Vol. I No. 3

BULLETIN

OF

The Archaeological Society

OF

Delaware

March 1934

Frank Martine Heal, Editor

THE BULLETIN

OF

THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF DELAWARE

APRIL 1934

Contents

Frank Martine Heal, Editor

PROBLEMS IN THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF THE DELMARVA PENINSULA

By D. S. Davidson

The Delmarva peninsula, comprising the Eastern Shore of Virginia and Maryland and the greater part of the State of Delaware, can be considered, prehistorically speaking, as terra incognita. As for most areas settled at an early time by the European colonists, lettered or unlettered, our knowledge of the aboriginal inhabitants is woefully meager, in spite of the many opportunities for direct observation which prevailed. The documentary evidence contained in the accounts of a few interested individuals is indeed so fragmentary that were it not possible by analogy to draw upon the also incomplete records of the related and culturally similar neighboring tribes, not even a partial description of the outstanding features of local Indian culture would be possible.

It is almost too late to add to this small store of ethnological information. Descendants of the Nanticokes from whom even now it is possible to secure some additional data are still found in Canada and in Oklahoma and remnant groups still exist in the peninsula itself. Their numbers are few, however, and in another few years when the present old folks are gone, the last opportunity for fortifying our scanty knowledge from living informants will have passed.

In respect to our archaeological knowledge of the peninsula even less information is available. Practically no excavations have been made and the little material we have is insufficient to warrant at this time the formulating of other than the basic problems of the region. Even the large museums contain but a few stone objects and pottery sherds from this area, although not an inconsiderable amount of similar material is in the hands of local amateur collectors. These specimens, however, are of little direct importance to the fundamental archaeological problems which must be solved before we can lay claim to much knowledge of the area, although they are of interest in themselves and serve to illustrate the complex nature of the cultural matrix of the peninsula. For the most part the collected objects represent surface finds and, in many cases, have been detached by natural or human agencies from a historical setting in association with which they were parts of an observable and readable paragraph in the story of aboriginal occupation. Removed from such a context by the plow or by erosion such objects or fragmentary pieces may be likened to pied type,--we can still ascertain the size and style of type and can separate the capitals from the small letters, but we cannot fit the individuals pieces into their word and sentence structures.

Except in the more generalized problems of distribution and diffusion surface finds are thus of little direct importance in any attempt to determine the sequence of cultures and the peculiarities of each, for on the surface it is possible to find specimens from all the different prehistoric levels side by side with discarded razor blades, pieces of coal or other objects of post-columbian age. It is only after the proper temporal relationships between the various types of objects have been determined by careful excavation, that the surface finds can be separated into their proper cultural settings. The determination of the chronology of culture elements in any area is one of the basic considerations of archaeology.

The lack of an abundance of carefully excavated material, however, should not be considered as an unfortunate condition for the Delmarva peninsula. As a matter of fact it may be just the opposite, for with archaeological studies of this region just beginning it should be possible by proper planning and a close cooperation of interested parties to achieve a more direct success with a minimum expenditure of time and effort than has been obtained, relatively speaking, in many other places in the world where activities with no centralized planning have been going on intermittantly over a period of years. It is also fortunate in many ways that efforts in the peninsula have been delayed until the present time, for it is now possible to conduct research with a knowledge of the already formulated general problems of the eastern part of the continent, arrived at only after many years of groping study by a number of students in many areas. With such a background for the Eastern United States it is to be hoped that progress in the understanding of problems local to the Delmarva peninsula will be more rapid than otherwise could be expected if nothing were known from adjacent regions.

The science which today we term Archaeology is no longer concerned with the mere collection of artifacts, but has as its foremost purpose the reconstruction insofar as the evidence warrants, of the story of life as it was lived by successive groups of prehistoric or preliterate peoples through the interpretation of the materials purposely or inadvertently left by them in the ground. Although the more obvious remains, and the ones generally represented in collections, such as manufactured weapons and tools of non-perishable materials, are of interest in themselves as evidence of the handwork of so-called primitive man, the data which tells a more complete and a much more human story are the unpretentious facts secured only by painstaking and tedious excavation. Arrowheads and pot sherds, the more common remains, must therefore be considered as not the most valuable clues to the reconstruction of the story of aboriginal life, although as the result of their durability it is often convenient to consider them as type specimens of established cultural levels. Of equal if not greater significance are the facts from the refuse pits, such as bits of charred food, the bones of animals and fish, shells from seafood, ornaments;

information such as floor types of houses, methods of burial and the skeletal types associated with them; and a host of other evidences which can be secured by an exacting methodology of excavation and by a careful observation of every clue which may contribute to the story. It is only after the less perishable objects usually encountered in surface collecting have been found to have specific associations and correlations with groups of other traits not represented on the exposed surface, that they may assume their prime importance as indicators of different cultures or of different culture levels.

