

THE



BULLETIN

November 1958

Number 14

---

Contents

B. Frank Hodges, June 13, 1896-April 12, 1958	1
Another Radiocarbon Date for New York State: The Oakfield Site, Genesee County L. L. Pechuman	2
Dating the Niagara Frontier Iroquois Sequence Marian E. White	4
A Recent Find at Factory Hollow Harry Schoff	9
Book Review	10
News and Notes	11



November 1958

Number 14

\*\*\*\*\*

B. Frank Hodges

June 13, 1896 - April 12, 1958

It is with a deep sense of loss that we report the death of B. Frank Hodges, one of the founders and a charter member of the Auringer-Seelye chapter.

Frank Hodges was intensely interested in the growth and welfare of this chapter, the organization of which he did so much to bring about. His interests and activities in archeological matters was not limited to this section of the State, as he was well informed concerning sites of Indian occupation throughout a great part of our State.

He investigated many sites along the St. Lawrence River in the northern counties and in Warren county and adjacent areas, and accumulated a considerable collection of artifacts. He had served in many capacities with the local chapter and represented our Chapter as trustee on the State Committee at the time of his death.

Mr. Hodges served in the U. S. Navy during the war years 1917-1918 on the U. S. S. Wisconsin and during 1919-1920 in the Reserve Force as Yeoman 3rd class on the U. S. S. Solace.

Frank Hodges came to Glens Falls from Syracuse, N. Y. in 1936 and made this city his permanent home. Although in poor health, his keen interest in archeology and in the progress of our local chapter never lessened. His council will be greatly missed. He passed away at Albany City Hospital, April 12, 1958. Interment was in Union Cemetery, Adams Center, New York.

He leaves a widow, Mrs. Esther Hodges of 12 May Street, Glens Falls, New York.

- Catherine M. Magee

Another Radiocarbon Date for New York State:

The Oakfield Site, Genesee County

L. L. Pechuman

Morgan Chapter

The "Old Fort" at Oakfield, Genesee County, first seems to have attracted attention in 1788 when it was visited by the Rev. Samuel Kirkland while on his way to the Senecas at Buffalo Creek. His account, to which I shall return, was printed in 1824 in Yates and Moulton's "History of the State of New York".

Since that time the "Old Fort" has received a stream of publicity, a questionable honor, which has few rivals in New York archeology. In 1849, Kirkland's account was republished by Turner in his "History of the Holland Purchase" and in the same year Squier in his "Aboriginal Monuments of New York" described and figured the fortification which he said was in the best condition of any he had seen. In 1861 the fort was mentioned in French's "Gazetteer of New York" and in 1890 in Beer's "Gazetteer and Biographical Record of Genesee County". North's 1899 "Genesee County" has a rather complete account and some pottery is figured. In Beauchamp's "Aboriginal Occupation of New York", 1900, there is a summary based largely on Kirkland, and Parker's 1922 account in "The Archeological History of New York" is almost identical with Beauchamp. There are also newspaper accounts and local releases of various sorts.

My own interest was aroused some years ago when I found some "woodland" pottery reminiscent of Owasco. This interest was heightened by the broad triangular projectile points also reminiscent of Owasco. Some of the points were as broad as any found on Owasco sites and few were as narrow as those commonly found on later Iroquois sites. The median point at Oakfield based on ratio of width to length is 26 X 39 mm. which is a point intermediate between those found on Owasco sites and later Iroquois sites. It was fairly obvious that this site did not belong necessarily in that convenient catch-all for Western New York, the "Neutral". I might add parenthetically that as digging progressed pottery designs did indicate a connection with some of the Ontario sites sometimes designated as early Neutral, but this is something for Dr. White to discuss.

