

# FIVE MANUSCRIPTS BY DR. JOHN NORMAN EMERSON

<><> 2012 <><>

## CONTENTS

Introduction	p.1
(1) A CONTACT IROQUOIS VILLAGE IN NORTH VICTORIA COUNTY, ONTARIO (1951)	p. 2
(2) A DECADE OF ARCHAEOLOGY (1957 ?)	p. 3
(3) A DECADE OF EXCAVATION (1957)	p. 8
(4) A QUARTER-CENTURY OF ARCHAEOLOGY AT TORONTO 1938-1963 (1963 ?)	p.10
(5) THE RESEARCH POTENTIAL OF HURONIA (1965)	p.11
List of Publications Cited in or Relevant to the Texts	p.15
Archaeological Sites Mentioned in the Texts	p. 19
Scholars Mentioned in the Text ((in addition to those in the List of Publications)	p.19
Selected Topics mentioned in the Texts	p.20

<><>0<><>

## INTRODUCTION

Charles Garrad

The manuscripts reproduced here were found in 1998 in the files of the late Dr. John Norman Emerson in the Department of Anthropology at the University of Toronto by Professor Helen Devereux and Patricia Reed, who recognized that as unpublished works the manuscripts were of exceptional interest. The matter was brought to the attention of the writer, who compiled them into a single document, and added various indexes, with the intention of releasing the publication at the 1998 Annual Symposium of The Ontario Archaeological Society to commemorate the Twentieth Anniversary of Dr. Emerson's death that year. This intention was not realized.

In 2012, with the permission of the J. Norman Emerson Estate, it was decided to enhance the work with a new Introduction, a revised List of cited or relevant Publications, and Indexes to Sites, Scholars, and Selected Topics mentioned in the Texts, added by Charles Garrad, and to make the work available in the Research Bulletin series of the Petun Research Institute.

Where a firm date for the manuscript was not given, one has been deduced from internal evidence. Only the first of the manuscripts is specific to the interpretation of a site, Benson; the others reflect the history of Ontario archaeology more generally during Dr. Emerson's time as he knew it.

The third manuscript ends abruptly and may not be complete.

My thanks go to Patricia Reed for contributing word-processing, and to Professor Helen Devereux for adding marginal editorial comments and references, and to you both for bringing these manuscripts to my attention in 1998, and to Mrs Ann Emerson and daughter Lynn, representing Dr. Emerson's Estate, for permission in 2012 to revise and republish the five manuscripts through the Petun Research Institute..

C.G.

<><>0<><>

(1) A CONTACT IROQUOIS VILLAGE IN NORTH VICTORIA COUNTY, ONTARIO  
by J. Norman Emerson (1951)

To anthropologists and historians alike, the findings of the University of Toronto field party in Bexley township this summer, will come as novel and surprising information. In brief, the evidence suggests that the rise of Iroquois tribalism, so clearly marked in historic times, was a very late development and something that was no doubt nourished and fostered by the incursion of the white man, particularly the rivalry between the French and the English-Dutch allies. This suggestion is of extreme importance to historians for it would help to account for the difficulties faced by the white man in marshalling the aid of the Indian: to anthropologists this data will aid in understanding the peculiar strength of the Iroquois clan system which often overrode tribal loyalties and was perhaps basic to the formation of the spectacular "League of the Iroquois". Such conclusions are based upon the peculiar nature of the archaeological materials found at the Benson Site (Emerson 1954:206-229, 1958a).

As excavation proceeded it became evident that the Indians who lived at the Benson Site, probably in the period between 1550 and 1600, not only produced a great deal that was peculiar to their own way of life as an independent and self sufficient community, but that they also participated in a widespread cultural development that clearly linked together such far distant points as the Roebuck Village near Prescott on the St. Lawrence River, and the Sidey-Mackay Village Site near Creemore near Nottawasaga Bay. Both of these sites have been excavated by the late Mr. William J. Wintemberg (1936, 1946) of the National Museum. In his analysis of the materials found at these sites he had come to the conclusion that the Roebuck Site was a prehistoric "Mohawk-Onondaga" village, because of certain affiliations with similar sites in eastern New York. Similarly, he concluded that the Sidey-Mackay site was a historic contact village of the Petuns, or Tobacco Nation Iroquois. Both of these conclusions appeared to be reasonably justified. Thus our findings at the Benson Site left us in a paradox, a people who, when they lived on the banks of the St. Lawrence, appeared to be Mohawk-Onondaga, moved up the Trent Valley, settled for a while, and finally moved further westward and ultimately settled in the Nottawasaga area where they were historically known as the Petuns. The only solution to this paradox is to say that the terms Mohawk, Onondaga and perhaps even Petun had virtually no meaning in the prehistoric period. Iroquois tribalism had not solidified into concrete identifiable entities. The general term "Iroquois" would be about as specific a name as one could possibly apply to these villages in their apparent state of social flux. What are the connecting links between Benson and Roebuck? Between Benson and the Sidey-Mackay Site? The gross and particular similarities are many and diverse. It is only possible within the framework of this preliminary report to highlight a few.

The chief similarities between the Benson and Roebuck sites are to be found particularly in the complex ceramic wares. Certain pottery decorations such as the elaborate "corn ear" designs and the stress upon circular punctate elements, often combining three circles to represent a human face, are found prolifically at both sites. Multiple, undulating castellations are also popular at both. Stress upon elaborate bone work, particularly harpoon points; and a scarcity of flint, are other features which link the two.

Similarities to the Sidey-Mackay Site lie chiefly in the pipe complex, as well as gross ceramic similarities such as noted above for Roebuck. Square topped "coronet" pipes are popular at both and are strikingly similar not only in shape, but in decorative motif. The most striking similarities are

in the conical "mortice" pipes. This latter is probably the most popular type at the Benson site.

Materials which link all three sites together in a solid core of cultural tradition are similarly many. Perhaps the most outstanding artifact of this type is the "gaming disk". Dozens of these small circular disks of both stone and pottery, either perforated, semi-perforated or unperforated, have been recovered in abundance from all these sites.

Human and animal effigy pipes, which reach a high stage of cultural elaboration on all Iroquois sites in the late prehistoric and prehistoric periods are popular at all three sites. The Benson Site produced a snake effigy, a pointed human head effigy, a very finely modelled pipe with a human face on one surface and a fox or wolf effigy on the opposite surface. A fourth human effigy face was recovered, and a fifth pipe which may be a highly decorated lizard effigy. It should be noted here that the Benson Site produced none of the highly elaborate human pipe forms such as the squash blossom coronet pipe or the classically modelled "smoker false face" pipes or double face "Janus pipes". These lacks, combined with the absence of many notable Huron ceramic characteristics, raises the problem of the relations between these sites and the historic manifestations of the Hurons in Simcoe County.

The apparent migration of the Petuns up the Trent Valley appears to have no doubt preceded that of the Hurons into North Simcoe County. The Petun migration certainly must have taken place in very late prehistoric and early contact times. This would place the Huron entry at about 1600 to Simcoe County, and lend credence to Champlain's observations that they had but recently moved into that area from the land between Huronia and the Bay of Quinte. The migration route and homeland of the Hurons still remains as a major archaeological problem remaining to be solved. No adequate candidate for a prehistoric Huron site has been excavated to date outside Simcoe County. The Hardrock Site excavated by the University of Toronto on Balsam Lake last summer (Emerson 1950, 1954:188-203) is a very doubtful candidate at best; it may however be a stage in "developmental Huron" as yet poorly defined. Certain sites such as the Black Creek and Downsview sites excavated near Weston, or the McKenzie site at Woodbridge along with the Aurora site dug by the University of Toronto (Emerson 1954:168-185, 1957) may contain clues as to Huron origins. What ever may be the case, the problem of Huron Origins still stands as a major archaeological problem to be investigated.

To return to the Benson Site, perhaps the most spectacular contribution to our knowledge of Ontario archaeology was the finding of three double-orifice pots (Emerson 1954:222). These pottery vessels, which were skilfully and elaborately done, represent unique finds in Ontario archaeology. In every detail they are Iroquois, except that the pots have two openings side by side on the body proper, complete with highly ornate castellated rims. The specimens are beautiful in their execution and perfection of form and design motifs, also duplicated upon each orifice. These pots no doubt represent a cultural specialization and elaboration peculiar to the Benson Site people. The Benson people also produced many specimens of fine bone work, one particular example of a hair ornament (or potter's tool ?) being rather outstanding.

In summary, the Benson site has been of outstanding interest to us. We hope to go back in the future. No information has been gained upon burial customs. We have only a beginning knowledge of their house structures. Certain of the refuse deposits merit further investigation, particularly in the interest of reconstructing pottery vessels. All in all, the excavation of this contact Tobacco Nation site in North Victoria County has been a rewarding and stimulating experience.

This Report is but the briefest outline of work carried out by the Department of Anthropology, University of Toronto, during July and August 1951, on the farm of Mr. Frank Benson, Bexley Township, Victoria County, Ontario. A full and final report is in the process of production. The writer would like to thank Mr. Benson for his kind permission to dig, and for his genuine hospitality during our stay there; also to thank the thirty odd members of the Society for Ontario Archaeology (The Ontario Archaeological Society) and their President Mr. John M. Sinclair, whose aid so supplemented the members of the university party as to render the excavation a very great success.

