Parks Canada archaeologists at work, YMCA Camp Kitchikewana, Georgian Bay Islands National Park. Photo by Parks Canada
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old habits are hard to break. Take for example this message. Having come to rely on the OAS president’s message, in the form of Jean-Luc’s often insightful, personal take on archaeology in Ontario and in the world, I certainly was happily awaiting his latest offering for the first Arch Notes of the second decade of the 21st century – until it dawned on me that, as of January, Jean-Luc had become the past-president of the OAS, and I had rather cautiously agreed to serve as president. Meaning the missives were now part of my assignment!

So I offer this brief, hurried communiqué, in lieu of a more substantive introduction. That, no doubt, will arise in the newsletters ahead, for I am sympathetic to the approach Jean-Luc adopted and so I will strive, in however a lesser capacity, to carry on that tradition.

In the interim, however, let me say that I have always been very impressed, both as a long standing OAS member and in my current role on the Board and past role on an OAS Chapter executive, with the commitment and effort the people on the Board, the Executive Director, publication editors, and Chapter executives all put in to making the OAS work for all members and users of this organisation’s output and activities. I am honoured and more than a little anxious to now be serving as president, and I hope I can help contribute to the ongoing success of the Society.

And there is plenty to keep us busy. We appear, as always and as a community, to be going through major changes in practice and indeed in even thinking about what it means to be doing archaeology in Ontario today. This coming year is set to continue that trend, with perhaps the formal adoption of changed standards of practice for commercial archaeology (which so dominates practice), as well as the greater integration of First Nations and Aboriginal communities into the basic activity and day to day decision-making of that practice. The implications of these changes, of course, are not the exclusive domain of commercial practice, but will affect us all. And critically these changes require all of us, both archaeologists (academic, avocational, consultant, student), as well as others in Ontario society today that value, interact with or learn from the province’s archaeological heritage, to work together and recognise our commonalities, as well as accommodate our distinct differences.

I strongly feel, as I know many of you do, too, that the OAS will be absolutely essential as the integrative force in the province to help recognise need, lead discussion, mediate difference and identify action, as we all negotiate the changed and changing world of Ontario archaeology.

But with one eye on that big picture, a lot of the day to day of the Board and Executive Director consists of striving to streamline and enhance member services, as we grapple with meshing 20th century databases, office technologies and conventions, with members reasonable expectations of 21st century access to those services! Jean-Luc, along with Luke Dalla Bona and others, have been instrumental in helping the OAS move here, but clearly we have more work to do on our administrative ‘back end’, and will continue to pre-occupy time at our Board meetings.

So lots to do! And no doubt I envision one of my jobs will be to knock on doors to ask some of you to help out the OAS with one initiative or another. I do hope you will jump at the opportunity, or better yet come forward with particular initiatives you would like to tackle on behalf of your fellow members! This I hope, since I’ve yet to take the course offered to OAS presidents – Arm-Twisting 101.

Until next time,

Neal Ferris
President

**A Peterborough Chapter of the OAS?**

In January 2010, I spoke as the new OAS Director of Heritage Advocacy, at a meeting of the Peterborough Historical Society, to announce the intention of forming a Peterborough Chapter of the OAS. When I asked how many present were already in the OAS, only one person raised her hand – Martha Kidd – a founding member of the OAS! With no chapters between Toronto and Ottawa, Peterborough would serve the broader region of east central Ontario and would be our eighth chapter. There are already about 50 members in the area.

Each chapter sets and collects its own dues and ours would do the same. The chapter would organize monthly meetings, featuring talks by local and visiting archaeologists and other heritage specialists. As with some other chapters, we could conduct archaeological excavations and laboratory analysis under the supervision of qualified licensed archaeologists, put out a newsletter, and so on.

If you are interested in joining or are already a member of the OAS and want to help start up a Peterborough
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Retracing the fur-trade trail

Timothy Kent has done it again with another major book. A Modern-Day Voyageur Family is the story of how Tim, his wife Dorée and their two sons, at the beginning aged only seven and five (the journey took 15 years), paddled the 3,000 mile fur-trade canoe route across the US and Canada from Montreal to Alberta, retracing the steps (paddle-strokes) of their French-Canadian ancestors, who worked the same route between ca. 1618 and 1758.

A vivid modern-day adventure story and a primer on virtually all aspects of the French fur trade, the book is hardcover, 760 pages, 36 colour photographs and maps, and is accompanied by a DVD with 370 colour photographs, narrative, and musical accompaniment.