My two major objectives were to determine if two occupations were present and secondly to arrive at some sort of date for the site. The site had been dug irregularly

1. Presented at the NYSAA annual meeting, 12 April 1958

---

THE BULLETIN, published by the New York State Archeological Association. Subscription by membership in a chapter or as a member-at-large. Back numbers available to members, 35c. per issue postpaid. Contributions and news items should be submitted to your chapter's member of the Association publication committee, or to the Editor, Charles M. Knoll, Spencerport, New York

for over 150 years before I ever saw it and what appeared to be untouched areas had the embarrassing habit of producing such artifacts as mid-19th century coins. In spite of our tribulations considerable progress has been made and without going into the evidence at this time, I may state that there is nothing in the stratigraphy of the site which indicates more than a single occupation. I am fairly well convinced now that there was only one occupation. This belief is additionally confirmed by the presence not only of definite Owascoid pottery design and distinct Iroquois designs which may fit into sequences elsewhere but also by pottery which is a blend of both cultures as for example, Iroquois design applied by Owasco techniques.

Dating the site presented the usual difficulties but Kirkland did present some sketchy information. Although the value of this information is questionable, it is of interest since it is about all we had available at the beginning of the study. In 1788, Kirkland reports there were many oaks within the enclosure and in the ditch and he thought they were older than 200 years. In order to get a round number we might select 218 years as the age of the oaks and this would take us back to 1570. Kirkland further relates that the Seneca historians were in complete agreement that their ancestors had fought and defeated the people who built the fort; they did not agree on how long ago it happened and estimates varied from 300 to 500 years. If we take the higher figure we go back to 1288 so between Kirkland and the Senecas we come to a figure somewhere between 670 and 388 years ago. Incidentally Kirkland discounted much of what the Senecas told him and suggested the fort was built by the ancestors of South American Indians.

Squier in 1849 stated that 30 years before, which takes it back to 1819, traces of oak palisades were found on excavation. Assuming this were true and taking into consideration that the Senecas had traditions concerning the site, it would seem that it was not of great age, probably just barely pre-contact. However, the lack of age of the site does not fit too well with our own ideas on the age of the Owascoid pottery found on the site although some material from Castle Creek considered to be late Owasco has been radiocarbon dated at  $520 \pm 200$  years.

In 1957 a charcoal sample was accepted for radiocarbon dating by the University of Michigan and cataloged by them as M-651. This was a reasonably large sample and was wrapped in aluminum foil when collected and then stored in an airtight metal container. However, it was collected at a depth of only 18 inches and, although the sample appeared free of foreign material, charcoal at that depth in a densely wooded area must have been penetrated many times over the centuries by rootlets. Rootlets are short lived and become almost invisible when they die although they must deposit a minute layer of modern carbon. I question if this deposit can be removed mechanically from the extremely porous charcoal and I am not well enough acquainted with radiocarbon techniques to know if other methods are used to remove more recent deposits. I mention this point only to suggest that if there is an error it is likely to be in too recent a date.

Collected with the charcoal were sherds resembling some from Castle Creek and

other sherds which were definitely Iroquoian in pattern and technique. The date determined by the University of Michigan is 420 years  $\pm$  150. If the figure of 420 years is used the site is dated at about 1537 and if the extreme variation of 150 years is also used it could carry the date of the site back to 1387.

\*\*\*\*\*

### Dating the Niagara Frontier Iroquois Sequence<sup>1</sup>

Marian E. White

Morgan Chapter

The question of the validity of a single radiocarbon date such as the one of 420 years ago  $\pm$  150 from the Oakfield site, described by Pechuman in the preceding paper, cannot be considered apart from the archeological sequence of which the dated site is a part. Most chronological sequences of cultures judged to be relatively recent in time have had estimated dates assigned to them. In assessing the correctness of the radiocarbon date, comparisons with these estimates which are derived from the archeological evidence must take place. In many instances there will be disagreement between the two dates; then abase must be made for regarding either the radiocarbon date or the "guess" date as a correct estimate of the age.