The determination of chronology is one of the most perplexing problems in the archaeology of Eastern United States. Very few sites showing actual stratification have been found although they are not uncommon in certain other parts of the country, particularly the Southwest. Nor has it been possible to make much use of geological and paleontological evidence as has been done in the Old World where human or industrial remains are found in various Pleistocene levels and can be given relative dates by glacial evidence or by the presence of those remains of extinct biota which are definitely associated with certain geological periods. In the New World we have as yet no authentic evidence to prove that man has lived here prior to the last Glacial period and, with some important exceptions there seem to have been few changes in animal types since that time. For the East, therefore, it has been necessary, to resort to other methods of determining chronology, efforts which are meeting with considerable success and which, in many ways, hold great promise of eventual satisfaction.

One of the most important sources of information has been the historical records which indicate the particular tribes which occupied known sites at the time of the arrival of Europeans. As a starting point it has been possible, therefore, to associate certain types of cultural and skeletal remains with definite tribal groups, and by archaeological investigation, fortified by native traditions of movements, to trace out in part some of the late prehistoric changes in native population. For instance it is generally recognized that Iroquoian speaking peoples are of southern derivation and that they invaded New York State and adjacent regions several hundred years before the arrival of European colonists. Since certain types of artifacts are associated with Iroquoian occupations it is possible to date all sites which contain these objects as relatively recent. Different forms and different kinds of objects, however, are also found in pre-Iroquoian sites in the same general region and these have been observed to be similar to artifacts contained in historic Algonkian sites of other areas. It thus has been possible to indicate a chronological relationship between what we term Iroquian and Algonkian cultures. This is stating the matter naively of course, for as is well known each of these cultures is characterized by variations which in certain areas

can be also shown to have chronological relationship. What may have preceeded the lowest Algonkian we have no way of telling at present. This crude culture may have been the first in Eastern North America. It may be said, however, that the whole question of the antiquity of argillite "culture" has never been satisfactorily explained and that peoples other than early Algonkians, but with a similar crude hunting culture, may have preceeded the latter in the East.

Many of the differences in the various "levels" of culture in the Northeast are undoubtedly the result of local developments. For a considerable period of time, however, just how long it is, of course, impossible to indicate in years, but antedating the Iroquoian migration but a great period of time, there seems to have been a constant drift of traits, especially those concerned with agriculture and sedendary industries, from the South. This movement on the whole appears to have been independent of tribal migration. At the present time very little can be said of the chronological aspects involved, except for New York State where they have received considerable attention. For the Atlantic Seaboard and the Southern States our knowledge is still too fragmentary to warrant more than the stating of the problem. It seems obvious, however, that sites containing these traits must be of greater antiquity in the South than in the North, and it is to be hoped that some day it will be possible to demonstrate the relative time periods of this long continued diffusion for the different districts of the whole eastern area. We may be certain, however, that solutions will not be arrived at easily but that many years of patient inquiry will be required.

The main conditions of a discouraging nature which hinder an understanding of the prehistory of the Atlantic Seaboard are primarily climateological ones. If only a part of this region were semi-arid our hopes could be much higher, but in an area where moist conditions, as the result of an abundant rainfall, are not conducive to the preservation in the ground of objects other than those of stone, bone and shell, and a few charred fragments of other materials, we are denied the privilege of ever knowing much, if anything, about clothing, netting, wooden objects, and the like. These conditions again emphasize the necessity for such careful work in all efforts to reconstruct the past, that no shred of evidence, no matter how insignificant it may appear, will be overlooked. These remarks apply to the entire East, in which the basic problems are closely interrelated, as well as to individual areas where local conditions may add to the difficulties of acquiring satisfactory information.