(2) A DECADE OF ONTARIO ARCHAEOLOGY

by J. Norman Emerson (1957 ?)

with numbered end-notes contributed by Professor Helen Devereux

A little over ten years ago an archaeological renaissance began in Ontario. At that time our knowledge of Ontario was contained mainly in the reports of the late William J. Wintemberg (1928, 1936, 1939, 1946, 1948) and the generalized writings of men like Boyle, Hunter, and Laidlaw in the Annual Archaeological Reports of the Department of Education (see Garrad 1987). Ten years later, over forty archaeological sites have been investigated and the major outlines of Ontario Archaeology have become increasingly clear. This renaissance has come about through a combination of factors. Considerable guidance and leadership has been provided by the Department of Anthropology, of the University of Toronto, who developed a technique of large scale "student excavations" which have been held each fall over a period of ten years now, and who, aided by grants from the provincial Department of Education, have maintained a consistent and regular program of summer field excavation. This represented a considerable step-up in activity. From this program, combined with museum extension lectures the Ontario Archaeological Society was formed and members of this Society have aided many major excavations and have carried out their own digs. Concurrent with this activity was continued and persistent field work done by both the National Museum of Canada and the Royal Ontario Museum. The net result was an almost geometric progression in the development of archaeological work. Field parties increased both in<sup>1</sup> size and efficiency.

Student excavations commenced in the spring of 1947 as a response to a 1st year premedical year request to do field work. The project which at first seemed fantastic, because of the numbers involved and a lack of trained supervision, has since proved a tremendous success both educationally and archaeologically. To the class of 5T2 of the Faculty of Medicine goes the credit for launching a program that has made a basic contribution to Ontario Archaeology. The site excavated was known as the Aurora Site, actually located upon the old "Murphy Farm" just to the east of Vandorf (Emerson 1954:168-185, 1957). The experiment proved such a venture was feasible. The archaeological material, although sparse, indicated that here had been found a manifestation which was clearly prehistoric Huron. During the summer of 1947 steps were taken to make up for the lack of trained personnel to supervise excavation work. The writer was able to take four young men to excavate the Kant Site (Emerson 1949, 1955) for two months in the Ottawa Valley near Eganville. This work served as an intensive training ground. The work provided interesting information upon a Point Peninsula culture burial complex, which was largely unknown in Ontario at that time.

At the end of this intensive training period these four young men and the writer moved for the balance of the summer to the Huron village site then identified as Cahiagué, near Warminster, Ontario. Here a camp of nearly thirty young people had been assembled by the Royal Ontario Museum. The basic purpose of this excavation was training in field techniques rather than the recovery of archaeological materials. The excavation was directed and supervised by the group from the Kant Site. Digging, mapping, note taking and surveying was stressed - and for the first time the Department of Anthropology had set out upon a program of developing Canadian archaeologists to carry out work in their own country. The archaeological work that summer brought to light the remains of two complete Iroquois "longhouses", and parts of a third. These represent the first actual archaeological knowledge of longhouse structures. Moreover, this work supplemented the work done at Cahiagué in 1946 by the Royal Ontario Museum when several refuse deposits and the village ossuary were excavated. This work in 1946, directed by Professor T. F. McIlwraith (1946, 1947) (*end-note* 1) represents the spark that really touched off the archaeological renaissance that followed upon the decline in activities during the war years. There is still<sup>1</sup> controversy as to the actual identification of the site as Cahiagué, the village visited by Champlain in 1615. It stands as the best candidate for these honours to the present. The Cahiagué ceramics which have been surveyed and reported upon by MacNeish (1952) (*end-note* 2) stand today as the best cross section of historic

Huron pottery reported upon to date (Emerson 1962, 1966). The Cahiagué ossuary material which has been reported upon from the point of view of skeletal pathology (Harris 1949) still forms an important body of data for future research in the physical anthropology of the Huron people.

While this important training work was being carried on at Cahiagué, a second Royal Ontario Museum party was beginning important work at the ossuary of Ossossané, near Midland. This village and ossuary was rediscovered by the ingenious research of Frank Ridley (1947), (*end-note 3*) whose excellent contributions have increased and accumulated as our decade proceeds. Kenneth Kidd (*end-note 4*) directed this excavation during the summers of 1947 and 1948 and has presented a stimulating report (1953) upon this ossuary recorded in the writings of the Jesuit Father, Brébeuf. The skeletal material, like that from Cahiagué, forms a very important contribution to Iroquois-Huron physical anthropology. This analysis is still being carried out, in part by Temple University. The associated village remains as an archaeological "must" for excavation, for seldom do we have available a village so definitely dated and identified as Ossossané.

As the summer activity came to an end at Ossossané and Cahiagué, we were impressed by the growing body of trained young people capable of taking on supervisory duties. The field work for 1947 culminated in the second university student dig which took place upon the McKenzie Site, at Woodbridge (Emerson 1954:146-164). With the available added supervisory staff this was a highly successful venture and laid the foundation for a continuing research program in the Metropolitan Toronto area which has continued up to the present. The McKenzie site was a rich and prolific village and produced a wealth of Huron-like material. The work here raised the problem of the Humber River Valley as a south to north migration route in the development of historic Huron. Over the years this proposition has now become a well documented theory. The McKenzie site is a prehistoric site and is located historically somewhere in the period of middle Iroquoian development in Ontario. It marks the first occurrence of animal and bird effigy pipes, and the characteristic square topped "coronet" or "squash blossom" pipe types that become so popular in the historic Huron sites. It is also one of the few sites which produce human skull gorgets, which may also have functioned as ceremonial rattles.

There is also considerable evidence of contact with the Roebuck people far to the east in the South Nation watershed. This is particularly noted by the presence of what is called "corn ear" design ceramics.

The summer of 1948 saw Kidd back to complete the work at Ossossané (1953) (*endnote 5*). Professor McIlwraith (1949) took a second Museum field party to the Sopher Farm, north of Bass Lake, west of Orillia. The materials from this latter site were uniformly crude, heavy and decorated with the most simple designs which suggest they represent an early stage in the development of this eastern Huron area. The fall term saw our student excavation again concentrating upon the problems of Huron migration in the lower Humber Valley. The site selected for excavation was the Black Creek site located upon the north west corner of Jane Street and Wilson Avenue in the heart of Metropolitan Toronto in an area which was soon to be subdivided. It became evident that our large scale student excavations were going to serve an additional useful purpose - we were able to obtain large and adequate samples from sites that were threatened by destruction as subdivision and house building proceeded forward in the Metropolitan area.

Archaeologically we were interested in determining the relationship between Black Creek and the McKenzie sites (Emerson 1954) as regards the whole problem of the Humber as a migration route for developmental Huron. Our work was rewarding. The most lasting effect was to recognize a new ceramic type in the Iroquois sequence. This type which is most readily recognized by the presence of complex, alternate oblique, incised line decoration upon the neck of the vessel. This type has been called "Black Necked" by MacNeish and serves as a mark for quite a number of important sites in central Ontario. We were quite convinced that Black Creek preceded McKenzie in our time sequence. The most useful clue in this direction was the elaboration of a pipe complex which featured various types decorated with incised ring lines decorating the pipe bowl. The presence of what we refer to as "rolled-rim" pottery vessels, in considerable numbers, opened up additional interpretation possibilities. This type of pottery was typical of many finds reported by William J. Wintemberg (*endnote 6*) in his early stages of Neutral development in Southwestern

Ontario. This raised the possibility that the manifestations in the Humber and Black Creek Valleys were in turn a product of migration from southwestern Ontario. This hypothesis is now rather well substantiated by subsequent excavations.

The fall of 1948 saw the University of Toronto group venturing somewhat father afield in student dig activities. The presence of MacNeish and Thomas E. Lee at the National Museum had considerably stepped up interest in Ontario. MacNeish (1952) was engaged in collecting data for his "Iroquois Pottery Types" and Lee (1951, 1952, 1959) was engaged in comprehensive archaeological survey work in both southwestern Ontario and the Bruce Peninsula. As a result in part, the National Museum of Canada, the University of Michigan, and the Department of Anthropology of the University of Toronto combined in digging a site in the Tillsonburg area. This site apparently faced destruction by cultivation, and represented a pre-Iroquoian manifestation of considerable interest. Lee (1958, 1963)(*endnote 7*) assigned it to the Glen Meyer Focus as developmental Woodland in Ontario. It represents one of Toronto's first excursions into the pre-Iroquoian field.

1949 saw two major excavations take place. The Royal Ontario Museum during the summer carried out the excavation of the Krieger site near Chatham. Kidd (1954a, 1954b) has reported at some length upon this site and it presents a real problem of classification. It is obviously somewhat distinct from the Neutral Iroquois sequence as outlined by Wintemberg. It certainly is involved in Lee's Glen Meyer Focus and it might ultimately be demonstrated that its orientation is more likely towards Michigan and westward rather than towards Ontario. It is neither clearly Owasco, nor Point Peninsula, in its features. It still remains as a problem calling for elucidation. It does point towards western southwestern Ontario as an interesting area of investigation. The Krieger burial customs were, in particular, intriguing and spectacular.