Order from Silver Fox Enterprises, P.O. Box 176, 11504 U.S. 23 South, Ossineke, MI 49766 ($69.95 plus $20 shipping Canadian). Visit www.timothyjkent.com for more details and news of Tim's other related books.

Provided by Charles Garrard

Meeting of the New York State Archaeological Assoc. April 23-25

President Bill Englebrecht sends along best wishes for 2010 to all OAS members, and notes that the 94th annual meeting of the New York State Archaeological Association will be April 23-25.

Further information can be obtained from their website. The link to the Winter 2010 newsletter is:
http://nysaaaweb.bfn.org/newsletter/newsletter_winter10.pdf

Canadian Subsidy Directory, 2009 Edition, is now available, newly revised it is the most complete and affordable reference for anyone looking for financing. It is the perfect tool for new and existing businesses, individuals, foundations and associations. This publication contains more than 3500 direct and indirect financial subsidies, grants and loans offered by government departments and agencies, foundations, associations and organizations. In this edition all programs are well described.

Canadian Subsidy Directory (All Canada, federal + provincial + foundations)
CD-Rom PDFfile)..........................$69.95
Printed (430 ages).......................$149.95
Also available for each province separately, on CD-Rom only at $49.95, except Quebec which is $69.95

To obtain a copy please call toll free 1-866-322-3376 or local 819-322-5756, or write to: Canadian Subsidy Directory, 14-A Des Seigneurs, St-Sauveur, QC, J0R 1R0
ANISHINAAABEMOWIN: TRADITIONAL LANGUAGE IN THE NAMING OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES

by William Arthur Allen

DEDICATION

This paper is dedicated to Elder Dr. William Commanda, Order of Canada, on the occasion of his 96th birthday, Nov. 11, 2009. Elder Commanda, who has taught me so much about traditional language, is the man who gave me my Anishinaabemowin Spirit Name and who, based on my consultations with him, has provided me with many of the names for archaeological sites registered with the Ontario Ministry of Culture.

The paper is adapted from a presentation prepared for Ontario Archaeological Society Symposium 2008, Toronto, Ontario, October 18, 2008.

Introduction:

I have a story. It is about the importance of place, the traditional naming of places, the naming of archaeological sites and the role of Aboriginal consultation in the naming of archaeological sites. The focus is on Anishinaabemowin, the traditional language of the Anishinaabeg, the Algonquian-speaking people of Algonquia, the vast territory north of the Great Lakes between the Rocky Mountains and Labrador (Allen 2004:38).

The Importance of Place:

In Aboriginal culture the naming of places is important and is undertaken with considerable thought so that the name accurately reflects the character of the land at that place. In its seminal policy entitled “An Approach to Aboriginal Cultural Landscapes,” Parks Canada notes that a place name, along with its use in stories and instructional travel, is the way that knowledge of the place is passed from generation to generation. Traditional place names serve as memory ‘hooks’ on which to hang the cultural fabric of a narrative tradition. In this way, physical geography ordered by place names is transformed into a social landscape where culture and topography are symbolically fused. (Parks Canada und., citing Andrews and Zoe, 1997; Andrews, 1990: 4).

Article 13 of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, adopted by resolution of the General Assembly on September 13, 2007, provides that Indigenous peoples have the right to revitalize their languages and to designate and retain their own names for communities, places (my emphasis) and persons (United Nations 2008). Although Canada was one of only four countries on the planet who voted against the UN resolution, that decision does not diminish the significance in Canada of place in Aboriginal culture and language.

Indeed, many Aboriginal place names survive as the legal names on Ontario’s map. The words Canada, Ontario, Ottawa, Muskoka, Madawaska, Agawa, Abitibi and a host of other names reinforce this importance, even if the general population does not understand the original associations of the words.

In 2009 The Canadian Government is progressing toward passage of Bill S-237, an act for the advancement of the aboriginal languages of Canada and to recognize and respect aboriginal language rights (Canada 2009). This legislation will provide a facilitating policy environment to recoup many Aboriginal place names that, although changed to other names early during the British regime of the late 18th century, can still be found in a host of documents such as the notes of early surveyors and historians and the oral traditions of First Nations communities.

One example is the July 4, 1796 letter of Augustus Jones who provided the Anishinaabemowin names for rivers flowing to Lake Ontario (Jones 1796) but there are many others. Such records are enhanced if modern traditional speakers provide derivations of the components of words, especially where a language circle, such as the one that meets regularly at Kitigan Zibi, Quebec, thoroughly discusses the range of meanings of parts of the words, the unique meanings and idioms when certain syllables are combined in a particular way and the inferences available in related stories, songs and dance movements.