In the Delmarva peninsula the fundamental archaeological problems are primarily those of the Northeast and of the Central Atlantic States. In this respect the peninsula itself does not warrant the distinction of being considered a major archaeological area. Situated to one side of the beaten roads of culture diffusion on the mainland, in pre-columbian times as today, we may suspect that it has either escaped many of the complicating influences of the nearby areas, or will be found to exhibit them in less intense form. In such a way it may be likened to southern New Jersey and eastern Long Island. Such a condition, in contrast to what

one might at first glance suppose, may eventually be found to add considerably to the importance of this area, for it may be possible by an analysis of the more simple appearances in the peninsula to shed some light upon the complicated related problems of the mainland.

Tentatively we may speak of the Delmarva peninsula as an archaeological unit. This does not necessarily mean that we will find uniformity throughout the region but that fundamentally we are treating with similar ecological conditions and that the differences in culture traits are probably of a minor nature. At the time of the coming of Europeans, for instance, the peninsula was found to be occupied by three tribes, all members of the great Algonkian linguistic stock, one of the most widespread and important in North America. The Nanticokes inhabited practically all of the area approximately as far south as the southern Maryland border. Here the boundaries of the small Accohanoc tribe commenced. In the southermost part of the peninsula another tribe, known as the Accomac, also of minor importance, was found. In spite of the fact that all three were closely related linguistically and insofar as we know in other respects as well, the Accohanoc and Accomac were politically allied with the Algonkian speaking tribes of the Powhatan confederacy west of the Chesapeake and possibly represent a relatively recent movement across the Bay. In such a case there may be some minor archaeological difference between them and the Nanticoke, although fundamentally it would seem likely that they are not dissimilar. As a matter of fact, the culture of the three may have been so similar in material traits, with differences found only in social and political organization, that the evidence which archaeology may bring to light may not indicate the contrasts which may have existed.

At the moment we have no information to indicate that these tribes were the first human beings to occupy the area. It would not seem unlikely that other groups, probably also speaking Algonkian languages, may have predeeded them, for the area undoubtedly has been inhabited for a great period of time during which we may suspect that political units underwent considerable change. The most we can hope to determine is whether the racial type has been more or less constant and whether there have been any abrupt culture changes in the past.

Although the Iroquois never occupied any part of the peninsula their influences, at least in the northern part, seem to have been considerable. At least we find numbers of objects of typical Iroquoian type and form. It must not be supposed that all of these objects have resulted from the visits by the Iroquois, or have emanated from Iroquoian centers to be brought to the peninsula as trade goods. Diffusion often, if not usually, involves merely the borrowing of concepts and techniques which subsequently are applied locally. Perhaps the most outstanding Iroquoian trait which can be noticed in any good-sized collection from the peninsula, is the triangular arrowhead. Tanged arro heads, on the

other hand, are distinctly Algonkian. There are also many differences in pottery forms and decorations which are not difficult to distinguish, as well as exclusive types of other objects associated with one culture or the other, which requires too involved a discussion to warrant consideration at this time.

In addition to these relatively recent Iroquoian influences historic peninsular culture contained many traits of southern derivation, many of which may have arrived at a time contemporary with Iroquoian influence, although the bulk of them undoubtedly were much earlier. If there has always been contact across the lower Chesapeake certain traits may have reached the lower end of the peninsula first, whereas others may have traveled overland around the Bay. However, since most of the southern influences seem to be very old, and as a result of this antiquity, are commonly distributed throughout a large part of the East, it will probably be a most difficult if not an impossible matter to arrive at any definite conclusions as to local routes of diffusion.

Chronologically earlier than the periods of these northern and southern influences we should expect to find what has been generally termed "early" or "archaic" Algonkian, a crude, non-agricultural, hunting culture. Whether it will be possible to find actually stratified remains of any or all of these periods of culture, remains to be seen. Tentatively, however, it would seem convenient to list the various types of sites which we may hope to find and which, judging from our knowledge of adjacent areas, should fall into the following generalized types:

Most Recent - Late Algonkian basic culture with objects of Iroquoian type and European trade goods.

Recent - Late Algonkian basic culture with Iroquoian traits but with no European objects.

Early - Basic Algonkian culture containing early southern agriculture and ceramic influences.

Archaic - Early non-agricultural, non-ceramic, hunting Algonkian culture.