The fall of 1949 saw our student dig activities again return to the McKenzie site at Woodbridge (Emerson 1954:146-164). The task faced here was to obtain what information we could upon the village plan, and in particular information upon longhouse construction. We were particularly interested to see to what degree this middle period Iroquois site produced longhouses which were comparable to the ones encountered at Cahiagué. Test trenches across the 10 acre area revealed at least 17 longhouses. The major achievement of this excavation was to completely dig a huge longhouse 184' long by 30' wide. The detail of construction was identical with that found at Cahiagué. Contrary to ethnological and historical descriptions, the outer walls were made up of two rows of saplings set 6" apart. The general result was to produce sets of posts 3" to 4" in diameter set in pairs 6" apart, and the pairs in turn set apart at 18" centres. The entire outer wall was so produced. The longhouse was rounded at the north end and squared at the other. Central fireplaces were recovered, two at each end, with a central dance area(?). The detail as to cubicle areas was very vague.

The summer of 1950 saw the Department of Anthropology carrying out its initial investigations in the Victoria County area of the Trent Valley waterway. The site selected was the Hardrock site located upon the west shore of Indian Point at the north end of Balsam Lake. The task here was to investigate the Trent as a possible migration route contributing to the development of eastern segments of the Huron people. The summer excavation produced detail upon a 150'x 30' longhouse which was again similar to those at Cahiagué and Woodbridge. The ceramic material however was very startling. Rather than producing types which were typical Huron, the majority of the pottery was the Black Necked type encountered upon the western outskirts of Toronto! This manifestation still raises problems and suggests at least two major Iroquoian stages in the Trent Valley. It also suggests that the developmental stage of Huron represented by Black Necked pottery was much more wide-spread than first suspected (Emerson 1950, 1954).

Fall activity saw our interest again concentrated upon the Black Creek Valley. Investigations were carried out upon the Cockshutt estate located on the southwest corner of Jane Street and Sheppard Avenue West (Emerson 1954:104-123). This area was threatened with potential subdivision. This was another rich and prolific site and provided added information to document our theory of the southwestern origin of these people. Ceramics and pipes revealed a close relationship between this Downsview area site and the Black Creek site. At the same time, many finds of "rolled rim" types helped confirm the similarity between this site and ones in

Wintemberg's early Neutral sequence in Southwestern Ontario.

1951 saw interest once again focused upon the Trent Valley. The Benson Site (*endnote 8*), near Bexley, Ontario (Emerson 1954:206-229, 1958a, this volume) and some 16 miles northwest of the Hardrock Site, was selected for investigation. The contrast with Hardrock was striking. This site produced European trade goods which appear to mark it of the "contact period" probably dated about 1550 a.d. It produced a profusion of human and animal effigy pipes, coronet and other types which link it with Huron. The typical Huron "pinched face" pipe was absent. The Benson site is very much like Wintemberg's Sidey-Mackay site near Creemore on the western fringe of Huronia. There can be little doubt that here we have a good representation of an early contact period stage of developmental Huron. The presence of many pottery types typical of the Roebuck Site, far to the southeast in the South Nation watershed, provided our first convincing evidence as to the southeastern connections of the Iroquois sites in Victoria county. It is also notable that the Benson Site saw the first organized participation of the members of the Ontario Archaeological Society in a regular, university, summer excavation (*endnote 8*). Since this time, Society members have participated in most of the major institutional excavations and have gradually built up a body of trained and competent excavators. They have been extremely helpful with supervisory tasks.

The summer of 1951 saw the Royal Ontario Museum turn its interest to pre-Iroquoian manifestations in the Lake Scugog, Rice Lake and lower Trent Valley areas. Excavation work was carried out by Harper (*endnote 9*) at the Washburn Island Site. Kidd was carrying out important research upon trade materials supported by a Guggenheim award (Kidd 1954c).

The fall of 1951 saw our student excavation activity concentrated again upon the Humber Valley survey. The village site known as the Seed Site was being devastated by work upon Hauman's gravel pit. This site was already known by relatively small collections and had been reported upon by MacNeish. We felt that it would be very desirable to increase the sample from this site as it apparently faced ultimate destruction. We received permission to dig upon the Roy Barker farm adjacent to the Seed property. This excavation was struck by the first snowfall of that particular fall. The digging was difficult and cold. Gales and snow swept the area known to the students as "Heartbreak Ridge". The site is located upon the east branch of the Humber River just north and east of Pine Grove. The findings confirmed and elaborated MacNeish's analysis of this site. It certainly represents a further stage in developmental Huron proceeding onward in time from the McKenzie Site, and yet it shows also an individual complexity seldom seen in Ontario Iroquois sites. The most striking feature is the high percentage of pottery decorated with cord impressions and lip notching as decorative techniques. Part of the development can be attributed to Seed inventiveness and part seems to indicate the influence of contact with the Fort Ancient peoples of Ohio. A few indications of this same influence were also seen at the Aurora Site. The most distinctive artifact produced at the Barker Site were notched tally beads, which are sparse elsewhere, but very numerous here. The Barker Site impressed us that we must be prepared to encounter sites showing considerable deviation and local inventiveness in the process of formulating our theories of Huron development.

The summer of 1952 saw our departmental interests turn towards the peripheries of Huronia. The writer, along with Robert E. Popham (1950, 1952), had surveyed this area for connecting links between the Humber Valley and Huronia, and in order to further define the status of the high collared ware used by Ridley (1952) to define his "Lalonde Culture". We were also interested to see if we could define a complex which would allow us to distinguish Petun from the Huron-Iroquois. The site selected was the Graham-Rogers Site located upon the Innisfil Creek, just to the west of Stroud, Ontario (Bell 1952). In the fall of 1952 our student excavation was once again directed to the Black Creek Valley. A pipe line was being cut through the Metropolitan area north of Finch Avenue. It was going to cut through a large and productive Iroquois village upon the north side of Finch between Jane and Keele streets. This became known as the Parsons Site. Once again our student parties arrived ahead of the march of civilization. The Parsons Site proved to be the connecting link between the Black Creek and Downsview sites to the south, and the McKenzie site to north at Woodbridge. The connecting links were very convincing including Black Necked pottery pointing south and the pipe complex in particular pointing northward, The presence of human skull gorgets

also formed a good local tie up with the McKenzie Site. Parsons and McKenzie also were the only sites in this area to share a considerable number of Roebuck ceramic types. We were also impressed by the large number of sherds similar to those reported by Wintemberg from the Lawson Neutral Site. This latter site makes up the later stages in the development of Neutral and suggests the presence of broad contacts across considerable geographic areas throughout each stage of Ontario Iroquois development (Cooper 1967; Emerson 1968).

The summer of 1953 saw the university's attention further directed towards the problem of distinguishing Huron and Petun. It appeared that if such a distinction were present it should be revealed in the Iroquois sites located in the Blue Mountain area of Collingwood. We were granted permission to excavate the MacMurchy Site located upon Silver Creek on the western fringe of Collingwood. Several refuse deposits were investigated and it was established that the site belonged to the Contact period. It certainly was Huron-like in many of its features but it possessed features which may provide the first real clues to the distinctive features of Petun. Douglas Bell who analyzed the materials feels that the following features may help distinguish Petun from Huron: (see Bell 1953).

The fall of 1953 saw our fall student work concentrated upon the Parsons Site once again where the problem of subdivision appeared more imminent (Cooper 1967; Emerson 1968). Little new came to light but the work served to broaden our sample of this important site and to provide a statistical sample which perhaps only has its counterpart in the Benson Site to date.

The summer of 1954 saw departmental interest turned towards eastern Ontario and the St. Lawrence Valley. The development of the Ontario Hydro Electric Power Project was bound to have profound results when flooding ultimately took place. A survey team took to the field and covered the entire area to be flooded in detail. Some thirty two sites were recorded, most of them quite small. Collections were analyzed and recorded. Only two sites were recommended for full scale excavation, the Malcolm Site and the Ault Park Site (Emerson 1956, 1957, 1958b). The Malcolm Site was excavated that summer and an excellent report upon this work has been presented by Dailey and Wright (Wright & Dailey 1956)(*endnote* 10). This, along with the Kant Site report (Emerson 1949, 1955), marks our first comprehensive knowledge of Point Peninsula in Ontario and begins to provide a sound basis for comparison with New York manifestations of this same culture. Plans were also laid to carry out the excavation of the Ault Park Site in 1956.

