
President Ken Ottridge (519) 821-3112
Vice-President Dean Knight
Treasurer Marilyn Cornies-Milne
Secretary Burns Proudfoot - 93 Milford Ave., #101, Waterloo, Ont. N2L 3Z5
Newsletter THE BIRDSTONE - Editor: Lois McCulloch
Chapter Fees Individual $5
Meetings: Usually at 8:00 p.m. on the 3rd Wednesday of each month, excluding June, July and August. Adult Recreation Centre, 185 King St. S., Waterloo.

LONDON
President Neal Ferris (519) 433-8401
Vice-President Linda Gibbs
Treasurer George Connoy
Secretary To be appointed
Newsletter KEWA - Editor: Bill Fox
Chapter Fees Individual $12, Family $14, Institutional $16
Meetings: Usually at 8:00 p.m. on the 2nd Thursday of each month, excluding June, July and August. Museum of Indian Archaeology, London.

OTTAWA
President Stephen L. Cumbaa (613) 235-8696
Vice-President Phyllis Lenethen
Secretary/Treasurer Marion Clark - 400 Second Ave., Ottawa, Ont. K1S 2J4
Newsletter THE OTTAWA ARCHAEOLOGIST - Editor: C. Kennedy
Chapter Fees Individual $15, Family $17, Student $10
Meetings: Usually at 8:00 p.m. on the 2nd Wednesday of each month, excluding June, July and August. Victoria Memorial Bldg., Metcalfe & McLeod Streets.

THUNDER BAY
President Frances Duke (807) 683-5375
Vice-President George Holborn
Secretary/Treasurer Lee Tracz - 144 McComber Cres., Thunder Bay, Ont. P7A 7E8
Newsletter WANIKAN - Editor: Ruth Hamilton
Chapter Fees Individual $4
Meetings: Usually at 8:00 p.m. on the last Wednesday of each month, excluding June, July and August. The National Exhibition Centre, Balmoral Avenue.

TORONTO
President Dene Doroszenko (416) 537-6732
Vice-President Tony Stapells
Treasurer Marjorie Clarkson
Secretary Annie Gould - 74 Carsbrooke Rd., Etobicoke, Ont. M9C 3C6
Newsletter PROFILE - Editor: Jane Sacchetti
Chapter Fees Individual $8
Meetings: Usually at 8:00 p.m. on the 3rd Wednesday of each month, excluding June, July and August. Room 561a Sidney Smith Hall, St. George St., Toronto.

WINDSOR
President Laurie Leclair (519) 727-5769
Vice-President Rosemary Denuzio
Treasurer Peter Reid
Secretary Garth Rumble - 454 Tecumseh Rd., R.R. 1, Tecumseh, Ont. N8N 2L9
Newsletter SQUIRREL COUNTY GAZETTE - Editor: Peter Reid
Chapter Fees Individual $3
Meetings: Usually at 7:30 p.m. on the 2nd Tuesday of each month, excluding June, July and August. Windsor Public Library, 850 Ouellette Ave., Windsor.
The Ontario Archaeological Society

EXECUTIVE 1986

President
Dr. Donald Brown
39 Weatherell Street
Toronto, Ont.
M6S 1S8
(416) 769-5078

Treasurer
Mr. Geoffrey Sutherland
20 Bonacres Avenue
West Hill, Ont.
MIC 1P7
(416) 284-5205

Director
Mr. John Steckley
20 Forest Manor Rd.
#105
Willowdale, Ont.
M2J 1M2
(416) 499-6985

Secretary
Ms. Marjorie Tuck
4 Eastglen Crescent
Islington, Ont.
M9B 4P7
(416) 622-9706

Director
Ms. Christine Caroppo
142 Glebeholme Blvd.
Toronto, Ont.
M4J 1S6
(416) 466-0460

Editor: Arch Notes
Mr. Michael W. Kirby
1225 Avenue Road
Toronto, Ont.
M5N 2G5
(416) 484-9358

Editor: Ontario Archaeology
Dr. Richard B. Johnston
Department of Anthropology
Trent University
Peterborough, Ont.
K9J 7B8

APPOINTED MEMBERS 1986

ADMINISTRATOR & LIBRARIAN

Mr. Charles Garrad
103 Annandale Drive
Willowdale, Ont.
M2N 2X3
(416) 223-2752

PUBLICATIONS

Scientific Journal: ONTARIO ARCHAEOLOGY
Newsletter: ARCH NOTES
Monographs: MONOGRAPHS IN ONTARIO ARCHAEOLOGY

FEES

Individual $16
Family $20
Institutional $30
Life $250
Chapter Fees Extra

Arch Notes -40- Jan/Feb 1986