There are two approaches which can be followed in evaluating the radiocarbon date:

1. One can accept or reject the radiocarbon date according to whether it is consistent with current interpretations and estimates of the age of the associated cultural material. This argument is strongest in the case of comparatively recent dates for which estimates based on archeological data seem on a firm footing and sample contamination may be an unknown factor.
2. One can regard the radiocarbon date as a hypothesis and examine current interpretations in the light of the hypothesis, to see whether the required revisions would be consistent with archeological evidence as well as with other pertinent radiocarbon dates. If the required modifications in interpretation conflict with the archeological data., then the radiocarbon date must be suspect. On the other hand, if the new interpretations derived from consideration of the radiocarbon date do no violence to the archeological evidence and especially if they are consistent with other radiocarbon dates, then the radiocarbon date in question should be accepted as a valid estimate of the true date within the limits of the standard error.

If we adopt the first approach in evaluating the Oakfield radiocarbon date, that is, rejecting the date if it does not agree with current estimates, we would conclude that the Oakfield radiocarbon date is not a true estimate of the age of the Oakfield site. From Pechuman's account of the archeological data from the Oakfield site, it is clear that the site can be classified as Transitional Iroquois. To summarize some of the evidence, the projectile points are significantly longer and wider than those of fully

---

1. Presented at the NYSAA annual meeting, 12 April, 1958

developed later Iroquois sites in the area. None of the popular Iroquois pipe forms such as the trumpet or ring-bowl are present. The pottery includes sherds tentatively identified as Ontario Horizontal, Iroquois Linear, Uren Corded, and Uren Dentate.

MacNeish (1952: 86) has dated Transitional Iroquois between 1100 and 1350 A, De Emerson (1956.3) also gives a date of 1100 A. D. for the beginning of Iroquois in Ontario.

The radiocarbon date of  $1537 \pm 150$  does not agree with currently accepted estimates for Transitional Iroquois. An examination of the evidence for assigning dates of 1100 - 1350 A. D. for Transitional Iroquois shows that there is no specific reason for the assignment of these dates. They are presumably general impressions based on the extensive experience of both these archeologists and others, which certainly took into account estimates of the time required for culture change and village migrations.

Most archeologists are working with dates within one standard error of the date arrived at in the single counting of the sample, in this case, 1387 A. D. to 1687 A, D. This is the range which I will use as a test of the archeological evidence and current interpretations. There is no need to repeat here the warnings given by Witthoft in the N.Y.S.A.A. #12, except to emphasize his general opinion that many dates are later than the true dates because of unknown factors of contamination. Since these factors are unknown and unpredictable, we must either make use of the dates we have, as unsatisfactory as they may be or else cease using radiocarbon dates at this time. First we will examine the consistency of the Oakfield radiocarbon date with other radiocarbon dates.

Radiocarbon dates to compare with that of 1387 - 1687 A. D. for the Oakfield site are limited. Two dates have been obtained for the Castle Creek site (Crane 1956; Personal communication from Ritchie). These are:

M-179	$520 \pm 200$ B. P.	or	1231 - 1631 A.D~
M-493	$760 \pm 200$ B. P.	or	994 - 1394 A.D.

The two dates average at 1312 A. D. giving a range for the Castle Creek date, within one standard error, of about 1100 to about 1500 A. D. The Castle Creek site has been classified by Ritchie (1951) as Late Owasco. It precedes Transitional Iroquois of which Oakfield is representative and is typologically far removed, lacking incised or interrupted linear decoration on the rims. The Oakfield radiocarbon date then is consistent with the radiocarbon dates for the Castle Creek site if the true date for the Castle Creek site lies in the older part of the range, as we would expect,

Mayer-Oakes (1958:13) has reported a radiocarbon date for the Brown's Island site, in Hancock County, in the West Virginia Panhandle. This date, obtained by the Carnegie Institute of Technology, is  $1200 \text{ A.D.} \pm 100$  or a range of 1100 to 1300 A. D. This dates the end of Middle Woodland in this area and immediately precedes the Late Prehistoric which in this section of the Ohio drainage is marked by triangular points and shell-

tempered pottery. It is my interpretation that the beginning of the Late Prehistoric in the Ohio drainage is defined by Mississippi influences which also are the source of the change from Owasco to Iroquois in New York. Thus the date of 1100 to 1300 A.D. for the beginning of Mississippi influences in the Ohio valley is consistent with the date for the Oakfield site at which Transitional Iroquois is well under way.

