VOL.VIII, NO. 1 APRIL 1956 THE ARCHEOLOG NEWS LETTER OF THE SUSSEX ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION







### THE ARCHEOLOG

# Vol. 8, No. 1

### April 1956

An editorial board consisting, for 1956, of Catharine Maull, David Marine, Henry Hutchinson and Warren Calloway, will pass upon all material submitted for publication in the Archeolog.

COVER: All the pictures on the cover of this issue relate to the causeway discovered by James Parsons of Lewes and investigated by several of our members. At the left is a part of the row of pali-saded posts or piling. They were not visible above the present surface of the marsh and were found by probing. The view in the upper right shows two of our members standing on the less yielding surface which revealed the location of the causeway. The slice of log is from one of the two large oak logs found where they had been placed to protect the causeway on the up-stream side. It lacks some of the outer rings but about 250 remain, and with this and other examples it may be possible eventually to determine by dendrochrono-logy the date of the building of the causeway. The log from which this slice was made had been roughly squared off with an adze of an unusual shape ~ like a large gouge but with a curved edge. This detail is being investigated. In lower right is shown the end of one of the piles. It was cut by a sharp axe. The chisel or wedgeshaped end permitted working a post down into mud or sand for two feet or more by simply rocking it back and forth. If greater depth was required, a maul was used. We have not excavated the level on which a stone or other maul or pieces of one would be found, for this would require pumping equipment.

It is unfortunate that historians do not make up those "trait lists" that are perhaps the most valuable part of our records in Indian studies. A really exhaustive trait list of the three or four peoples who colonized Delaware might contain enough for us to decide which one built this causeway and at about what time. Early in our investigation we were informed that earthwork was completely lacking as a diagnostic trait for the Indians of the villages of this area. On the other hand, it is one of the best known traits of the Dutch, and the Swedes protected two or three thousand acres near Wilmington from damage by brackish water by a system of dikes. There are places in the South where Indian burial mounds are so frequent that one would not attribute a mound of earth to White settlers without proof. A trait list may always be altered by new discoveries, but the burden of proof is on the person who proposes an item of which no other example exists. To be accepted, such an item must have inherent and unquestionable proof that it belongs in the list.

Our investigations have not shown that the Indians had any part in the building of the Great Dike or the present causeway or that the linking of Indian villages was the purpose of these constructions. We know that most of the Indians moved inland at an early date and by the time White settlements were established with enough man and ox power to build a dike that required moving about 200 tons of earth and building a bridge and constructing lesser elements such as this causeway there were no permanent Indian villages in Lewes.

## DESCRIPTION OF PROJECTILE POINTS H. H. Hutchinson

There seens to be a definite need for some standardization of terms used in describing chipped stone projectile points. We read and hear in lectures of such points as "bifurcated", "leaf shaped", "Christmas Tree", etc., without further description, and we have no idea just what the point may look like, for my idea of a "leaf shape" may be an oak leaf, somebody class's may be an apple leaf, and the author may be thinking of a willow loaf, and so on.

We therefore here set forth a few basic terms which can be applied to 95% of the projectile points found, and which, if used, will give a clear picture to the reader or listener of just what the point is like. Most of these terms are already well known to archaeologists (but who frequently don't use then), and they can be easily learned by the interested layman, as the terms are mostly self-explanatory.

There are eight different elements or parts that should be described. Some points may not have all of these clements, others nay have all of then. They are: (see chart)

- Shape. Fig. 11
  Sten. (if any) Fig. III
  Shoulder. Fig. IV, or Notch Fig. V (if either).
  Base. (Straight, convex, concave, etc.)
  Edge (Sharp segmented etc.)
- Edge. (Shirp, serrated, etc.) STEMS (Fig. 111)
- 6) Tip. (Sharp, rounded, blunt, ctc.)
- 7) Face. (Fercussion chipped, pressure flaked; oblique flaking, fluted, high median ridge, flat faced, otc.)
- 8) Material. (Kind of stone)

After the first two items above, the sequence of items is not too important, but those two should be given first in the description to give the reader or listener a mental picture on which to add the other items as they are given. There are undoubtedly many instances when a point will have some special characteristic which will not fall into these standard elements, and which will be described in suitable terms, but the basic picture should be built up by these terms, with the special description following.