In addition to the work in the St. Lawrence Valley, the Department carried out a detailed investigation of the "Peterborough Petroglyphs" (*endnote* 11). These fascinating art relics have been the subject of considerable debate and controversy. They have been ably summarized by Paul Sweetman (1955) in an able and interesting report. Plans for a considerably restricted fall student excavation had been laid in the Woodbridge area. This curtailment had been brought about by a seeming lack of sites sufficiently large to accommodate the usual 200 students normally involved in the student dig. Our excavation weekend coincided with the devastation of "Hurricane Hazel". The Woodbridge area, including the site area, was decimated. Our attention was shifted to the eastern fringe of Toronto where excavation was carried out upon Steeles Avenue, near the Markham town line. Digging was carried out upon the Millroy and the Reesor farms. This represented follow up work commenced in the spring by the Ontario Archaeological Society. The findings here were of extreme interest for despite some relationship to the Black Creek Site it appeared that these sites in the Rouge and Highland Creek Valleys were perhaps earlier and more closely related to Wintemberg's Middleport Site than anything encountered in the Metropolitan area to date.

In the spring of 1955 a group of interested premedical students organized a post-examination expedition to the Shebishekong Site. This was a extremely interesting site located far outside the expected northern range of Iroquois sites. It was located near the mouth of the Shebishekong River upon the east shore of Georgian Bay near Nobel. This was the typical, rugged, pre-cambrian area of the Muskoka section of the Laurentian Shield. The site appeared to be a hunting camp. There was an abundance of beaver bones, many which appeared to have been skinned for fur rather than for food purposes. The site was rich in trade goods, including knives, a flint lock and a silver pendant. It certainly appears to have existed into the full historic period. There

was a nearly complete ceramic sequence from early to late. Moreover the Iroquois material definitely showed a fairly extensive Point Peninsula camp site.

In the summer of 1955 the Royal Ontario Museum resumed its interest in the Rice Lake area and the Peterborough district. The early part of the summer was spent in excavating the Quackenbush Site, an interesting Iroquois site which appears to bear some relationship to Ridley's Lalonde Culture. The balance of the summer was spent in survey and mapping work at the famous "Serpent Mounds" at Rice Lake (Kidd 1956). This represented a continuation of the work begun by Harper in (blank) (Spence & Harper 1968) and this site will represent an area of intensive interest and development by the museum for a number of years to come. It is hoped that the archaeological data will be integrated with plans for recreational and parkland development in the area.

The fall student excavation again was carried out by way of an experiment. It was evident that large scale sites suited to student excavations were disappearing within simple daily commuting distance of Toronto. It was decided to see if total, long distance commutation for a complete weekend was possible and feasible. A decision was made to return to the Benson Site. Here we considered it an interesting archaeological problem to see to what degree two large archaeological samples would turn out to be statistically comparable - somewhat in the way we had tested MacNeish's findings at the Seed Site. This material is still under analysis and the results are as yet unknown; but it should prove stimulating to define the concept of an "adequate sample" of a site. The problems of commutation and organization were solved in an admirable way by the facilities of Camp Gay Venture who provided us with excellent food and accommodations at a very reasonable rate and demonstrated that commuting for a hundred to one hundred and fifty miles was quite feasible.

The summer of 1956 saw departmental interest turn to the emerging excavation of the Ault Park Site (Emerson 1956, 1957, 1958b). Here an elaborate Point Peninsula burial complex was revealed and a large statistical sample of domestic artifacts was obtained. The Royal Ontario Museum continued detailed excavation of the Serpent Mounds (Kidd 1956). The National Museum carried out investigations in the Sarnia area at the Corunna Site under Thomas E. Lee (1958).

Footnotes contributed by Professor Helen Devereux:

- 1 - Head, Dept. of Anthropology, University of Toronto, but also cross-appointed with the Royal Ontario Museum, I believe.
- 2 - Senior Archaeologist, National Museum of Canada, Ottawa.
- 3 - independent part-time archaeologist and member of The Ontario Archaeological Society.
- 4 - Curator, Department of Ethnology, Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto.
- 5 - the ossuary only, I believe.
- 6 - National Museum of Canada, Ottawa.
- 7 - Archaeologist, National Museum of Canada.
- 8 - Members of the O.A.S. took part in their first dig here !. So did Helen Devereux.
- 9 - Graduate Student, Department of Anthropology, University of Toronto.
- 10 - Robert C. Dailey, later Ph.D.; James V. Wright, later Ph.D.
- 11 - The site became included in the Serpent Mounds Park.

<>>0<><>

### (3) A DECADE OF EXCAVATION by J. Norman Emerson (1957)

A decade ago the basic knowledge of Ontario Archaeology was contained in five reports by the late William J. Wintemberg (1928, 1936, 1939, 1946, 1948), archaeologist of the National Museum of Canada. Today, ten years later, our knowledge is based upon the large, full scale excavation of over forty sites. This tremendous increase has been the result of a stepped-up program of archaeological research by the National Museum of Canada, the Royal Ontario Museum, the Ontario Archaeological Society, and the Department of Anthropology of the University of Toronto.

In the midst of this broad upsurge of excavation activity, publication has naturally fallen far behind the digging itself. This paper is an attempt to describe some of the broad trends and new knowledge that is emerging from this work. As one might expect, it is the Iroquois sites which have received the greatest amount of attention. The search for identifiable villages was carried out, and both Ossossané (Ridley 1947) and Cahiagué (Emerson 1962, 1966; Emerson & Russell 1965; McIlwraith 1946, 1947) villages were located, the former dated at 1639, the latter at 1615. Cahiagué village and ossuary have been excavated, and the Ossossané ossuary has been dug. The latter has been reported upon in considerable detail, the former but briefly. Cahiagué serves as the most useful cross-section of historic Huron ceramics excavated to date, and has been reported upon by MacNeish. Mr. Kidd's (1949, 1950) report on the Orr Lake pottery is the only other comprehensive study of early Huron in North Simcoe County. Excavation at the Sopher farm north of Bass Lake (McIlwraith 1949) may furnish clues as to some of the early stages of Huron in Huronia proper.

In the search for Huron origins proper, a certain amount of information has come to light. Ridley has been the most prolific worker here. He has distinguished a Lalonde culture, which is certainly basically Iroquoian, but is distinctive from Huron apparently. However, whether Lalonde is ancestral to Huron, or contemporaneous with it and perhaps somehow related to Petun is a problem. The presence of Lalonde and Neutral types upon sites in the Inverhuron District of the Bruce Peninsula (Lee 1960) would perhaps argue this way. In addition to the presence of characteristic Lalonde features upon sites to the south of Huronia, all the way to the Metropolitan area, seem to indicate that Lalonde was a small offshoot which moved northward from that area. At the same time Ridley has demonstrated the presence of very early Middleport-like manifestations in the Huron area and northward by his material from the Barrie site (Lee 1958; Ridley 1958), the Webb site (Ridley 1947, 1952), and from Frank Bay on the French River (Ridley 1954). This certainly represents a surprisingly widespread distribution of this early Iroquois material. Recent excavations in the north and east Toronto districts, at the Thompson, Millroy and Robb Sites (Donaldson 1962), have produced material which appears to be nearly as old. All of which suggests that there was considerable movement and spreading, even at early Iroquois times in Ontario. To date of course the Uren and Middleport sites are still credited as the earliest Iroquoian manifestation in Ontario.

Looking at the eastern periphery of Huronia, the Trent Valley, and especially North Victoria County, has been and are of intensive archaeological interest. Here, two sites, the Benson Site and the Hardrock Site, offer some clarification. The Benson Site (Emerson 1954:206-229, 1958a, this publication) is a contact period village and is very much like the Sidey-Mackay village studied by Wintemberg (1946). He considered the latter to be Petun, probably swayed by its position upon the western periphery of Huronia and its lack of certain very common Huron features. He was also aware of its similarity to the sites in Victoria County to the east of Huronia. Our intensive study of the Benson site has led us to consider both it and Sidey-Mackay as a developmental stage in Huronia representing the early contact period, probably around 1550.

The most striking feature of the Benson Site, apart from its affinity to Huron, was the high degree of similarity to the Roebuck Village in the South Nation watershed in the St. Lawrence Valley. It certainly appears that some of the constituent elements which ultimately blend to form Huron came from this source and the Trent waterway would appear to be the route taken. The intensive investigation of the Trent Valley exists as a major problem to be tackled. The investigation of the Hardrock Site on Indian Point, Balsam Lake, for possible clues as to Huron origins served but to further confuse the problem. The Hardrock Site showed its closest affinity to the Black Creek Site upon the western fringe of Toronto and bore little if any relationship to either Historic Huron or to Roebuck, as might have been anticipated from its geographic location. It is slim evidence, but it does raise the problem of a further wide distribution of Iroquois culture at the period marked by the Black Creek Site, which seems to be prior to any Roebuck influence being felt in the Trent Valley.

Upon the western and southern peripheries of Huronia, excavators of the MacMurchy and Graham-Rogers Sites (Bell 1952, 1953) appear to allow the setting up of a manifestation which appears capable of being distinguished from Huron proper. It would appear that in these two sites we may have the key which allows us to distinguish Huron from Petun.

As we proceed to the Metropolitan Toronto district proper a broad picture of developmental Huron is being brought to light.

### A Decade of Excavation

(by the University of Toronto ?)