The Ontario Government, through the Ontario Geographic Names Board, has a process for assigning legal names to unnamed locations and to changing names if sufficient researched reason is provided from the public. An Aboriginal representative sits on the Board. In recent years the Board has removed offensive names from the map and has retained traditional names such as Mazinaw when overtures were made to give the place a new name (Allen 2009). Some Anishinaabemowin words have been abbreviated so we need the wisdom of fluent traditional speakers to know, for instance, that the Kashe River once
was the Kasheshebogamog (Hamilton 1879:46), that the word refers to a lake with many deep bays or that the same word has been morphed into 'Cache', pronounced 'cash', as the name of the irregularly-shaped Cache Lake in Algonquin Park. Some names have been translated with loss of the significance of the associations. Sadly some very descriptive Aboriginal names were obliterated by early surveyors and colonial administrators, a practice which still is a threat.

**The Traditional Naming of Places**

An example will illustrate traditional naming of places. In Anishinaabemowin the word ‘mnjikang’ with its locative ‘ang’ ending means ‘the place of the barrier’. Originally the word was applied to very large landscape barriers such as points of land or escarpments which were impediments to travel. A person at present day Detroit wishing to canoe to present day Chicago could not travel in a straight line because there was a large barrier in the way, a michigang. Travel required a circuitous route north through the Straits of Mackinaw and around the barrier. The barrier name in this case has been retained with the final softly spoken ‘g’ removed. We all are familiar with the State of Michigan, perhaps without knowing its origin as a barrier to canoe travel.

On Manitoulin Island the great barrier is the limestone escarpment. Here the people call their community M’Chigeeng (Aboriginal Canada und.), the same word as Michigan, perhaps without knowing its origin as a barrier to canoe travel.

On Manitoulin Island the great barrier is the limestone escarpment. Here the people call their community M’Chigeeng (Aboriginal Canada und.), the same word as Michigan, perhaps without knowing its origin as a barrier to canoe travel.

At Wasauksing First Nation the mapping of local features with traditional names includes Mnj’kinaakdinaak (Snake’s Back), a ridge of rocks shaped like a fence (Pegahmagabow Und.).

In later times the word mnjikang and its cognates have been applied to fish fence barriers. At Couchiching Narrows, Orillia the fish fence barrier is called Mnjikanizing (Allen 2008). In more eastern dialects the ‘M’ is pronounced as an ‘N’ so the fish fence was described as a Nishigan as in the 1868 Canadian legislation which prohibited Aboriginal traditional use of fishing using a nishigan or nishagan, thus relegating the Aboriginal fishers dependent on the technology to starvation, poverty and mistrust (Canada 1868, Pulla 2003:135, MacGregor et al 2009:718).

Algonquins of Barriere Lake are known by their traditional Algonquin name, Mitchikanibikok Inik (Assembly of First Nations 2000). In all cases the name, whether Michigan, M’Chigeeng, Mnjikaning, Mnj’kinaakdinaak, Nishigan, Nishagan or Mitchikanibikok, has an association with a barrier.

**The Naming of Archaeological Sites**

In Ontario archaeologists have the opportunity to name archaeological sites which they are registering with the Ontario Ministry of Culture. Both the site registration form and site update form have entries for ‘preferred name’ and ‘other name’ (MCL, 1995; MCL 2001). In my experience the Ministry has been very open about accepting Aboriginal names when offered on the form and has not engaged in any roadblocks where the preferred Aboriginal name is quite lengthy. The opportunity to name a site with a name that accurately reflects its history or evidence of its material culture places a large responsibility of the shoulders of archaeologists and one that potentially is quite time consuming. However, the dialogue flowing from the search for an appropriate name is often rich and revealing. Let me give some examples from my own experience.

Site BlHe-02 was named Nekickshegeshing, using the same spelling entered on the 1852 survey map of John Stoughton Dennis (Dennis 1852). The site is within Henvey Inlet First Nation territory on the Georgian Bay coast as marked by a cluster of buildings in the Dennis field notes (Dennis 1851:34). Current Chief Wayne McQuabbie, who had never been to the site, was with me along with Elder Roger Noganoi when, with the 1852 Dennis plan in hand, we located the village ruins abandoned soon after the signing of the Robinson Huron Treaty of 1850. Elder Noganoi conducted a smudge and offered a prayer at one of the features of the site.