### SHAPES (Fig. II)

1. Triangular. Essentially an equilatoral triangle, though soldon are the two sides and the base all exactly the same length

or perfectly straight. 2. Long Triangular. If the length or height of a triangular point is more than 12 times the width of the base, then it should

bc called Long Triangular. 3. Ovoid. (Sometimes called oval.) Somewhat egg-shaped but nore pointed at the small end. (These have sometimes erroneously been called "leaf-shaped".)

4. Leaf Shaped or Lanceolate. "Leaf-shape" in this case always referring to the shape of a leaf like the willow leaf, NOT to broad

leaves like maple, oak, eln, etc. 5. Lozenge or Diamond Shaped. Roughly the conventional playing card diamond shape, though seldom will the basal and tip onds be the some longth.

6. Parallel. With the sides or edges almost parallel.

Stens will nearly always fall. into one of the six types: rounded, pointed, square, expanding, contracting, and knobbed, as shown in Fig. III. Soretimes an exceptional type will show up which should be described according to its individual poculiarity.

# SHOULDERS (Fig. IV)

There are three kinds of shoulders: square, extruding, and intruding. They may be broad and deep, or small and almost indistinguishable. An intruding shoulder might be so deep that the corners become "barbs", and it would be so designated.

### NOTCHES (Fig. V)

Both the "location" and the "shape" of the notch or notches should be given. They will generally be located in one of three places: on the corner, side, or on the base; and of three shapes: square, angular, or rounded. A deeply corner notched point might also become a "barbed" point.

### BASE (see Fig. I)

The base is the bottom or rear edge of the point. It may be straight, convex, or conceve, or have other treatment which should be described.

### EDGE (see Fig. I)

The edge is usually the cutting part of the point, except in the parallel and leaf-shaped points where it does little cutting. It may be straight, concave, or convex, and may be sharp, dull, serrated, beveled, etc.

# TIP (see Fig. I)

The penetrating point of the projectile. It may be sharp, blunt, rounded, etc.

#### FACE (see Fig. I)

The face may show some of the most characteristic elements of the workmanship of the point. It may be percussion chipped, pressure flaked, parallel or oblique flaked, be fluted, or have a high median ridge, or be flat faced, etc.

### MATERIAL

The kind of stone from which a point or series of points is chipped is sometimes very important, and whether that kind of stone is native to the area in which the point or points are found should be noted. It is sometimes worthwhile to have a specialist name the kind of stone the point is made of, and where such stone is found. But even most amateurs can at least recognize the basic types of stone, such as quartz, slate, sandstone, limestone, jasper, flint, obsidian, chalcedony, etc.

#### GEHERAL

The use of such indefinite terms as "long", "large", "wide", etc. should be discouraged unless accompanied by definite figures of the dimensions. What is considered a large point by the author may be considered a normal length in some other area. Dimensions should be given in the metric system if practicable; if not, they can at least be given in inches or fractions thereof.

The use of the terms "thick" and "thin" fall into the same category, and we recommend that those terms be used only as follows: when the thickness is one half or more of the width, it is a thick point; if the thickness is one quarter or less of the width it is a thin point. Those in between are normal.

#### EXAMPLES

Fig. VI gives a few arbitrary and hypothetical types in outline and which we will use as examples of how easily this system of standard terms can be applied to almost any combination, and how complete a picture it will convey in a few simple words and short sentences.

A. Parallel sided, square stom, very slightly shouldered on



Le Marine Carlo

one side only, percussion chipped but retouched with pressure flaking on edges and tip. Tip sharp and cutting edge only medium sharp. Thin obsidian 45 x 18 nm.

B. Long Triangular, slightly concave edges and base, edges and tip very sharp, pressure flaked with high median ridge, 29 x 12 mm x 7 mm thick brown jasper.

C. Ovoid, barbed with rounded notches forming a stem with slightly convex base, sharp tip and dull edges, pressure flaked and shows basal thinning. 26 x 20 nm quartz.

D. Lanceolate, expanding stem, intruding shoulders, concave base, percussion chipped but with pressure flaking at tip and base, making sharp tip and thin base. 35 x 15 rm, black flint.