- 1946 - Aurora, Cahiagué
- 1947 - Kant, Cahiagué, Woodbridge
- 1948 - Black Creek, Bass Lake or Serpent Mound, Tillsonburg
- 1949 - Woodbridge
- 1950 - Indian Point, Downsview
- 1951 - Benson, Barker
- 1952 - Graham-Rogers, Parsons
- 1953 - MacMurchy, Parsons
- 1954 - Malcolm, Arctic, Millroy, Reesor, Shebishekong
- 1955 - Arctic, Benson
- 1956 - Ault Park, Scarborough

(by others ?)

- 1947 & 1948 - Ossossané
- 1949 - Krieger (Kidd)
- 1951 - Washburn Island (Harper)
- 1952 - Rice Lake
- 1954 - Petroglyphs (Dewdney 1957)
- 1955 - Serpent Mound, Quackenbush
- 1956 - Serpent Mound

<><>0<><>

#### (4) A QUARTER-CENTURY OF ARCHAEOLOGY AT TORONTO 1938-1963 by J. Norman Emerson (1963 ?)

As a former student and current colleague of Dr. Thomas Forsyth McIlwraith, I deem it a considerable privilege and a pleasant task to put down for the record the part that he has played in the development of Ontario, Canadian, and for that matter, world archaeology. No one, not even he himself, would classify Professor McIlwraith as an archaeologist but his influence upon the development of archaeology has been profound, and a lasting monument has been built, and is still being built, based upon both his broad and sympathetic approach and upon his particular and personal interests. Perhaps most of all I find it both shocking, and startling, to be able to write and talk in terms of a quarter century of development. Such a great span of continuous activity makes one feel one with the ages oneself. But Rome was not built in a day, nor was the archaeological program at Toronto developed overnight. To many, our development will come as a surprise because it has been done quietly and without fanfare; we have never sought publicity. Thus it is certainly time that these achievements should be chronicled. In actual fact the Department of Anthropology, at the University of Toronto, has pursued the most active archaeological program of any department in the world during the last twenty-five years and we are just moving into a stage where the fruits of this labour are beginning to be recognized. The only comparable development is the development of "the Chicago School" under the leadership of the "Great White Father", Dr. Fay-Cooper Cole during the '30 and '40's at the Kincaid site (Cole 1951) and the University of Chicago. Professor McIlwraith is best known as "the Head" of the Department of Anthropology at the U of T; he is next best known as a Field Naturalist of great reputation (following the lead of his illustrious father) and his constant participation in the program of Camp Billy Bear and the Ontario Field Naturalist Society. In anthropological circles he is known for the production of the two definitive and weighty volumes upon the Bella Coola; he is also widely known for his role in the development of the Royal Ontario Museum, as Associate Director for many years, and it was only the

"one job" policy which caused his separation from this institution. He had to choose in favour of the academic department. He will always be remembered as occupying the largest and most commodious office in the museum, from the second story of which an excellent view of bird life could be obtained.

All of the foregoing simply indicates that his role as an archaeologist is not prominent, nor has been overlooked by the university, his colleagues, his students and the public, as Professor McIlwraith found his responsibility in other areas increasingly demanding. But for those students who are now involved in the field of anthropology with a special interest in archaeology, I would like to document the role of Professor McIlwraith in the subdiscipline of archaeology. He is a field man and a digger who loves to sleep under canvas and is at his relaxed and happiest best as a member of a field party; he has taken over the role of field director both at Cahigué and at the Sopher Site; he has proved himself as an intrepid and rugged archaeological surveyor particularly with his initial investigations of the Puckasaw Pit Cultures (McIlwraith 1957) upon the rugged and inhospitable shores of Lake Superior; but most of all he has academically and socially proved himself as an excellent public relations man in the field of archaeology, convincing everyone from Prime Ministers to first year students that here was an area of significant endeavour. His ultimate task was that of "archaeological watch dog". As member and chairman of the Archaeological and Historic Sites Board he found himself in a position where he had to help and develop the whole historic and prehistoric programme of the department of Travel and Publicity. He helped formulate Bill 66 which is the Antiquities Law for the province of Ontario. Finally, Professor McIlwraith has found himself in the position of grant adjudicator. He was prepared to vouch for the expenditure of monies upon archaeology by his colleagues and students, funds provided by the Department of Education, Provincial Government, Dept. of Travel and Publicity, Canada Council, Archaeological and Historic Sites Board, the Committee on the Humanities and Social Sciences (University of Toronto) and to evaluate the aid offered by provincial, federal and private corporations.

<><>0<><>

#### (5) THE RESEARCH POTENTIAL OF HURONIA

by Dr. J. Norman Emerson (1965)

(notes on the manuscript cover state "Mariposa Festival, Orillia, January 30, 1965" and "read by Robert C. Dailey")

Almost twenty-five years ago to the day, Dr. William N. Fenton (1940) wrote a very significant article assessing the state of knowledge of Iroquoian problems at that time. Then, as today, there was a feeling that a great deal had been done and a great deal was known. Fenton said, "The time has come when the cultural history of the Iroquois peoples demands a new synthesis". He was writing, of course, of all the Iroquoian peoples, and included a comprehensive summary of the then current knowledge of the Hurons. To Fenton, at that time, the greatest single problem facing the student of Iroquoia was, ".. to demonstrate the intrusive and linguistic position of the Iroquois in the Northeast".

This paper will deal largely with the first problem as stated above, namely: to assess to what degree a new synthesis of Huron history and prehistory has been produced in the last quarter century.

The second problem, that of the understanding and explanation of the intrusive position of the Iroquoian peoples in the Northeast, I shall largely ignore in the context of this paper. Suffice it to say at this moment, it still stands as a major and unsolved aspect of the general problem.

There is a growing body of data and publication by archaeologists, pioneered by the work of men like Ritchie and MacNeish, who now subscribe to the "in situ" theory of Iroquois development. They feel that they can demonstrate a long history of Iroquois emergence in the Northeast. This can be traced backward in time through a series of developmental and interconnected cultural units, which resulted ultimately in the genesis of the historic Iroquois, including the Hurons. Cultural traits, characteristically southern, have appeared in the Northeast by a process of diffusion, for example, corn cultivation; by invention, as in the case of the development of confederacies; and through social

processes, illustrated by the matrilineal family. The problem of linguistic connections still remains a major one to solve.

To return to the main theme, that of a cultural synthesis of Huron history and prehistory, we ask: Has this been achieved? The overwhelming answer is, no. But, herein lies the great potential for research in Huronia. And the study of Huronia is like any other study. If pursued with honesty and integrity, it leads to the ultimate conclusion that the more one learns, the less one knows. The achievement of an historical and cultural synthesis is the product of the answers to four interrelated questions:

1. Have we asked ourselves all the pertinent and important questions related to the subject?
2. Have we made use of all the methodological tools and techniques of modern archaeological and historical research available in order to ferret out the answers to our questions?
3. Have we made use of the most comprehensive theories and hypotheses as guides to the historical and cultural understanding of the Hurons which we seek to produce?
4. Have we pursued an organized programme of publication which has made the results of our findings common knowledge to at least the specialists in the field of Huron studies?

In every case, the answer is, no. It is my intention to deal with each of these problems in turn. This approach, which seems to be obviously negative, is not calculated to be so. It is rather offered in the sincere hope that an evaluation of the work done, and a statement of the work not yet done, will serve as a source of inspiration. There is a need for growing numbers of Huron and Iroquoian scholars to double and redouble their efforts in a field which holds a tremendous research potential.

It seems that we have not asked ourselves all the pertinent and important questions related to this subject. There are a multitude of these, both large and small, which the Huron scholar should ask. The following statement of these is simply suggestive rather than comprehensive or exhaustive.

A first and obvious question is one of the definition of Huronia itself. The wealth of maps, articles, books and road signs would suggest that this has been done. However, if we define Huronia as the territory in which the Hurons lived, the task is not so simple. Traditionally, Huronia has been considered as that part of North Simcoe County which lies roughly between Barrie, Orillia, Midland and Matchedash Bay. This is largely adequate and true if we confine the definition to Historic Huronia of the period from about 1600 to 1649 a.d. There are in a sense, however, at least two other Huronias. There is Huronia of the Contact Period, and there is Prehistoric Huronia. Archaeologists, historians, missionaries and the early explorers, have all recognized that Historic Huronia was the result of a process of withdrawal, contraction and population concentration. What they did not know, quite so clearly, was just when, and from whence, these people came.

Archaeological work to date points to several specific areas. Popham in 1950, and more recently Heidenreich (1971) and Trigger (1960, 1962), have clearly demonstrated that Huronia of the Contact Period occupied an area to the south of Barrie, and in particular, considerable areas of Innisfil Township. Secondly, excavation work by the University of Toronto to the east of Historic Huronia, in the neighbourhood of Bexley, Ontario (Emerson 1954:206-229) has indicated that a similar population spread of Huron peoples existed at the Contact Period in the area of North Victoria County. In addition, the excavation of the Sidey-Mackay Site by the late William J. Wintemberg (1946) of the National Museum of Canada, indicates a similar western extension along Georgian Bay at least to Creemore on the Nottawasaga River. Thus Huronia, if conceived as including the Contact Period, extends well beyond the extent of Huronia as defined generally today.

The pioneer archaeological survey work of men like Andrew F. Hunter and Colonel George Laidlaw, richly confirms the reality of this extension. The same is true of references and comments interspersed throughout the historical records.