Subsequently I appeared before a meeting of Henvey Inlet First Nation Chief and Council and asked about retention of the name Nekickshegeshing as the registered site name, distributing copies of the original map as part of the consultation. The discussion which followed resulted in extensive sharing of traditional knowledge (McQuabbie to Allen pers. comm.), the later locating of other sites within the First Nation territory and the provision of important context which Chief McQuabbie and I passed to colleagues working at BIHe-1 (Percy Currie) along the major interior canoe route between Nekickshegeshing and the French River via Nisbet Creek (Macdonald 2007).

Surveyor Dennis had interpreted the word Nekickshegeshing to mean ‘Place of the Otters’, but one elder indicated that the word had more components and might have the notion of ‘gijig’, the word for ‘day’ embedded in the name so that a fuller meaning would be ‘Day of the Place of the Otter’. This not only was consistent with the otter clan presence within the community but also related to the traditional long distance canoe route from southern Georgian Bay to Lake Nipissing, a five day trip as recorded in the Jesuit Relations (Thwaites 1896-1901). There were favourite stopping spots along the way during this trip and stopping to visit friends often was a priority. Knowing the day’s destination at the Place of the Otter, Nekickshegeshing, might well have been referred to as the day of travel that ended there.

A check of other archival documents reinforced the practice of stopping at Nekickshegeshing with travelers.
such as Vidal and Anderson in 1849 (Vidal and Anderson 1849). Nekickshegeshing seemed to be a highly appropriate and historically used name so the archaeological site was registered with that name with Chief McQuabbie’s endorsement. Figure 1 shows the Dennis map with the Anishinaabemowin name, and Figure 2 is a closeup where the village is clearly marked.

In another region, Site BiGp-41 in Algonquin Park was named Kitchi Mikanak Assin (Great Turtle Stone) by Elder Dr. William Commanda, O.C. (Commanda 2005) after visiting the site via float plane, conducting ceremony.
there including smoking of a traditional pipe and offering a teaching with the 600-year-old wampum belt which he brought along for the occasion.

The site, a 30-ton granite erratic perched on smaller stones, has long been known as having an Aboriginal value as a sacred site (Allen 2006:32-46; Allen 2007:82-87). It was photographed in 1897 by a Buffalo railway tycoon who was led to the spot by three men from Rama First Nation. It was photographed again and published by George Laidlaw in the 1921-22 edition of Annual Archaeological Reports for Ontario (Laidlaw 1922:83). In 1939 Ken Kidd visited the site and sketched the Turtle, including an apparently culturally applied circle of black stain in the position of the eye. Pictograph researchers from as far away as New Zealand and Australia have visited the site as well as many Elders from different Ontario and Quebec First Nations.

In 2005 and 2006 Elder Dr. Commanda went on to name several other sites that formed part of the cultural landscape which includes Kitchi Mikinak Assin. One of those sites is BlGp-16, Nij Mishomsak Niaishing (Two Grandfathers Point), named after two erratics sketched in 1971 by the William Hurley team who collected artifacts there but did not name the site.

Site CaHa-06, in a treacherous rapids within Dokis First Nation on the French River, was named Keso Point Pictograph by Thor Conway in 1981. Keso is not an Aboriginal name. Conway never visited the site but a local report was sufficient under the policy of the day to result in the registration. Grace Rajnovich published a photograph of parts of the pictograph, interpreting the motif as a lattice sign of the Midewiwin along with what she called a smear of red ochre denoting the special spirituality of the site (Rajnovich 1994:33).

After I visited the site I consulted with Elder Leonard Dokis who told of a natural feature of stones shaped like a child and a cradleboard. The Dokis people call this place Cradle Rapids as a result and now are engaged in deliberations about the proper spelling of Cradle Rapids in traditional Anishinaabemowin. Another Dokis band member described the pictograph as marking the location of growth of a wider than usual range of medicines, possibly due to the humidity from the adjacent rapids. Still another elder described the motif in the pictograph as a sacred tree, not a lattice. There are multiple values at this site and the pictograph, a sign of sorts, is only one component of those values. The dialogue about naming the pictograph is still under way but Keso Point may not be the most appropriate name. As the consultation extended into a second year an additional pictograph, previously undocumented, was located, honoured in ceremony and registered as CaHa-20 (Okikendawt).

**The Role of Aboriginal Consultation**

Effective dialogue with Aboriginal people proceeds in a certain way (Allen 2008). The process is time consuming but is very rich and productive. The process is based on relationship and trust building, long before specific tasks of consultation occur. Relationship is enhanced through shared experience on the land and in ceremonies such as those conducted in sweat lodges, through listening to specific stories and wampum belt teachings and in examining together significant traditional-use natural stone features such as stone medicine lodges or medicine wheels. The spirit names given by elders reveal much about relationships and past associations within traditional culture, as when Dr. James Hector was named Natoos, a sign of esteem related to notions of The Sun or Medicine Man (Lakusta 2007:162).