To return to the Oakfield site and the possibility of accepting a date between 1387 and 1687 A.D. - it is necessary to look at the sequence of which the site is a part. The Oakfield site typologically is the earliest of seven Iroquois sites, known as the Niagara Frontier Iroquois Sequence. These are the Green Lake, Goodyear, Eaton, Buffam, Shelby, Kienuka, and Oakfield sites, in order from late to early. The Green Lake site was dug by William A. Ritchie for the Rochester Museum. The Goodyear site was dug by a group in the Buffalo area, of which I was a part. The Eaton and Buffam Street sites were dug by several people in the Buffalo area, including Frederick Houghton and A. L. Benedict. Richard McCarthy has done the major share of the work on the Shelby and Kienuka sites and Laverne Pechuman on the Oakfield site. I wish to emphasize that the linking of these sites in chronological order does not imply that these are sites of a single group.

In this sequence a date can be assigned to the Goodyear site with the most confidence. Based upon a very small amount of European trade material, mostly brass kettle scraps and three glass beads, as well as typological similarities to the Adams site which Wray and Schoff (1953:54) have dated convincingly at 1550 - 1575, the Goodyear site was probably occupied some time between 1550 and 1600.

The Green Lake site is typologically later, has slightly more trade material and from historical evidence cannot be later than 1650. An occupation dating some time between 1575 and 1625 seems reasonable.

All other sites in the sequence are prehistoric. The Eaton and Buffam Street sites, because of their geographical proximity (1 1/2 miles), and typological similarity, are either contemporary villages or a village movement from Buffam to Eaton. The Eaton site is also typologically very close to the Goodyear site; this evidence suggests that the Eaton site was occupied only shortly before the Contact Period. An estimate of about 1500 A. D. seems reasonable for the Eaton-Buffam part of the sequence.

The Shelby site is more difficult to assign a "guess date". The Niagara Frontier Iroquois sequence as a whole is based on the assumption that the differences in the culture represented at each site are the result of temporal differences and that spatial or geographical factors are of no consequence. Under this assumption the Shelby site typologically falls between the Buffam Street and Kienuka sites and is earlier than 1500 A.D. The Shelby site does, however, show certain similarities to the Richmond Mills and Belcher sites in the Seneca country (though not necessarily Seneca sites) which are prehistoric but are generally "guess dated" later than 1500. Furthermore McCarthy has found two pieces of European material at the Shelby site. On the other hand, thirty burials produced no grave goods except a single shell bead and a pipe. While the case

for a date for Shelby is not clear, my own opinion is that a date of about 1500 or slightly earlier is not unreasonable.

For Kienuka and Oakfield there is no archeological basis for assigning a date and we are too far away from the reasonably well-dated end of the sequence to speculate. Now with the radiocarbon date we have a means of assigning independently a date for the beginning of the sequence. If we accept a date near the early end of the period within the range of one standard error and combine this with the dates derived by archeological methods, we can narrow the period for the Oakfield and Kienuka sites from about 1387 A. D. to perhaps 1475 A. D. There is no precise way of evaluating this speculation. The question which we must ask and eventually answer is this: Could the amount of culture change, mainly in the pottery, which took place between Oakfield and the general Eaton - Buffam-Shelby level have taken place in about 100 years? Let's examine these changes in very brief fashion.

### POTTERY

Between Oakfield and Kienuka, cord-wrapped stick decorated rims, 17% at Oakfield, disappeared completely. The interrupted linear technique decreased from 14 to 9% and then, after Kienuka, disappeared completely. Since both these techniques of decoration were carry overs from an older tradition and were being practiced by a small percentage of the potters at Oakfield, it is reasonable to find them disappearing in a brief time.