If we accept also (as seems unavoidable) the reality of the concept of a Prehistoric Huronia, the task of definition becomes even more complex. This concept raises the difficult and as yet incompletely answered question of the origin of the Hurons. We are led also into consideration of the definition of concepts such as "developmental Huron" and "proto-Huron". Further, it raises the problem of the development of Huron tribalism. I would suspect that, in part at least, the

development of tribalism would be accompanied by a partial breakdown in clan organization. Historical writings, and Tooker's most recent 'Ethnography of the Huron Indians' (1964) certainly suggests that the definition of Huron clans presents difficulties. In addition, Fenton, back in 1940, suggested that the Bear, Cord, Deer and Rock peoples were to be more properly recognized as intermarrying lineages than as clans proper. It is clear that participation in the Iroquois wars over the fur trade, and the need of tribal or national identifications which would be understood by their white allies, would hasten the definition of tribal groups. In these circumstances, it became important to know where their loyalties and allegiances lay. In terms of relatively recent work in the field, we have not even found it easy to distinguish archaeologically between the Huron and the Petun as tribal units, notwithstanding the MacMurchy village at Collingwood has been defined by the late Douglas Bell (1953) as Petun. It is doubtful, however, that the Sidey-Mackay Site investigated by Wintemberg (1946) is actually Petun as he suggested. It is apparent that even the distinction of Huron from Petun is a large problem calling for intensive investigation by Huronia scholars.

To return to the question of Huron origins, all those familiar with the field realize that such distinctions as those between Huron and Neutral groups become more and more difficult. The two seem to merge and become more and more alike until a stage is reached where we find a generalized Ontario Iroquoian culture base. This is best exemplified in James V. Wright's (1960) publication on the Middleport Horizon.

Two questions which have been asked by workers in the Huronia field are centred upon the query: where have all the bodies gone? There are records of hundreds, if not thousands, of skeletons dug up in the early 1900's by Dr. Taché (Hunter 1897). It is today a complete mystery as to where they are and who owns them. Certainly no comprehensive study of them has appeared in print. In view of the current high level of proficiency in the study of physical anthropology, these remains represent a very serious loss to Huron history. In the same way, the vivid descriptions of massacre and death attending the downfall of Huronia have not so far been documented archaeologically. One would expect to have come upon what must have been the almost Dachau-like disposal of bodies so massacred.

A final question one might ask at this time is: has the program of excavation as carried out in Huronia been adequate? The answer is, no. What has been done has varied from poor to excellent. I would particularly recommend Ross Channen and Norman Clarke for their work on the Copeland Site (Channen & Clarke 1965). I will not comment upon the institutional work at such sites as Cahiagué, Ossossané, Forget, Flanagan, Ste. Marie I, St. Ignace, Sopher, Sidey-Mackay, and others.

Even this considerable amount of work represents only a small and very minimal sample of the vast array of both historic and prehistoric villages known and recorded in Huronia. A pitiful few among the hundreds.

Above, we have considered one or two of the many pertinent questions which might be asked with regard to Huronia. I have also suggested above that in the past we have not made full use of some of the comprehensive theories and hypotheses which would serve as guides in attempting to answer such questions. Several theories of Huron origins exist. In this paper I shall refer only to the archaeological ones.

One well-known theory is that of Frank Ridley, who uses his cultural sequence at the Frank Bay Site on the French River as a point of departure (1954). This work, followed by a comparison of a series of sites in the Huronia area, has led him to seek a northern origin for the Iroquois in general, and the Hurons in particular. This development to him constantly reflects the imprint of what he calls Mississippian and even Plains influences. The key to Ridley's theory has been his definition of a "Lalonde people" (1952) who, to him, are also ancestral to the eastern Iroquois of New York and groups such as the western Seneca. The fact that "Lalonde" represents neither a culture, nor a people, but a pottery type, indicates the absurdity of this theory. It is most unfortunate that George Quimby's (1952) recent publication upon the archaeology of the Great Lakes area follows Ridley's lead almost verbatim.

Among the problems facing modern Iroquois and Huron students is the need for specialists in the field, working in both eastern and western New York, to evaluate this theory of Ridley's. Certainly the "Lalonde" have become a people with flesh and blood reality as seen in some of the

museum displays in Ontario, as well as in Quimby's book (1952). Ridley's views have caused him to be severely critical of what he has called the "MacNeish-Emerson Theory" of Huron origins. This theory stems from the larger work of Ritchie and MacNeish in their study of New York ceramic sequences. It is embodied in MacNeish's publication *Iroquois Pottery Types* (1952). Here, MacNeish, as recommended to us in Dr. Fenton's 1940 article, pursues "the direct historical approach". He works from known historic tribal groups and from villages attributed to them, backwards in time, through the technique of pottery typing and seriation studies, to the point of ultimate emergence and origin - ceramically speaking. This study by MacNeish is not without its gaps, deficiencies and weaknesses, but to date it is the most comprehensive statement of Iroquois origins, including that of the Huron.

My own name has been appended to that of MacNeish by Ridley because of my particular interest in the Huron aspect of the problem. My own views were first expressed in my doctoral thesis and supplemented by additional articles as the issue became controversy in archaeological circles. The MacNeish-Emerson Theory sees the origin of the Huron as the result of a south to north migration as opposed to the north to south theories of Ridley. A recent geographical-historical analysis by Conrad Heidenreich (1971) lends considerable support to the views of MacNeish and myself. However, the problems of Huron origins are by no means solved as yet. There is not time to elaborate upon them within the framework of this paper. However, I am convinced even now, that there is sufficient evidence to indicate that the Hurons are the product of not one, but two, major migrations of peoples leading to a merger of these in late Contact times to form the Huron nation. This second migration refers to the disappearance of the Laurentian Iroquois from the areas of Stadacona and Hochelaga as mentioned by Fenton in the 1940 article. There can be little doubt that some groups moved from the South Nation watershed and the confluence of the Ottawa and St. Lawrence Rivers, to occupy areas of eastern New York and the Mohawk Valley. James Pendergast (1965) has done recent and valuable work on this problem. At the same time, the survey work of Colonel George Laidlaw in Haliburton County (see Garrad 1987:38) and excavation by the University of Toronto at the Benson Village near Bexley (Emerson 1954:206-229, 1958a), convinces me that additional intensive work will document the Trent waterway as a second south to north migration route of Iroquoian peoples who became Huron.

Consideration of initial questions in the light of various theories and hypotheses will, in turn, raise additional questions for Huron scholars. Theories of dual origins for the Hurons lead to the query: is it possible to define an eastern and western division within Huronia itself? Such a division is perceptible and recognizable among the New York Iroquois. We may suspect the same is true for the peoples of Huronia. Such divisions could certainly be related to the moiety or dual organization reported by historians and ethnologists among the New York Iroquois. Dual organization, in turn, would have its ramifications for the clan, tribal, and ultimately for the league or confederacy so characteristic of the New York Iroquois, the people of the Longhouse.

The development of confederacies met with only periodic success among the Hurons. The progress of the missionaries was much greater among the western villages. On the contrary, many of the eastern villages, particularly Cahiagué, remained the staunch defenders of the native religion. Thus, this problem of dual origin, dual organization, and that of east-west division in Huronia, remains as one for fruitful research both by archaeologists and historians.

The question of the ultimate origin of the Iroquois, and of course of the Hurons, is still greater. Frank Ridley, Tom Lee and others, have contributed considerably in this area. The problem revolves essentially around the delineation and origin of such typically Huron cultural features as the Feast of the dead, ossuary burial, the Longhouse dwelling, matrilineal descent and female status, the development of agriculture, and the production of fortified semi-sedentary agricultural villages. In addition, the problem subsumes such aspects as the tracing of the invention of such typically Huron artifacts as exemplified in the pinch faced human effigy pipe and the development of the smoking complex. The most recent work in Ontario upon this problem has been by Walter Kenyon (1958, 1960, 1968) at the Miller Site near Pickering, Ontario, and by James V. Wright (1956) at the Bennett Village Site near Carlisle, Ontario. However, there are both large time gaps to be filled, discrete definitions, such as ossuaries, to be agreed upon, and many more connecting links to be excavated before the picture is complete.

Initially, we asked ourselves whether Huronia had been subjected to the full impact of modern archaeological methods and techniques. Again, the answer is, no. Techniques such as pollen analysis, dendrochronology, carbon 14 analysis, aerial photography and flint patination studies, have never been attempted. The study of blood groups through bone analysis has not been tried. Any comprehensive study of flora, fauna, land use and natural resources is sadly lacking. Our knowledge of comparative vertebrate osteology, so needed to identify bones in refuse middens as a clue to diet, is almost nil. However, our use of pottery typing and seriation studies are a productive approach to the problem of methodology in these circumstances. And, as a possibility for the future, students of Huronia can look forward to the prospect that their work will be aided and abetted by the use of the computer.