Relationship also is enhanced by sharing artifacts recovered at archaeological sites and seeking First Nations perspectives about such matters as patterns in the knapping or preferred grip of the artifact. Some Métis and First Nations offer workshops on consultation processes. Participation in such programs, the 2008 OAS Symposium format included, improves archaeologists’ chances of understanding Aboriginal consultation expectations.

At Site BdGu-35 at Orchard Point beside Mnjikaning Fish Weirs National Historic Site, Rama First Nations members were involved in determining the location of nearby burials, in providing a breaking the ground ceremony before archaeological survey began, in working the screen, in an on-site ceremony to honour the artifacts recovered and to remember the ancestors who left them. The Rama Culture and Research Department even made a teaching video of the archaeological work in progress and now uses the video for educational programming. Rama First Nations members were further involved in conducting an appropriate ceremony when human remains were disturbed at an adjacent property (McKim, 2009).

Underlying the entire archaeologist/First Nation relationship is the acknowledgment that traditional language contains nuances of meaning that help to understand the land and specific sites. At Kitigan Zibi First Nation questions about language are brought to a weekly Elders’ Circle where nuances of language are discussed. An example is the wording in the Anishinaabemowin component of a published pictograph research poster (Brady, Allen and Decontie, 2008). Consultation often starts gently while the archaeologist and Elder are together in the field examining the broader context of an archaeological site. Substantial lead time and substantial process time are required to come to a determination about the naming of a site. Sometimes there will be differences in perspectives among different speakers of Anishinaabemowin. The naming process may be further complicated because of a site having multiple values.

The Ontario Archaeology Society has a Statement of
Ethical Principles which includes respecting the right of First Nations to play a primary role in the conduct of any Aboriginal archaeological investigation. Such consultation is not only a right, it is a prudent way to find information not available from any other source. That includes seeking out and involving Elders who have a thorough understanding of traditional language.

Consultation about naming archaeological sites with traditional names should be part of the consultation process. Archaeologists who engage Aboriginal people from the locality of the archaeological site about such naming are sure to contribute significantly to understandings about the site and its context and to enjoy the benefits of building positive relationships between Aboriginal people and themselves as well as the archaeological community. I commend such consultation and site naming to everyone in the archaeology profession.
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EXCITING NEW $^{14}C$ DATES FROM CAMP KITCHIKEWANA, GEORGIAN BAY ISLANDS NATIONAL PARK OF CANADA

Brian D. Ross
Senior Archaeologist
National Parks and Native Sites
Parks Canada – Ontario Service Centre

Parks Canada’s National Parks and Native Sites team, from the Ontario Service Centre, have been mitigating the affects of the YMCA’s Camp Kitchikewana on significant buried cultural resources since 1989. The camp is located on Beausoleil Island in Georgian Bay Islands National Park and occupies ~6.5 ha.

The primary objective of the archaeological work at the camp has been to salvage those cultural resources threatened by the development and operation of the summer residential facility. Over the years, work has focused on salvaging material from the camp’s new septic bed, volleyball court, mess hall entrance, basketball court, main entry ramp, and tetherball court. A total of 631 square metres (or just under 1% of the camp’s area) has been investigated. With evidence extending from the Middle Archaic to the early 20th century Boys Brigade (a forerunner of the YMCA), this work has revealed two major occupations beneath the present camp: a mid-19th Ojibway reserve village and a ca. 400 BC – AD 1400 Middle to Late Woodland campsite.

Each field season has brought new and exciting discoveries, including a 17th century Jesuit ring (1990), a Uren/Middleport pipe (1993), a 19th century Moravian effigy pipe (2007), and, this year, charred corn kernels and beans. Samples of this floral material were sent to Keck Carbon Cycle AMS Facility at the University of California, Irvine, for carbon dating.

Over the years, a number of samples have been collected and sent off for dating, almost all consisting of burnt wood from various hearth and pit features. Two exceptions to this were discovered in 1990. Both of these samples were burnt acorns from two separate roasting/processing pits. One sample was dated to “cal A.D. 1360-1480” (S-3265) and the other, to “cal A.D. 1430-1610” (S-3266).

In total, four carbonized beans and two carbonized corn kernels were found this past summer in two different excavation units, ~ 4.5 m apart. All of these specimens came from excellent contexts.