It must not be supposed that it will be an easy matter to distinguish these different cultural levels. As a matter of fact, as we have already indicated, the kind of material which we can hope to retrieve from an area of extremely moist conditions, and one practically all of which has been repeatedly plowed, may be so disturbed as well as so fragmentary in character that it will not warrant the drawing of definite distinctions except possibly in a very few instances. The above general classification, however, should be kept in mind with the hope that the evidence in the ground will substantiate it in a general way and possibly permit even further subdivisions.

Archaeological research in the Delmarva peninsula involves a number of local difficulties, lacking on the mainland, in addition to those enumerated for the East as a whole. In the first place the peninsula is devoid of caves and rock-shelters

which, in being relatively dry, serve to protect artifacts from disintegration as the result of natural agencies but which also, in not being suited to agriculture, save the deposits from destruction by the plow. Rock shelters have furnished important data in other areas.

One of the most interesting peculiarities of the peninsula, however, and a condition which is of major importance archaeologically, is the general lack of indigenous stone. Since, broadly speaking, most of the stone present in a large part of the peninsula is in the form of artifacts, we can well imagine the premium which the Indian placed upon this commodity and upon the weapons and tools made from it. In spite of the scarsity of raw stone, stone artifacts appear to have been quite abundant, indeed, much more so than one might expect under the circumstances. It seems hardly necessary to state that as the result of this general lack of stone the specimens made from this material must represent either importations of the objects themselves or of the raw material from which they were made. That many weapons, such as arrow and spear heads, were made locally would seem to be indicated by the presence of chips in some sites. It would seem quite likely, however, that many specimens, probably the larger ones such as pestles and axes, were made in other localities and introduced by trade. A most interesting and important research study awaits one who will attempt to trace the types of stone found in Delmarvan artifacts to their places of origin. It should not be difficult to determine the nearest places where outcroppings occur for there undoubtedly are many sources for the more common types. Some of the stone, however, may exhibit such unusual peculiarities in its grain or other characteristics that it may be possible to identify the very region from which it had been taken. All in all such a study would contribute important data to our knowledge of intertribal trade in primitive communities.

Another peculiarity of the local region was the custom of scraping the bones of the dead, especially of important chiefs, and the placing of them in baskets or other containers. Until a considerable number of sites have been excavated it will be impossible to determine how important this custom was or how long it had been practiced in the area. In spite of the care with which these bones were undoubtedly handled we may expect that it will be much more difficult to obtain information by archaeology about this manner of disposal of the dead than in those instances where there is direct interment of the body.

In a very brief way the foregoing account introduces some of the more obvious problems of a general nature which are concerned with any attempt to reconstruct the prehistory of the prehistory of the Delmarva peninsula. As in all areas where the remains are meager, success and understanding will be achieved only by means of a most careful scrutiny of every fact obtainable.

It is too much, perhaps, to hope that it will be possible to more than partially solve many of the problems indicated. However we have the advantage of at least knowing what many of our goals are. If it should be found impossible to reach them let us hope that the failure may be the result of an inability to secure adequate information and not the result of hasty and destructive efforts, careless observation or a lack of a scientific method of excavation.

THE AMATEUR'S OPPORTUNITY

By Arthur C. Parker
President, New York State Archeological Association

The amateur archaeologist has an important function in the unearthing of the pre-history of the new world. Much depends upon the amateur; much depends upon what he does and upon what he refrains from doing. One is as important as the other.

Before the collector may call himself an archaeologist even in the amateur sense he must understand the scientific objective of his collecting activities. There is nothing complex or abstruse about understanding this for it is simply revealed. It is this: The objective of archaeology is to so examine the evidences of past cultures that it is possible to evaluate and revizualize them in the present.

Let us take the oft-used simile of a book. The past is written in the soil by the relics of past generations. From these artifacts we are able to arrive at a knowledge of the abilities, the ingenuity, the mental attitudes, and the artistic sense of people no longer existing. In other words our aim is to read the whole story in the earth-leaved book of archaeology. We can only do this by getting every vistage of material that remains for interpretation. It will not do to make selections or to ignore things that cannot easily be displayed upon the shelves of a cabinet. It will not do to ignore the bones of the aborigines as forming no part of the picture. Everything must be saved. It must be saved and kept together and not separated until expertly examined and recorded. Thus one only performs a part of his duty in collecting arrowheads, pottery or polished stone implements, to the exclusion of rougher objects. The collector may do this but archaeologist, amateur or professional, never. There is a fundamental difference between the two in the method of approach. The collector merely wants to accumulate the things that strike his fancy or satisfy his aquisitiveness. The archaeologist first desires to restore the lost culture in all its details for the purpose of making it live again in present-day understanding, and to

accomplish this end he gathers all the material that he can discover in original sources. Then he makes his interpretation.