E. Triangular, concave base, pressure flaked sharp edges and tip, 20 x 19 nm x 6 nm thick. Quartzite.

F. Long Triangular, short square sten, square shoulders with small round notches, edges and tip quite sharp, very thin obsidian 23 x 10 nm x 3 nm thick.

G. Lanceolate, angular side notches, convex base, crudely percussion chipped with sharp tip and relatively dull edges, high median ridge, granite-like stone, 28 x 11 nm x 9 nm thick on ridge.

H. Long Triangular with large radius corner notches forming a crude sten, very rough base. Percussion chipped, fairly sharp edges and point, 28 x 14 nm x 6 nm thick from a laminated slate-like stone.

I. Lanceolate, square ston, snall irregular shoulder, straight sharp base, tip very sharp, edges nedium sharp. Fluted one side only and pressure flaked elsewhere, high ridge on face eppesite flute. 49 x 20 mm, reddish quartzite.

\* \* \*

The excavation at the log cabin... ...and at the Dickinson house illustrates how archeological techniques may be useful in exploring historic problems...... (C.A. Weslager Bul. A.S.D. Vol. 5, No. 1)

SUS EX (COUNTY) SITE SURVEY (Summary)

The Site Survey Committee submitted a report ready for transmittal to The Delaware Archaeological Board, at the March 15th meeting of the Sussex Archaeological Association. This article will briefly summarize that report.

During the approximate two years of this committee's activities the members thereof have traveled more than 2500 miles in investigating and locating sites in Sussex County (and in adjoining counties of Maryland). Many places reported as sites were visited and investigated but not enough corroborating evidence could be found, so they were not . included in our report. However, exactly one hundred sites were located in Sussex County including three historic sites. Forty four sites in the adjoining areas of Maryland were investigated and recorded.

We believe that we have recorded most of the sites in Sussex County, but that there will be occasional new sites that will come to light which should be added to the record. We hardly have touched the sites in adjoining Maryland, as we made no special effort to do so, and have only reported those sites that we knew of, or were brought to our attention.

This survey was not undertaken any too soon. We found that many sites have been destroyed, or are being destroyed, by the advance of residential, industrial, and commercial enterprises, and by the repeated deep plowing and cultivation by modern agricultural methods. It will not be long before all traces of prehistoric man in these places will be completely obliterated. A number of our reports are based on the memory of reputable local persons as to the artifacts and material found, others are based on the written record of archaeologically interested persons written years

# ago about sites now completely destroyed.

The detailed data included in our individual site reports is necessarily limited in scope, but we have tried to get as much fact- excavated sites will be necessary ual characteristic data included as possible, but this was also limited by the technical knowledge of the reporter. However, with the limited data available, we have tried to analyze the general characteristics of the different sites. Since some of us have thought that there was considerable difference between the prehistoric man of the Delaware -Atlantic side and the Chesapeake side of the peninsula - we have divided the sites into two groups, those on the Delaware-Atlantic Drainage, and those on the Chesapeake Drainage, and have tabulated them in the accompanying table.

20

It is surprising how similar the two areas are in most of their common characteristics, notably the pottery tempering, and the type of projectile points. Truc, the data are limited, and mostly from surface finds, but they are probably indicative of a real similarity of the culture or cul-tures that existed in this area before contact with the white man. However, though not shown in the table, there are some definite style differences in pottery decorative treatment and shape between the drainage areas and also between different sites in the seme drainage area.

Considering the data herein together with our observations of the material obtained in the few sites that have been excevated by members of the S.A.A., it appears to the writer that a grit-tempored pottery culture preceded a shelltempered pottery culture, and that there was a blending or a gradual change from the one to the other. Also with the same considerations in mind there seems to be a definite trend toward the association of the tri-angular projectile point with

the shell-tempered culture, just as the hafted and notched projectild point is associated with the grit-tempered culture. More detailod study of statistical data from before these assumptions are established as facts.

The committee feels that the recording of all data possible should be continued, both on any new sites that may be discovered, as well as on any sites already reported. To this end we have made the following recommendations-

(1) That the S.A.A. appoint a permanent Site Committee to investigate and record any archaeological sites that may be discovered or reported in the future in Sussex County, and to number them in accordance with the system used in our March 1956 Report, and to report same (at least once per year) to the Delaware Archaeological Board or to the person or in-stitution appointed by them to recoive and record such information.