One sample of both charred corn and bean came from an undisturbed, multi-featured, precontac occupation layer between 26 and 35 cm below ground surface. This layer produced a concentration of fire cracked rock and calcined bone (thought to be the remains of a boiling or rendering pit); a rather large, organic rich, basin-shaped pit; and a dense concentration of Huronia pebble chert debitage, likely from an in situ lithic reduction activity. Other artifacts found in association included numerous sherds from a single cord-wrapped stick decorated ceramic vessel and a single plain rim sherd that may be castellated. The carbon sample from this area was dated to “cal A.D. 1305-1335” (UCAMS-68297).

A separate C$^{14}$ date came from an apparent hearth feature that also contained charred beans and corn. However, in this instance, it was decided not to use the specimens themselves for dating; but, instead, a chunk of carbonized wood found in direct association was submitted. This time, the date came back as A.D. 1350 – 1380 (UCAMS-68313).

The 2009 sample dates can be seen as falling within the parameters of the Middle Ontario Iroquoian stage (Dodd et. al. 1990:321-359). Indeed, some may wish to argue that the first sample comes from an Uren substage context; while the other comes from a Middleport substage context. Dodd et. al. date Uren to ca. A.D. 1280-1330 and Middleport to ca. A.D.1330-1400 (Dodd et. al. 1990:356-359).

From the staggering amount of ceramics recovered at Kitchi, it would appear as though the site served as an important hub of pottery types, styles and motifs from all over Ontario. As such, the presence of corn and...
bean at Kitchi, in the 14th century, does not necessarily indicate the growing of these crops in situ. Trade may be the more likely explanation for their presence here.

It must be kept in mind, however, that Beausoleil Island is a transitional ecosystem with the Canadian shield/boreal forest at the north end of the island and hardwood forests on extensive sand plains to the south, and that the Anishnaabe were able to grow corn on Beausoleil in the 19th century.

Because our assemblage of carbonized samples was so small, we had to make a decision as to what to do first: send a sample out for species identification or for C14 dating? We chose the latter, so we do not yet know what species of corn we have.
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A Dutch Clay Smoking Pipe from Camp Kitchikewana, Georgian Bay Islands National Park of Canada

Stacey Taylor and Brian D. Ross
National Parks and Native Sites
Terrestrial Archaeology
Parks Canada - Ontario Service Centre

A pipe stem fragment recovered from archaeological investigations at Camp Kitchikewana, Beausoleil Island, Georgian Bay Islands National Park of Canada, in 2008, proved to be a very exciting find. The pipe, described below, was identified and dated by the distinctive 'fleur-de-lis' decorative pattern on its stem.

The broken white clay smoking pipe stem fragment (Figure 1) measures 2 cm long by 1 cm wide. One end is decorated with a 1 mm wide rouletted band (a 'roulette' is a small instrument, often a revolving toothed wheel, used to produce a series of dotted lines or perforations). Below this band are four fleur-de-lis arranged in a diamond pattern, measuring ~ 10 x 12 mm. This pattern is called a 'four-on-diamond' (McCashion 1979:65 & 76-77).

The opposite end of the pipe stem has been partially cut through (perhaps at another roulette band), then snapped off. There is also some exfoliation from the pressure of this snapping. Possible teeth marks are also present on the underside of the stem, closest to the cut/snapped end, likely caused by being clenched between the teeth of the smoker. Although this artifact is only a stem fragment, it bears close similarities to a 'Dutch tulip' bowl type, as shown in McCashion (1979:84, Plate 7). Similar pipes have been found on Mohawk and Oneida sites from New York State, dating to ca.1630-1650 (McCashion 1979:65), and at the Martin's Hundred site in Virginia, ca. 1620-1645 (Noel Hume 1979:19); all are considered to be of Dutch manufacture.

Tobacco was introduced to Europe from the New World in the mid-1500s (Oswald 1975:3). Although the Natives smoked tobacco in clay pipes, Europeans first took it as a medicine, generally in the form of snuff, using a ladle-like tool (Oswald 1975:3). Soon, the Europeans started to copy the Native pipe design, described as “a cane and earthen cup in the end” (Oswald 1975:4). By the end of the 16th century, pipe smoking was common throughout industrialized Europe (Bradley 2000:104).

In North America, the Dutch were quick to develop a flourishing trade in tobacco pipes with the Natives from their Dutch West India Company posts at Fort Orange.

Figure 1: Dutch clay pipe stem with stamped pattern.
Photo by Parks Canada
(present day Albany, New York State) and Fort Amsterdam (on Manhattan Island), built in 1624 and 1626 respectively (McCashion 1979:67). The Dutch successfully dominated the pipe trade north of Virginia until ca. 1700 (McCashion 1979:69).