The decrease in the popularity of these two, cord-wrapped stick and interrupted linear techniques of rim decoration, is compensated for by an increase in incising, from 51% at Oakfield to 69% at Kienuka to 97% at Shelby. Equally important changes took place in the motifs of decoration. At the Oakfield site, 58% of the pot rims are decorated with horizontal lines executed by all three techniques. At Kienuka, only 27% are so decorated. In addition, at Kienuka all the important motifs found later in the sequence are present, whereas at Oakfield several are absent. There are two additional points to note about the pottery at Oakfield. Sixteen per cent of the vessels are more in the tradition of Owasco pottery, showing such attributes as no collar, outflaring rims, beaded lips and cord-wrapped stick-impressed designs unpopular on Iroquois pottery. The use of several techniques of decoration on the same vessel and the execution of the same motif in different techniques on different vessels suggests rapid change at the Oakfield site itself.

My impression of the pottery traditions during this period of Transitional Iroquois culture is one of rapid change. Admittedly the rapidity of the change is related to one's concept of how long it took. We do, however, have a model of culture change which fits very well to this postulated situation.

The rate of culture change has accelerated through time. If we plot on a graph the rate of culture change against time, the resulting pattern is not that of a line with a steady slope representing a constant accelerating rate of change. Instead, culture



change through time can best be described as a series of increasingly closely spaced S-shaped curves. Each S-shaped curve represents a long period of relatively slow change followed by a brief period of rapid change.

According to this model, change during a transitional period is rapid or steep while change during the time represented by the major culture types (Point Peninsula, Owasco, Iroquois) is slower. Support for this is derived from archeological observations that transitional sites are fewer in number than those representing the major culture types. To my mind this model fits very adequately in this situation. It serves to strengthen the case for 100 years being a sufficiently long period of time for the pottery changes noted between Oakfield and the Eaton-Buffam- Shelby level.

Additional evidence can be adduced by analogy with other culture change situations in which the time span is accurately known. Here I can only suggest a comparison for the purposes of illustration since the necessary data have not been compiled. In the early historic Seneca sequence, the time span between Adams (1550-75) and the Power House and Steele sites (1630-50) is slightly less than 100 years (Wray and Schoff, 1953). During this time, knocked, notched, and fringed decoration on Seneca rims increased from less than 25% to 80%. Castellations, present on nearly half the vessels at the Adams site disappeared, as did large vessels and notched shouldered vessels. In fact, pots themselves were becoming infrequent. Obviously this last change, the replacement of pottery vessels by brass kettles is the direct result of European contact. But other aspects of the pottery-making behavior, such as how the rims were decorated, whether the shoulders were notched, etc., were probably less directly related to European influence, sharing in the effects of the acculturation situation only to the extent that they were part of a rapidly changing culture. In other words, European contact did not, I suggest, directly and specifically affect the pottery decoration. If this point can be established from a careful consideration of the evidence, then the parallel is useful and indicates that the pottery-making behavior for the first hundred years of historic Seneca is analogous to an aboriginal situation of rapid culture change. It would represent another sharp rise in the curve of culture change in pottery in even less time than we are concerned with in Transitional Iroquois. This, of course, obligates us even more to attempt to explain the nature of the culture change during the time of Transitional Iroquois culture.