These facts are held essential by every field archaeologist amateur or otherwise. He selects a site and makes a complete examination, procuring not only the skeletons and the objects but making detailed photographs and sketches of pits, graves and objects of importance in their relative positions, in situ. More than this, he makes a record in his field book on the spot. He will not remove an important or significant specimen until it is photographed, diagramed and described in his field book. His work is done as conscienciously as that of a surgeon operating upon a patient, and his notes will be as meticulous.

If the amateur will take heed of these suggestions, he may add much to the work of discovering pre-historic America. By taking proper precaution he will be able to aid the professional scientist and receive the hearty thanks of every institution engaged in the difficult task of saving the fragments that remain. It must be remembered that most professional archaeologists who have risen to recognition began their careers as amateurs. By the application of correct principles to their opportunities they have achieved their success, while the many who merely remained collectors have not only added little to knowledge but actually destroyed valuable facts that can never be recovered.

The moral is simply this: Get the facts and the collection will take care of itself in a handsome way.

(The following article was found by Miss Anna T. Lincoln, Curator of the collection of the Delaware Historical Society in the Old Town Hall, in an old copy of The Every Evening, September 27, 1883.) Editor.

DELAWARE'S STONE AGE
DELAWARE AS A RIVAL TO MYCENAE FOR ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH
RECENT DISCOVERY OF CORN CRUSHING MILLS OF STONE

(Special correspondent of the New York Evening Telegram)

Felton, Del. September 25.-For the last five years a scientific examination of the archaeological remains of Delaware has been conducted by Francis Jordan, Jr., of the Antiquarian Society of Philadelphia, and these investigations have resulted in discoveries of much value to the observer interested in this branch of scientific research. In conversation with Mr. Jordon to-day your correspondent learned that the remains of an ancient Indian town at Rehoboth, four miles south of Cape Henlopen, have already been discovered, and recently careful examinations have been made of the artificial shell deposits at Long Neck Branch, and of the extensive mounds that occur on the sand flats in front of Lewes. Southern Delaware possessed unusual attractions for the Indians on account of its proximity to the oyster beds and fishing grounds of the lower bay, and the vast accumulations of kitchen debris that have been found on its shores furnish strong evidence

that for centuries a multitude of people annually visited the locality. Eligible sites on the little bays and inlets were selected for their temporary villages and occupied during the months succeeding the planting season. The remarkable deposits on Lewes and Long Neck Branch are two miles apart and separated by a fine forest, and, although they have an identical antiquity, their condition is very different. Long Neck Branch is a narrow strip of land a mile and a half west of Cape Henlopen, which a century ago projected into an inlet from the sea, where now only an immense salt meadow exists. The shell hills occupy this neck of land on an elevation that was then above high water mark and traverse its entire length, which extends half a mile from east to west and is 500 feet wide at its base.

A large part of the deposit is covered with a grove of pine trees, which have grown up since the spot was deserted, and among them a number whose cortical rings denote an age of over 200 years. If any other evidence were needed, this would establish the prehistoric character of the mounds. The trees and undergrowth have contributed to their preservation, and where the roots have arrested disintegration, the composition of these accumulations can be studied as accurately as if their abandonment had been a recent event. They consist of hard-shell clam, oyster, and conch shells and the broken bones of animals, and a marked feature is the abundance of charcoal and cracked and calcined stone. These cinders and stones are the remnants of aboriginal fireplaces. Fragments of earthenware of extraordinary size were found among the charcoal, and whenever excavations were made the yield of pottery was large and the shells in a more perfect condition than generally occurs. A short distance from the hills, on the surface of the sand, or directly underlying it, were found several hundred specimens of stone implements, comprising axes, hammer-stones, celts, finished and unfinished arrow heads, and a number of perforated ornaments-many of them rare to archaeologists. Evidence of a trail through glades, and connecting the encampment with a pond of fresh water, from which the Indians obtained an unlimited supply are plainly visible.