European manufactured pipes are a common find at the Camp Kitchikewana site. Generally, these pipes date from the mid-1800s to the early 1900s and are from either Scottish or Montreal pipe makers. So, not only is the four-on-diamond pipe stem the oldest historic pipe from Kitchi, it is also the only confirmed Dutch artifact.

The date of the Dutch pipe (ca. 1630-1650) is also significant in that it matches the time frame of Sainte-Marie among the Hurons (1639-1649). As Bradley (2000:118) notes, until the French developed their own industry in the 1850’s, Dutch pipes appear on sites associated with French settlement.

As such, this pipe stem joins a growing assemblage of artifacts from Camp Kitchi that dates to the early 17th century; likely arrived on site via the Jesuit mission at Ste. Marie; and includes a copper kettle lug (Teal et. al. 2009:15-16), two French trade axes (Mortimer 2006:88-89), and a brass Christianization ring (Ross & D’Annibale 1994:5).
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**2010 Archaeological Field Schools in Ontario and Abroad**

**Field Schools in Ontario**

**Wilfrid Laurier University**  
Ruthven Park/Indiana Field School  

Dates: May 18 to June 25  
Location: 3 km north of Cayuga on the Grand River (about 90 km from Wilfrid Laurier University)

Contact: Dr. John Triggs  
jtriggs@wlu.ca

**Trent University**  
Ontario Field School  

The 2010 Ontario Field School provides a focused and intensive introduction to archaeological field methods, from Stage Two (field survey) to Stage Three and Four (excavation). Our fieldwork is supported by digital survey methods, GIS, and digital cartography, which provides participants with learning opportunities in GIS and Total Station survey.

We will be working in the vicinity of Trent University, and mainly, but not exclusively, concentrating our activities...
on the excavation of a mid-19th Century pioneer settlement and the settlement patterns associated with the nearby historically-known village and neighbouring farmlands.

The program runs for six weeks, between Monday to Friday, 8 a.m. to 4 p.m. This is a non-residential field school, although summer accommodation is available on the Trent University campus.

Contact: Dr. James Conolly  
jamesconolly@trentu.ca

McMaster University  
Ontario Field School  
http://www.socsci.mcmaster.ca/anthro/index.cfm

The field school offered by the Department of Anthropology will be located in the Hamilton area this summer, exact location TBA. Excavations in previous years have investigated Princess Point components of Cootes Paradise.

Contact: Dr. Scott Martin  
swmart@mcmaster.ca

Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA)  
Boyd Archaeological Field School  
http://www.boydfieldschool.org

Over a three week period, students develop and master interdisciplinary knowledge and skills through the exploration of Aboriginal and Euro-Canadian histories. The course includes lectures and hands-on work at an archaeological site under the instruction of certified teachers and archaeologists.

This field school is operated in partnership with the York Region Board of Education and students will earn a Grade 12 Interdisciplinary Studies Credit.

Course dates: Sunday August 1 to Saturday August 21

Contact: Cathy Crinnion  
ccrinnion@trca.on.ca

Field Schools Abroad  

Trent University

Belize Field School  
http://www.trentu.ca/anthropology/belize.php

The Social Archaeology Research Program (SARP) is a long term project focused on the investigation of ancient Maya sociopolitical interaction. In particular, we are interested in examining the following questions: Why were ancient Maya polities so unstable? How did centers of different hierarchal rank interact with each other? How were ancient polities integrated? How were Maya royal courts organized? What caused the famous ‘Maya Collapse’? Twelve years of research at Minanha has answered many questions, but there is much more to learn. Only 20 spaces available.

Application Deadline: April 1st, 2010 (Applications will be evaluated beginning February 1st, 2010, so apply early)

Contact: Dr. Gyles Iannone  
giannone@trentu.ca

University of Toronto  
The Rudabánya Field School  
http://www.chass.utoronto.ca/anthropology/Faculty/Begun/main.htm

Rudabánya is a world famous locality located in north central Hungary with one of the richest collections of fossil primates from the late Miocene period. Especially noteworthy at Rudabánya is Rudapithecus, a fossil ape that figures prominently in debates about great ape evolution and human origins.

The University of Toronto and the Geological Institute of Hungary are collaborating to excavate Rudabánya to learn more about Rudapithecus and the environment in which it lived. As part of this project, the Rudabánya Palaeoanthropological Field School offers students the opportunity to experience firsthand the multidisciplinary approach of human origins research.