In summary, a radiocarbon date of 1387 - 1687 A, D. which can be restricted by archeological evidence to a period of about 1387 to 1475 A.D. has considerable support as a reasonable date for Transitional Iroquois in the Niagara Frontier. Transitional Iroquois here is represented by two sites, Oakfield, to which the radiocarbon date pertains and Kienuka, neither of which represent the beginning of Transitional Iroquois. This radiocarbon date is consistent with dates from Castle Creek, a late Owasco site, as well as with a date for the end of Middle Woodland in the Ohio valley. Nor does it do violence to the archeological evidence. Furthermore the amount of change in the pottery traditions during the time of Transitional Iroquois is consistent with the model of rapid culture change during transitions between culture types and may be parallel to a suggested similar situation in the Seneca pottery of early historic times.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Crane, H. R.                    "University of Michigan Radiocarbon Dates I."  
1956                            Science 124.
- Emerson, J. Norman        "New Pages of Prehistory; Archaeological Researches  
1956                            in Ontario, 1956." Reprinted from Ontario History.
- MacNeish, Richard S.     "Iroquois Pottery Types - A Technique for the Study  
1952                            of Iroquois Prehistory." National Museum of Canada Bulletin No. 124.
- Mayer-Oakes, William    "Radiocarbon Dates from the Upper Ohio Valley."  
1958                            Eastern States Archeological Federation Bulletin No. 17, January, 1958.
- Ritchie William A.        "A Current Synthesis of New York Prehistory."  
1951                            American Antiquity Volume 17, No. 2, October, 1951.
- Wray, Charles F. and      "A Preliminary Report on the Seneca Sequence in Western New York.  
.....Harry L. Schoff      1550-1687. "Pennsylvania Archaeologist, Volume XXITI, No. 2~ July, 1953.  
1953

\*\*\*\*\*

A Recent Find At Factory HollowHarry SchoffMorgan Chapter

The first real good day of spring brings out the woodchucks, schoolboys, and amateur archeologists, it seems. One fine Saturday afternoon in April of this year, Clarence Bill dropped in and suggested we go over to Factory Hollow and see how the site had wintered.

I recalled when Don Cameron, Charlie Wray, and I had excavated the burial plot in the south end of the site. There remained a small area around several large cedar trees we had not examined too well. Here we concentrated our efforts and soon located two undisturbed graves. They both contained things of interest. The first produced a large iron trade axe and four mullers or hammerstones. The pit was small, and the only indication of the skeleton were a few enamel caps of teeth and a thin dark stain on the pit bottom. The bones were completely decayed. The fill contained small bits of charcoal. This evidently was the grave of a small child.

---

1. Factory Hollow is a well-known Seneca site, located on Honeoye creek, two miles east of Lima, Livingston County. It was described by Parker in 1919 ("A Contact Period Site", Researches & Transactions of the NYSAA., vol. 1:, no. 2). Wray and Schoff date its occupation as about 1590-1615 ("A Preliminary Report on the Seneca Sequence in Western New York, 1550=1687" Penn. Archeologist vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 53-63; 1953) (see following page)

Near a large cedar tree I located another grave which contained the decayed remains of a young adult. This was an oval pit 42" long, 36" deep. The skeleton had been flexed on its right side, heading south. The bones could just be traced on the pit bottom. Between the face and knees was a decayed and crushed brass trade kettle, 8" in diameter. It contained a well-preserved wooden ladle with a wolf's head carved on the handle, and a wooden hair ornament depicting eight upright human figures. It has twenty-one teeth and is identical to the more common ones made from antler. It had been broken in use and laced together with twine which still adheres to it.

There was also a large quantity of what appears to be leather string or possibly fish line, a section of woven matting and a quantity of other organic matter, possibly food. Massed around the base of the skull were the remains of a necklace of about 225 turquoise blue glass beads and a few red ones. At the occiput were two small pottery vessels, each of about one quart capacity. One is of the heavy notched rim type, the other has a double row of small notches divided with two horizontal lines. Both were broken by the weight of the grave fill but were easily repaired. One contained a mass of berry seeds, the other nothing which could withstand the long time of burial.

At the back of the skeleton was a trade axe with the blade pointing to the feet as if the axe had been placed handle upright at the time of burial. The fill was of slightly stained and mottled clay which contained small particles of charcoal. There was a pronounced dark bottom layer due possibly to the preservative action of the copper and zinc salts from the decaying brass kettle.

These two graves bring the total number to 151 and probably will be the last ones to be found intact on this particular plot.