(2) That the S.A.A. request the Delaware Archaeological Board to have our report (and other similer reports) filed with the Curator of the State Museum at Dover, and that the Curator of that Museum be given the responsibility of keeping these reports up to date as subsequent site reports are sent in, and to keep these reports available for reference by responsible and interested parties.

(3) That the S.A.A. request the Delaware Archaeological Board to appoint the Sussex Archaeological Association and/or their successor, to be the official party to assign numbers to any future archaeological sites discovered in Sussex County, and that the Archaeological Society of Delaware be appointed to perform the same duties for Kent and New Castle Counties.

Characteristic	Chesapeake Drainage	Delaware- Atlantic Drainage
"Concentrated Sites"	percent 20	percent 26
"Scattered Sites"	80	7 <sup>1</sup> 4
Predominately grit or sand tempered pottery	20	26
Predominately shell tempered pottery	38	45
Mixed - both types present	42	29
Predominately Triangular projectile points	13	14
Predominately other types of points	16	16
Mixed - both or many types of points	71	70
Soapstone artifacts reported	5.8	2
Stone pendents or gorgets reported	12.6	23
Grinding stones reported	7	20
Native smoking pipes (clay) reported	8	14
" " (stone) "	2	0
Banner stones or Atlatl weights re- ported	3	0
Sites excavated*	18	27

All figures are percentages of total sites reported in that drainage area.

\*Few of these "excavated" sites have been thoroughly excavated, but where reports indicate that several shell or refuse pits have been explored, they are included in this figure.

Sussex Site Survey Committee H. H. Hutchinson, Chairman

TABLE

. 40 AN INVESTIGATION OF A CAUSEWAY (FARSONS') Near Leves, Delaware\*

Percy S. Flegel, Orville H. Peets, David Marine and C. A. Bonine.

At our June (1955) meeting Mr. H. Geiger Onwake reported on his investigations of an artificial dike or causeway in a prong of the Great Marsh located about 800 yards west of the southwestern end of the Great Dike or Causeway across Pagan Creek. (See Map.)

60

This newly found causeway is approximately 13 feet wide and at present is raised at most only a few inches above the marsh level in contrast with the Pagan Creek Causeway which is 30 feet wide at its base and rises 2½ to 3 feet above the marsh level and is known to have carried a standard width roadway as late as 1773.

Mr. Omwake concluded that this newly found causeway was probably a part of an Indian trail circumventing the Great Marsh.

Our interest was primarily stimulated by his implication that the Indians of Delaware constructed dikes or causeways and secondarially because of its possible connection with the early history of the Lewes (Whorekill) area.

We made our first visit to the site at low tide (at high tide the causeway is under water) on July 6, 1955, and confirmed the surface findings of Omwake and Parsons but on probing found what appeared to be a log about 13 inches below the marsh surface and parallel with the southern edge of the causeway fill. (See chart.) This log-like mass was followed to the Civilian Conservation Corps drainage ditch and probing in the bottom of this ditch revealed the log which was at a depth of 17 inches below the marsh

\*Read at the meeting of the Sussex Archeological Association, Feb. 16, 1956.

level. We exposed the log at the bottom of the ditch which is 72 feet from the shore line at the east end of the causeway. Here the log was covered with 2-3 inches of mud and sand and (at low tide) about 4 inches of clear running water. We took a large chip from the log and found it to be white oak. We then wont back 49 feet toward the east end of the causeway and dug our first test hole down to the log, took a large chip and found the log here was red oak. It was therefore certain that the junction of the two logs was somewhere in the 49 feet between the ditch and the first test hole.

We then sank a second test hole 31 feet east of the ditch and again found the log was red oak. We sank a third test hole 15 feet west (toward the ditch) of the second test hole and found the log here was white oak. Obviously the junction of the two logs was within the 15 feet between the second and third test holes. We had to trench back 7 feet 3 inches to find the small end of the white oak log abutting end to end against the butt end of the red oak log. We exposed 23 inches of the red ock log and found it had been cut off with a sharp ax using the common bovel-cut method, while the abutting white oak log was nearly square cut.