In 1940 Dr. Fenton cautioned us, and stressed the need for comparative and analytical studies in the related subdisciplines of linguistics, physical anthropology, archaeology and ethnology. Progress has been made, particularly in the alliance of archaeology and physical anthropology. Here, Dr. James Anderson has provided brilliant leadership and boundless energy in the definition of Iroquoian and non-Iroquoian peoples. Skeletal material from the Fairty ossuary (Anderson 1963b), the Bosomworth Site (Anderson 1962; Emerson 1958b), the Donaldson Site (Anderson 1963a) and others, is bringing the picture into greater clarity. The work of Kenyon and Churcher at Tabor Hill (Churcher 1960; Emerson 1956; Kenyon 1956)), and of Dr. R. I. Harris (Harris 1949; Kidd 1954b) on material from Cahigué, has been most fruitful. A definition of normal Huron populations as well as a wealth of information upon the palaeopathology of these peoples is emerging as a result of cooperation among the related sub-disciplines.

Finally, on the subject of modern archaeological method, I would ask: are the students of Huronia approaching their work with a sense of problem? With the possible exceptions of Dr. Bruce Trigger in particular, and a few others, I would say no. It is my opinion that too many people feel that all of the questions about Huronia are already answered - or will be by 1967. This is largely because the problem is approached in simple historical terms. Huronia, even now, has produced a substantial amount of data. If these data were viewed in the light of hypotheses currently being developed in anthropology, many rewarding papers could result. I will suggest but a few. The study of the fur trade and missionary activity needs to be continued. Settlement patterns have only just begun. The village and the longhouse present fascinating problems related to the study of human relationships and men's use of physical space. The Fischer Hypothesis, suggesting a relationship between art motifs and social organization, could profitably be pursued. Long ago Bertram Kraus (1944) suggested that the Ontario Iroquois would be a fruitful area for the study of prehistoric acculturation. The list could be extended indefinitely, limited only by the creativity and scholarly interest of the student of Huronia.

Our fourth and last question, basic to the production of a synthesis of Huron history and culture, is here but briefly mentioned. It will be agreed that to date, no organized program of publication has been initiated to assist the student of Huronia. The standards of archaeological reporting are largely deficient, highly descriptive, and lack analysis and documentation in most cases. However, very recently the seeds of improvement have been sown. New standards have been set and fulfilled, and closer deadlines for publication prevail.

It was our announced purpose at the outset of this paper to attempt to assess to what degree a new synthesis of Huron history and prehistory had been produced in the last quarter century. It must be concluded that from the aforegone that Dr. Fenton's plea for such a synthesis has largely gone unfulfilled. However, it must also be concluded that Huronia is a rich area for potential research, the surface of which has, both literally and figuratively, barely been scratched.

<><>0<><>

#### LIST OF PUBLICATIONS CITED IN OR RELEVANT TO THE TEXTS

Anderson, James E.

1962 A Pre-Iroquois Burial Site.

Ontario Archaeology 7:39-46, The Ontario Archaeological Society, Toronto.

- 1963a Osteology of the Donaldson Site.  
pp.93-113 (in) The Donaldson Site, by J. V. Wright and J. E. Anderson,  
National Museum of Canada Bulletin 194, Ottawa.
- 1963b The People of the Fairty; an Osteological Analysis of an Iroquois Ossuary.  
National Museum of Canada Bulletin 193, Ottawa.
- Bell, W. Douglas  
1952 Ceramic Analysis of the Graham-Rogers Site, Simcoe County, Ontario.  
ms. Dept. Anthropology, University of Toronto.
- 1953 The MacMurchy Site: A Petun Site in Grey County, Ontario.  
ms. Dept. Anthropology, University of Toronto.
- Channen, E. Ross, and Norman D. Clarke  
1965 The Copeland Site: A Precontact Huron Site in Simcoe County, Ontario.  
Anthropology Papers 8, National Museum of Canada.
- Churcher, Charles S., and Walter A. Kenyon  
1960 The Tabor Hill Ossuaries - a Study in Iroquois Demography.  
(in) Human Biology, xxxii(3)September.
- Cole, Fay-Cooper  
1951 The Kincaid Site.  
University of Chicago Press (includes contribution by J. Norman Emerson, pp.92-113, cited  
by Noble 1979).
- Cooper, R. K.  
1967 Background Material on Indian Village Site (Parsons' Village), Black Creek.  
ms. Historic Sites Division, Metropolitan & Toronto Region Conservation Authority.
- Donaldson, William S.  
1962 Archaeological Research in the Rouge.  
Ontario Archaeology 6:15-21. The Ontario Archaeological Society, Toronto.
- Dewdney, Selwyn  
1957 Quetico Pictographs.  
(n.p. in) New Pages in History 1957, ed. by J. Norman Emerson.
- Emerson, J. Norman  
1949 Preliminary Report on the Excavations of the Kant Site, Renfrew County, Ontario.  
National Museum of Canada Bulletin 113:17-22, Ottawa.
- 1950 The Hardrock site.  
ms., cited by Noble 1979.
- 1954 The Archaeology of the Ontario Iroquois.  
Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago.
- 1955 The Kant Site: A Point Peninsula Manifestation in Renfrew County, Ontario.  
Transaction of the Royal Canadian Institute xxxi(1)24-66.
- 1956 The Village and the Cemetery and Red Ochre and Ritual.  
Archaeological Researches in Ontario 1956, Ontario Historical Society.
- 1957 Before the Flood and The Old Indian Fort Site.  
(n.p. in) New Pages in History 1957, ed. by J. Norman Emerson, Ontario Historical Society.
- 1958a The Benson Site, Victoria County, Ontario.  
ms. Dept. Anthropology, University of Toronto, cited by Noble 1979.
- 1958b Farewell to Ault Park and The Bosomworth Site.  
(n.p. in) New Pages of Prehistory 1958, ed. by J. Norman Emerson,

- The Ontario Archaeological Society.  
1962 Cahiague 1961.  
Ontario History 54(2)134-136, Ontario Historical Society.
- 1966 The Cahiague Excavations, 1966. An interim Report.  
ms. submitted to Dept Northern Affairs and Natural Resources, Canadian Historic Sites  
Division.
- 1968 The importance of the Parson's Village.  
mss. National & Historic Branch, Dept. Indian Affairs, Ottawa.
- Emerson, J. Norman & William Russell  
1965 The Cahiague Village Palisade. A Report to the Archaeological and Historic Sites Board of  
the Province of Ontario.  
ms. Archaeological and Historic Sites Board, Toronto.
- Fenton, William N.  
1940 Problems Arising from the Historic Northeastern Position of the Iroquois.  
(in) Essays in Historical Anthropology of North America, Smithsonian Miscellaneous  
Collections 100:159-252. Washington.
- Garrad, Charles  
1987 The Annual Archaeological Reports of Ontario 1887-1928, A  
Research Guide.  
The Ontario Archaeological Society, Toronto.
- Harris, R. I.  
1949 Osteological Evidence of Disease Amongst the Huron Indians.  
University of Toronto Medical Journal 27(2)71-75.
- Heidenreich, Conrad E.  
1971 Huronia, A History and Geography of the Huron Indians 1600-1650.  
McClelland and Stewart Limited, Toronto.
- Hunter, Andrew F.  
1897 Archaeological Research in the Huron Country.  
JR5:295-298. Discusses Dr. Joseph Charles Taché p.296.  
See also JR10:319 and Taché entry in JR:Index.
- Johnston, Richard B.  
1957 Serpent Mounds Excavation of 1957.  
(no pp., in) New Pages in History 1957, edited by J.N. Emerson.  
1958 The Serpent Mounds Site in 1957.  
Royal Ontario Museum Bulletin of the Division of Art and Archaeology #27:3-7  
(note: also subsequent publications concerning the Serpent Mounds).
- Kenyon, Walter  
1956 A Prehistoric Cemetery.  
Archaeological Researches in Ontario 1956, Ontario Historical Society.  
1958 A Late Woodland Site Near Pickering.  
New Pages in Prehistory 1958, The Ontario Archaeological Society.  
1960 The Miller Site.  
Papers and Records LII(1), Ontario Historical Society.  
1968 The Miller Site.  
Art & Archaeology Occasional Paper 14, Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto.

Kidd, Kenneth E.

- 1949 Some Notes on Historic Huron Pottery from Orr Lake, Ontario.  
Society for American Archaeology at the University of Toronto, Bulletin II.
- 1950 Orr Lake Pottery - A Study of the Ceramics of an Early Historic Huron Site.  
Transactions of the Royal Canadian Institute xxviii, no.59:165-185.
- 1953 The Excavation and Historic Identification of a Huron Ossuary.  
American Antiquity 18(4)359-379.
- 1954a A Woodland Site near Chatham, Ontario.  
Transactions of the Canadian Institute, 30 (part 2)141-178.
- 1954b A Note on the Palaeopathology of Ontario.  
American Journal of Physical Anthropology 12 n.s.(4)1-6.
- 1954c Trade Goods research Technique.  
American Antiquity 20:1-8.
- 1956 A Brief Study of the Human Remains from the Krieger Woodland Site in Southwestern Ontario.  
Pennsylvania Archaeologist xxvi #1:15-26.
- 1956 Serpent Mounds Excavation.  
Ontario History 48:187-188.