The mounds at Lewes are more extensive than at Long Neck Branch, but less interesting, because they have lost much of their original form. When the Swedes landed on the spot where Lewes now stands this shell deposit lined the banks of an estuary that entered from the bay, and the bed of this dried-up stream may still be traced. A very large number of stone implements were also found together with two pipes of unique design, several ornamental tubes and two portable stone corn mills - one weighing over 100 pounds, and containing in one of its con-cavities the grinding stone, probably just as the Indian women had left it. Thirty years ago Lewes shell heap was 15 to 20 feet high, and dazzling whiteness of the bleached shells made them a conspicuous object far at sea, but now they have an altitude that will hardly measure as many inches. The great factor in this work of demolition has been utilitarian man, by whom tons of decomposed shells have been carted away and their valuable phosphate used for fertilizing purposes,

and the elements are gradually obliterating what remains. Mr. Jordan is at present compiling a work in which he will give the result of his labors in Delaware during the past summer and part of which will appear in a forthcoming publication by the Smithsonian Institution.

Eastern States Archaeological Federation
Minutes of the Executive
Committee Meeting, February 17, 1934.

The Executive Committee of the Northeastern States Conference of Archaeological Societies met at the University of Pennsylvania Museum, Philadelphia, at eleven o'clock, February 17, 1934. Col. Leigh M. Pearsall, President of the New Jersey Society presided and the following representatives were present: Dr. Arthur Parker, Rochester, N. Y.; Vincent J. Schaefer, Schenectady, N. Y.; Miss Frances Dorrance, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; Dr. J. Alden Mason, Philadelphia, Pa.; J. W. Murray, Athens, Pa.; Lewis J. Duncan, Harrisburg, Pa.; H. Geiger Omwake, Hockessin, Delaware; Ralph E. Beers, Laurel, Delaware; Dr. Cornelius Osgood, New Haven, Conn.; Douglas Rights, Winston-Salem, N.C.; A. Crozier, Kennett Square, Pa.; and Mrs. Kathryn B. Greywacz, Trenton, N. J.

The Chairman stated the purpose of the meeting was to prepare, for presentation at the afternoon meeting, plans for a permanent interstate organization, including a name, officers and committees, and a program of work; and he appointed the following Executive Organization Committee to make the report at the afternoon session: Mr. Cadzow, chairman, Dr. Parker and Mr. Philhower. The Chairman then asked for suggestions for a suitable name. After a discussion it was voted to submit the name "Eastern States Archaeological Federation."

Mr. Glenn A. Black of Indianapolis was called to the meeting to tell about the set-up of the Central Section States.

After a discussion as to the officers needed for the Federation, Dr. Parker was appointed chairman of a Nominating Committee including the president or next representative of each state society. This Committee was requested to present a ticket at the afternoon conference.

The meeting then adjourned.

Minutes of the Eastern States Archaeological Federation Meeting,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, February 17, 1934.

The second meeting of Northeastern States Conference of Archaeological Societies was held at the University of Pennsylvania Museum, Philadelphia, on Saturday afternoon, February 17, 1934 at two-thirty o'clock. Sixty-four representatives were present.

Col. Leigh M. Pearsall, President of the Archaeological Society of New Jersey, called the meeting to order and introduced Horace H. F. Jayne, Director of the University of Pennsylvania Museum, who expressed a cordial welcome and assured the conference of the whole-hearted cooperation of the Museum.

Donald A. Cadzow, as chairman of the Executive Organization Committee presented a brief report of the morning meeting and moved that the conference organize permanently under the name of "The Eastern States Archaeological Federation" with its purpose - "to promote more scientific study of aboriginal remains and to provide means for inter-state cooperation." The motion was carried.

Charles Philhower was appointed temporary chairman of the meeting, immediately after which he called for the report of the Nominating Committee. Dr. Parker then submitted the following slate of officers:

PRESIDENT - Col. Leigh M. Pearsall, Westfield, N. J.

VICE PRESIDENTS -
New York - Charles F. Goddard, New York City
Pennsylvania - Frederick A. Godcharles, Milton, Pa.
Delaware - H. Geiger Omwake, Hockessin, Delaware
New Jersey - Charles A. Philhower, Westfield, N. J.
North Carolina - Douglas L. Rights, Winston-Salem, N. C.
Connecticut - Dr. Cornelius Osgood, New Haven, Conn.
Maryland - Frank A. Woodfield, Baltimore, Maryland.