---

1. (continued) Cameron and Schoff opened 149 burials in this plot in 1950. In that same year a Morgan chapter dig uncovered a longhouse which measured over 100 ft. long by 15 ft. wide. Schoff dug nearly 100 burials in the 1940's on the opposite (north) end of this site. - Editor

\*\*\*\*\*

BOOK REVIEW. Sun Circles and Human Hands. The Southeastern Indians - Art and Industries. Edited by Emma Lila Fundaburk and Mary Douglass Foreman. Published by Emma L. Fundaburk, Laverne, Alabama 1957. 232 pages, index, bibliography. \$7, 50,

This is a carefully prepared summary of southeastern United States archeology. It contains a selection of pictures, sketches, maps and diagrams relating to the cultures represented in the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Oklahoma, the Carolinas, Tennessee, and Virginia. The plates (160 of them containing 500 pictures) have been assembled from 46 museums and 56 private collections. The plates are

accompanied by explanatory paragraphs and captions which indicate the collection in which the specimens, or pictures, are located.

A short introductory chapter presents the cultural sequence of the area: Paleoindian, Archaic, Woodland, Mississippi, and Historic. Each period is briefly described in terms of cultural achievements and representative artifacts. The remaining chapters deal with specific subjects. Native Trade, the Ceremonial Complex, Symbolism, Key Marco, Stone and Copper, Pottery, Wood, and Animal Products. The text of these chapters consists almost entirely of quotations from standard archeological references. Among the authors of these are John R. Swanton, James Bo Griffin, Frank H. Cushing, Clarence B. Moore, William H. Holmes, William Bartram.

This reviewer was impressed by the variety of subjects covered. One can find a page indicating a system for describing projectile point forms. A method of chipping flint is illustrated and described. There are maps showing the distribution of historic tribes. Several design elements are discussed and the symbolism interpreted. The chapter on Key Marco, a site producing unusual wooden objects in Florida, is particularly welcome. Copies of Cushing's report on his excavations there are hard to find. But the excerpts from this report which are presented here provide the reader with much information about this site and its cultural content.

While some may criticize the crowding of pictures into one plate, this detracts only slightly from the overall value of the publication. The editors evidently devoted considerable time in studying the subject, selecting the plates and putting the book together. The bibliography is one of the most comprehensive available on southeastern archeology. It fills 5 1/2 pages, and there are three columns per page. It is believed that this publication will be welcomed by students of southeastern archeology. Anyone wishing to obtain information on the material recovered in that area will find this a most useful reference.

Alfred K. Guthe

\*\*\*\*\*

#### NEWS AND NOTES

Morgan chapter held its April meeting jointly with the Ontario Archeological Society at the Niagara County Historical Society's museum in Lockport. About sixty members attended from Toronto, Rochester, and Lockport.

The session was called to order at 3:00 p. m, by President Guthe. Raymond Yates welcomed the group for the Niagara Historical Society. McCarthy introduced several. Morgan Chapter members who described the material which was on display as follows. Laverne Pechuman, Oakfield site; Stanley Vanderlaan, Sites around Waterport and Albion, Richard McCarthy, Kienuka and Shelby; Marian White, Eaton site.

;

At 5:00 p. m. the meeting was adjourned and wine was served to the guests. About forty had dinner together at Sisby's restaurant.

At 7: 00 p. m, the meeting reconvened to the music of Seneca songs recorded on the Tonawanda reservation by Ralph Ward. Richard McCarthy described the Lewiston site. Marian White summarized the archeology of the Niagara Frontier. Comparisons and problems common to the Western New York-Ontario region were discussed by the group. The meeting was adjourned and the discussion continued informally as the exhibits of both Niagara Frontier and Ontario material were viewed. Doughnuts and coffee were served and a social time followed. The response to this joint meeting was very enthusiastic and future sessions have been requested.

\*\*\*\*\*

We hope to publish the minutes of the 1958 annual meeting in the next issue of THE BULLETIN.

\*\*\*\*\*

The nominating committee will be appointed shortly. It is hoped that members will be prepared to nominate qualified persons from each of the chapters, and that a more representative ballot will be presented. Morgan and Van Epps-Hartley chapters have dominated the officers' positions long enough.

\*\*\*\*\*