Kraus, Bertram S.

- 1944 Acculturation, a New Approach to the Iroquois Problem.  
American Antiquity 9(3).

Lee, Thomas E.

- 1951 A Preliminary Report on an Archaeological Survey of Southwestern Ontario in 1949.  
Bulletin 123:42-48, National Museum of Canada, Ottawa.
- 1952 A Preliminary Report of an Archaeological Survey of Southwestern Ontario for 1950.  
Bulletin 126:64-74, National Museum of Canada, Ottawa.
- 1958 The Parker Earthwork, Corunna, Ontario.  
Pennsylvania Archaeologist 28(1)5-29.
- 1958 Appendix to the Boys and Barrie Sites.  
Ontario Archaeology 4:39-40, The Ontario Archaeological Society, Toronto.
- 1959 An Archaeological Survey of Southwestern Ontario and Manitoulin Island.  
Pennsylvania Archaeologist 29:80-92.
- 1960 The Lucas Site, Inverhuron, Ontario.  
Bulletin 167:29-65, National Museum of Canada, Ottawa.
- 1963 The Glen Meyer Aspect.  
Anthropological Journal of Canada 1(3)27-28.

MacNeish, Richard S.

- 1952 Iroquois Pottery Types.  
National Museum of Canada Bulletin 124, Ottawa.

McIlwraith, Thomas F.

- 1946 Archaeological Work in Huronia, 1946: excavations near Warminster.  
Canadian Historical Review xxvii(4), Toronto.
- 1947 On the Location of Cahigué.  
Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada, 3rd series(2)41:99-102, Ottawa.
- 1949 Excavations at Bass Lake, Simcoe County, 1948: A Preliminary Report.  
ms. Dept. Anthropology, University of Toronto.
- 1957 The Puckasaw Pit Culture.  
(n.p. in) New Pages in History 1957, ed. by J. N. Emerson.

Noble, William C.

1979 Obituary: John Norman Emerson (1917-1978).  
Canadian Journal of Archaeology (3)240-244.

Pendergast, James F.

1965 Other Ideas on 'The Ontario Iroquois Controversy'.  
Ontario Archaeology 8:39-44, The Ontario Archaeological Society, Toronto.

Popham, Robert E.

1950 Late Huron Occupations of Ontario: an Archaeological Survey of Innisfil Township.  
Ontario History 42:81-90.

1952 Comments On "The Huron and Lalonde Occupations of Ontario".  
American Antiquity 18(2)162-164.

Quimby, George I.

1952 The Archeology of the Upper Great Lakes Area.  
(pp. 99-102 in) Archaeology of Eastern United States, James B. Griffin ed.,  
University of Chicago Press.

Ridley, Frank

1947 The Search for Ossossane and its Environs.  
Ontario History 39:7-14.

1952 Huron and Lalonde Occupations of Ontario.  
American Antiquity 17(3)197-210.

1954 The Frank Bay Site, Lake Nipissing, Ontario.  
American Antiquity 20(1)40-50.

1958 The Boys and Barrie Sites.  
Ontario Archaeology 4:18-42, The Ontario Archaeological Society, Toronto.

Spence, Michael W. & J. Russell Harper

1968 The Cameron's Point Site.  
Art & Archaeology Occasional Paper 12, Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto.

Sweetman, Paul

1955 A Preliminary Report on the Peterborough Petroglyphs.  
Ontario History xlvii(3)101-121, Ontario Historical Society, Toronto.

Tooker, Elisabeth

1964 An Ethnography of the Huron Indians 1615-1649.  
Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology,  
Bulletin 190, Washington, .D.C.

Trigger, Bruce G.

1960 The Destruction of Huronia: A Study in Economic and Cultural  
Change, 1609-1650.  
Transactions of the Royal Canadian Institute 33(1)14-45, Ottawa.  
1962 The Historic Location of the Hurons.  
Ontario History 54(2)137-148, Ontario Historical Society, Toronto.

Wintemberg, William J.

1928 Uren Prehistoric Village Site.  
National Museum of Canada Bulletin 51, Ottawa.  
1936 The Roebuck Prehistoric Village Site, Grenville County, Ontario.  
National Museum of Canada Bulletin 83, Ottawa.

1939 Lawson Prehistoric Village Site, Middlesex County, Ontario.

National Museum of Canada Bulletin 94, Ottawa.

1946 The Sidey-Mackay Village Site.

American Antiquity 11(3)154-182.

1948 The Middleport Prehistoric Village Site.

National Museum of Canada Bulletin 94, Ottawa.

Wright, James V.

1960 The Middleport Horizon.

Anthropologica n.s. II(1)113-117.

Wright, James V. & Robert C. Dailey

1956 The Malcolm Site: A Late Stage of the Middle Point Peninsula

Culture in Eastern Ontario.

Transactions of the Royal Canadian Institute, xxxi (64,65)(parts I & II):3-23.

<><>0<><>

#### ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES MENTIONED IN THE TEXTS

Arctic	10	Kincaid	10
Ault Park	7, 8, 10	Krieger	5, 10
Aurora	3, 4, 6, 9	Lawson	7
Barker (see Seed-Barker),		Lucas (not named)	9
Barrie	9	MacMurchy	7, 9, 12
Balsam Lake (see Hardrock)		Malcolm	7, 10
Bass Lake (see Sopher)		McKenzie (Woodbridge)	3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9
Bennett	14	Middleport	7, 8
Benson	1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13	Miller	14
Black Creek	3, 5, 6, 7, 9	Millroy	7, 9, 10
Bosomworth	14		
Cahiagué	4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14		
Cockshutt Estate (see Downsview)			
Copeland	12		
Corunna	8		
Donaldson	9, 14		
Downsview	3, 6, 7, 9		
Fairty	14		
Flanagan	12		
Forget	12		
Frank Bay	9, 13		
Goessens (not named)	5		
Graham-Rogers	7, 9		
Hardrock	3, 6, 9		
Indian Point (see Hardrock)			
Kant	4, 7, 9		

Murphy (see Aurora)		Seed-Barker	6, 8, 9
Ossossane, Ossossané	4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 12	Serpent Mounds	8, 9, 10
Parsons	7, 9	Shebishekong	7, 10
Peterborough Petroglyphs	7, 10	Sidey-Mackay	2, 6, 9, 12
Puckasaw Pit	10	Sopher	5, 9, 10, 12
Quackenbush	8, 10	Tabor Hill	14
Reesor	7, 10	Thompson	9
Rice Lake (see Serpent Mounds)		Tillsonburg	9
Robb	9	Uren	9
Roebuck	2, 4, 6, 7, 9	Washburn Island	6, 10
St. Ignace	12	Webb	9
St. Marie I	12	Woodbridge (see McKenzie)	
Scarborough	10		

SCHOLARS MENTIONED IN THE TEXTS  
(in addition to those in the List of References)

BOYLE, David	3	
COLE, Fay-Cooper		10, 11
DEVEREUX, Helen		1, 8
EMERSON, J. Norman		1
GARRAD, Charles		1
HUNTER, Andrew F.		3, 12
KIDD, Kenneth E.		4
LAIDLAW, George E.	3, 12	
LEE, Thomas E.		3, 14
MacNEISH, Richard S.		11
McIlWRAITH, Thomas F.		10
REED, Patricia		1
RIDLEY, Frank		9, 14
RITCHIE, William A.		11
SINCLAIR, John M.		3
TACHÉ, Joseph C.		13

SELECTED TOPICS MENTIONED IN THE TEXTS

Archaeological and Historic Sites Board (Ontario)	110, 11	
Bella Coola		10
Canada Council		11
Chicago, University of		10
Education, Ontario Department of		3, 11
Fischer Hypothesis		14
Fort Ancient		
		6petBayviuew Walk-in Clinic
Fur Trade		12, 14
Glen Meyer Aspect/Focus		5
Guggenheim Award		6
Huron, Hurons		

2,  
3,  
4,  
5,  
6,  
7,  
9,  
11,  
12,  
13,  
14

Huronia

3,  
5, 6, 9, 11,  
12, 13, 14

“In Situ Theory”

11

Iroquois, Iroquoian, League of

9, 12, 13, 14,15

2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8,

“Iroquois Pottery Types”

5, 13

Lalonde Culture

6,

8, 9, 13

Laurentian Iroquois

13

MacNeish-Emerson Theory

13

Michigan, University of

5

Middleport Horizon

9,

12

Mississippian

13

Mohawk/Onondaga

2

National Museum (of Canada)

2, 3, 5, 8, 12

Neutrals

5, 6, 7, 9, 12

Ontario Archaeological Reports

3

Ontario Archaeological Society, The

1, 2, 3, 6,, 7, 8

Ontario Field Naturalists

12

Owasco

5

Petun, Petuns

2,

3, 7, 9, 12

Petun Research Institute

1

Plains

13

Point Peninsula

4,

5, 7, 8

Roebuck Culture

7, 9

Royal Ontario Museum

3, 4, 5, 6,

Toronto, University of,  
Committee on the Humanities and Social Sciences 11  
Department of Anthropology  
Faculty of Medicine

8, 10

1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10  
4

<><>0<><>