Contact: Dr. David Begun  
begun@chass.utoronto.ca

The Irish Archaeological Field School (IAFS)  

The 2010 research programme will focus on archaeological excavations at Bective Abbey, Rath Maevé on the Hill of Tara, and Rossnaree, Newgrange, Co. Meath, Ireland.

The programme will run over a 12 week period from the June 7 to August 27. The application deadline is May 15, 2010.

Students / participants can elect to earn three to six academic credits (three credits for a minimum of two weeks participation or six credits for four weeks participation). Transfer of credit to a student’s home institution must be arranged between the student and his/her home institution.

Contact: www/iafs.ie/contact us/ or email info@iafs.ie.
Membership
(Canadian $. Second figure includes a subscription to *Ontario Archaeology*)

- Individual: 34 / 46
- Family: 38 / 50
- Student: 23 / 32
- Institution / Corporate: 60
- Life: 750

**Arch Notes submissions**

Contributor deadlines:
- January 15
- March 15
- May 15
- July 15
- September 15
- November 15

Send articles to:
aneeditor@ontarioarchaeology.on.ca

or

*Arch Notes* editor
PO Box 62066
Victoria Terrace Post Office
Toronto, Ontario M4A 2W1

---

**Hamilton chapter**

- President: Gary Warrick
- Vice President: Jacqueline Fisher
- Treasurer: Ruth MacDougal

*The Heights* Editor: James Bandow
E-mail: hamiltonOAS@hwcn.org
Web: www.hwcn.org/link/hcoas

Mail: Laurier Brantford, 73 George St. Brantford, ON N3T 2Y3
Phone: (866) 243-7028

Meetings: Fieldcote Museum, 64 Sulphur Springs Road, Ancaster, dates TBA
Membership: Individual $11, Family $28

---

**Huronia chapter**

- President: John Raynor
- Vice President: Ann MacKinnon
- Secretary/Treasurer: Michael Henry

Mail: P.O. Box 82, Station Main, Midland, ON L4R 4P4
Meetings: 2nd Thursday of every month Sept. to May at
The Huronia Museum, 549 Little Lake Park Rd., Midland, ON
Membership: Individual $15, Family $18

---

**London chapter**

- President: Nancy VanSas
- Vice President: Darcy Fallon
- Treasurer: Chris Ellis

KEWA Editors: Christine Dodd, Chris Ellis & Arthur Figura
Web: www.ssc.uwo.ca/assoc/oas

Mail: Museum of Ontario Archaeology, 1600 Attawandaron Rd.,
London, ON N6G 3M6
Phone: (519) 473-1360 Fax (519) 473-1363
Meetings: 8 pm on 2nd Thursday of the month except May–August; at MOA
Membership: Individual/Family $18, Student, $15, Institutional $21

---

**Ottawa chapter**

- President: Glenna Roberts
- Vice President: Andre Miller
- Secretary: Libby Imrie
- Treasurer: Bill MacLennan

Director of Public Archaeology: Rory Mackay
Director at large: Stacey Girling-Christie

*Ottawa Archaeologist* Editor: Marion Clark
Web master: Yvon Riendeau
Web: www.ottawaaoas.ca
Email address: contact@ottawaaoas.ca
Mail: PO Box 4939, Station E, Ottawa ON K1S 5J1
Meetings: Every 2nd Thursday of the month from Sept. to May; usually at Routhier Community Centre, 172 Guigues Street, Ottawa (in the Byward Market)
Membership: Individual $20, Family $25, Student $12

---

**Thunder Bay chapter**

- President: Clarence Surette
- Vice President: Bill Ross
- Secretary/Treasurer: Jennifer Surette

Director: Frances Duke
E-mail:.clsurette@lakeheadu.ca
http://anthropology.lakeheadu.ca/?display=page&pageid=80
Meetings: 7 pm on the last Friday of the month
in Room BB0017, Braun Building, Lakehead University
Membership: $5

---

**Toronto chapter**

- President: Sylvia Teaves
- Vice President: Janice Teichroeb
- Treasurer: Norma Knowlton

Secretary: Annie Gould

*PROFILE* Editor: Mima Kapches
Web: http://tinyurl.com/ebpfj

Meetings: 7:30 pm on the 3rd Wednesday of the month, except June–August
in U of T Anthropology Building, Room 246, 19 Russell St.
Membership: Individual $12, Family $14

---

**Windsor chapter**

- President: Katherine Graham
- Past president: Rosemarie Denunzio
- Secretary: Barbara Johnson
- Treasurer: Bob Drago

Web: http://ca.geocities.com/windsoroas
Contact: windsoroas@yahoo.ca
Membership: Individual $15, Family $20, Students $5