RECORDING SECRETARY - Miss Frances Dorrance, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

CORRESPONDING SECRETARY - Mrs. Kathryn B. Greywacz, Trenton, N. J.

TREASURER - J. Havard MacPherson, Trenton, N. J.

By a unanimous vote, Colonel Pearsall was elected President of the Federation and was asked to take the chair. It was then voted that the rest of the ticket be elected as a whole and that the Secretary cast the ballot. This was done.

The President then announced the following conference committee chairmen:

Research - Dr. Arthur C. Parker
Editorial - Charles A. Philhower
Public Education - Donald A. Cadzow and J. Alden Mason
Exhibits - Vincent Schaeffer

It was suggested that the President appoint a committee to consider By-Laws.

The minutes of the Trenton conference held May 27, 1933 were read and approved.

Dr. Arthur C. Parker, Director, Rochester Museum of Arts and Sciences presented an excellent paper on "Some Primary Considerations in the Determination of Aboriginal Cultures.". This paper will be published in full in the Pennsylvania Archaeologist, copies of which may be secured from Miss Frances Dorrance, President of the Society for Pennsylvania Archaeology, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

Dr. D. S. Davidson, Dept. of Anthropology, University of Pennsylvania discussed the Problems of Archaeological Research in the Delmarva Peninsula.

> The Delmarva Peninsula includes Delaware, Maryland and Virginia. The University of Pennsylvania plans to make a survey there in the near future. The area has been neglected and is quite inaccessible. From a preliminary survey, Dr. Davidson found the Iroquois did not occupy the Peninsula. Their influence extended to certain areas but he does not yet know the importance or extent of that influence. Three tribes are represented in stone implements and pottery found but the typical types of them are not known yet. The area is void of rockshelters; has open sites; its moist, low areas are not conducive to retention of wood and bone objects. No definite plans are made for survey at present since arrangements are difficult due to three states being involved. He hopes for funds to start work next summer.

Miss Mary Butler, of the University of Pennsylvania, gave some general information concerning the cooperation of the C.W.A. and T.V.A. government projects with archaeologists, and also told of the proposed archaeological survey of Delaware County under C.W.A. grant. Mr. Cadzow announced that the Pennsylvania Historical Commission had applied for C.W.A. funds for a State-wide survey, and he suggested that other states do the same. New Jersey reported that they would make application for funds.

Representatives from the various societies presented reports of recent research and plans for future work, as follows:-

Delaware - H. Geiger Omwake stated that very little had been done in their state because of necessary economies. Since they have no State Museum they plan to ask for a place to exhibit at the State University at Newark. They also will cooperate with Dr. Davidson in his work.

North Carolina - Douglas L. Rights reported that the North Carolina Society had only organized last year but that they wished to thank the eastern societies for helping them. The society is making a survey of sites of Indian mounds and villages. It also hopes to do field excavating and research, form a museum and to classify artifacts.

Connecticut - Dr. Cornelius Osgood, expressed the willingness of Yale University to cooperate with the work of the Federation. He stated that Connecticut was in general very poor in archaeological material but that three years ago the Peabody Museum started a paper survey of the State through which it located quite a number of sites and collections. They hope to continue the survey and record work of individual amateur archaeologists, and to help in organizaing them.

Pennsylvania - Miss Frances Dorrance reported that not much field work had been done but that interesting meetings had been held and publications issued. A letter had been received from Somerset County saying that they were starting a survey; and that Gettysburg was also planning work in Adams County. Miss Dorrance told about a summer meeting at Athens to inspect excavations there; and she called attention to the various archaeological publications on display. She stated that their plans for the future were to develop chapters and to have each county represented in the membership.

MARYLAND - Frank Woodfield reported that he would have to deal in futures. As Director of the Maryland Academy of Sciences, he is especially interested in the survey of Indian sites which are fast being spoiled. He said that Maryland is organizing a group of interested people and that they hoped to announce soon the formation of a Society.

New York - Dr. Parker reported that the general office or mother chapter of the New York Archaeological Society is in Rochester, with a membership of nearly 400 and that throughout the State are other chapters which report annually to the general New York Society.

Vincent Schaefer told about the excellent work being done by the Van Epps-Hartley Chapter and of their systematic classification of sites and finds. His stimulating report, of the careful but extensive work of this group of young people fired the enthusiasm of all present.

A letter was read from Charles F. Goddard, regretting his inability to be present and telling of interesting bundle burials uncovered by the Long Island Chapter.

New Jersey - Charles Philhower presented a review of recent fieldwork done by members of the New Jersey Society, including burials with interesting grave furniture found in part of the famous Munsee village, along the east bank of the Delaware, as well as a series of important burials excavated near Red Bank. He announced the release of a new publication on New Jersey Indian Pipes.

Dr. J. Alden Mason told of his pleasure in welcoming the new societies, and said he felt that a drive for new members should be made. He suggested that the representatives join other state organizations, especially new ones who needed advice and encouragement. Dr. Mason asked everyone to sign the register which would be passed around by Mr. Duncan.

Hon. Frederick A. Godcharles urged the further development of the Federation and suggested that possibly Virginia, West Virginia, and Rhode Island could be added to the group.

Dr. Parker, as chairman of the Research Committee, asked the federation to concentrate on the study of pottery during the year, securing photographs or drawings of typical vessels, indicating scale, location, specific site, etc. If no complete pottery is available, the same thing should be done with fragments of vessels. He requested that these photographs be forwarded to t the Corresponding Secretary so that a formal report on pottery could be submitted at the next meeting.

Dr. Parker stated that the Research Committee would soon draw up a field record sheet that would be printed in large quantities and distributed to the members at cost.

Miss Dorrance expressed a vote of thanks to the University of Pennsylvania Museum for the privilege of holding the conference there and to Dr. Mason for arranging for the delightful luncheon. The meeting was adjourned.

Frances Dorrance
Recording Secretary

Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the Archaeological Society of Delaware.

The annual meeting of the Archaeological Society of Delaware was held on January 20, 1934, in the auditorium of Wolf Hall at the University of Delaware. President Omwake opened the meeting at 3 P.M. by calling for the reading of the minutes of the previous meeting, which were approved as read. In the absence of Mr. Allen Craig, Chairman of the Nominating Committee, the Secretary read the following list of nominations for office: President, Mr. H. Geiger Omwake; 1st. Vice President, Miss Anna T. Lincoln; 2nd Vice President, Mr. Ralph E. Beers; Secretary, Mr. William Taber; Treasurer, Mr. Leon deValinger, Jr.; Editor, Mr. Frank Martine Heal; and for three year terms on the Executive Board, Dr. M. Dalema Draper and Dr. Frank Morton Jones. It was moved by Mr. Cubbage and seconded by Dr. Ryden that the Secretary be instructed to cast a ballot in favor of these nominations. This motion was voted unanimously in the affirmative.

Then President Omwake announced that dues for the year 1934 should be renewed. He called on Dr. George H. Ryden, whol told of President Hullihen's interest in having the permanent collection of this Society located at the University of Delaware. Dr. Ryden said that there was room at the University for an exhibit and the University might bear part of the expense of providing display cases. Dr. J. A. Mason moved, and it was seconded that the President appoint a committee to investigate the possibility of establishing a museum at the University of Delaware and the committee report at the next meeting.

The proposed amendments to our Constitution were taken into consideration by President Omwake, who explained that as our meetings are now held, according to our Constitution, on the same day as those of the New Jersey Society, our members were prevented from attending their meetings and they ours. The proposed amendments were then read, changing the dates of our meetings from the third to the second Saturdays of January, March, May and October and the vote to accept these amendments was unanimous.

Dr. D. S. Davidson, of the Department of Anthropology of the University of Pennsylvania, told of the work that he had done on this Peninsula under his fellowship grant from the University of Pennsylvania. Dr. Mason assured the members of the Society that any artifacts found by Dr. Davidson while in Delaware, would not be taken from this State.

Rev. Dr. John M. Cooper, of the Catholic University, Washington, D.C., was introduced and gave the Society a very interesting address on the Far Northern Crees. At the conclusion of the address Miss Regina Flannery, Dr. Cooper's secretary, exhibited a number of utensils and articles of wearing apparel used by the Crees. Upon the motion of Dr. Ryden, which Rev. Bumstead seconded, a vote of thanks was extended to Rev. Dr. Cooper for his kindness in coming to address our organization. At this meeting, the second number of our Bulletin was distributed.

Presented by,

Leon deValinger, Jr.
Ex-Secretary