One brace post (red ock) about 7 inches in diameter was found firmly anchored in the ground 70 inches from the east end of the white oak log and another similar brace post for this log was located 5 feet west of the ditch. The purpose of these brace posts in all probability was to hold the log in place. These were the only brace posts exposed in the approximately 18 feet of trenching over the 88 feet of logs. We then dug another test

We then dug another test hole (4th) 22 feet west of the ditch and again exposed the white





oak log with an ax-cut notch 7" x 6" x 5" cut into its southern top quadrant which resembled the notching used in the colonial period for letting in the ends of joists. We extended this test hole 28 inches westward from the notch and found the partly decayed cut butt end of the white oak log. Very little fill dirt was encountered in digging this - the 4th test hole.

Both the red oak and white oak retaining logs were on the southern (up stream) edge of the causeway - the red oak log being approximately 43 feet and the white oak log approximately 45 feet long. Both logs were from large trees - more than 24 inches in diameter at their small ends. No other logs were found.

The dirt fill gradually decreased and was completely absent about 26 feet west of the ditch and no fill dirt was encountered in the remaining 80 feet to the west shore of the projected causeway.

Cut poles, yellow pine sawed slabs and red cedar brush laid roughly at right angles across the line of the causeway extended westward 20 feet from the end of the dirt fill.

Test hole No. 5 was made in this area in order to remove some of the brush and slabs for examination. The poles, slabs and codar brush were covered with about 15 inches of marsh mud. The remaining 60 feet of the projected causeway to the west shore contained no poles, slabs or brush that we could detect by probing and is similar to the soft marsh mud extending north and south of the line of the causeway.

The total width of the marsh in the line of the causeway is 178 feet, of which 72 feet are east of the C.C.C. ditch. The two (?) logs extend out 88 feet from the east end of the causeway and the dirt fill disappears completely at 98 feet.

We exposed a line of 70 or more palisaded posts varying from 4 to 6 inches in diameter set sloping northward along the northern edge of the causeway fill and extending about 12 feet east and 17 fect west from the center of the ditch (some of those in the bed of the ditch were broken or cut off when the ditch was dug by the C.C. Corps in the 1930's). We removed one of the smallest of these palisaded posts (a cleanly ax trimmed white oak limb) by means of a chain and pry. It was 7 feet 4 inches long, well pro-It was served both as to wood and bark, and about 5 inches in diameter at the large end. The small end was beveled to a sharp edge and this edge was as clean and smooth as if recently cut. This post obviously was sharpened on the small end to facilitate driving it into the marsh mud. Allowing for approx-imately 14 inches of the upper end which had rotted away, this post would have been 8 feet 6 inches long. These palisaded posts demarcate the dirt fill on the north side just as the oak logs do on the south (upstream) side, and were probably put in to retain the fill dirt. The castern and western limits of the palisaded posts were not determined with certainty.

The fill dirt used on the causeway was taken from the east shore land approach as reported by Mr. Omwake, and this is clearly indicated by the irregularities and unevenness of the ground surface of the well wooded approach. No corresponding irregularities of the ground were found at the western approach to the projected causeway. However, there is a slight ridge, possibly 9 feet wide, with a shallow depression on each side paralleling the shore line and about 16 feet back.

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

1. The logs, poles, posts and cedar brush used in this causeway

were all cut, trimmed and shaped with sharp metal axes by workmen skilled in their use. The yellow pine slabs were made with a saw.\*

(\*According to the Forest Products Laboratory U.S.D.A. at Madison, Wisconsin, the earliest authenticated water powered saw mill was established in 1634 at the Falls of the Piscatauqua between Maine and New Hampshire.)

10

2. The logs were placed to retain the fill dirt on the south (upstream) side and at least a part of the north side of the causeway fill is supported by a line of 70 or more palisaded posts. Since the fill dirt disappears 3. at 98 feet from the east shore, the logs at 94 feet and the mattress of poles, slabs and cedar brush at 118 feet, it is probable that the causevay was never com-pleted. It is possible, however, that the 24 feet of incomplete causeway and the 60 feet where no evidence of causeway construction was found were due to destruction by storm and flood action.

In conclusion, all the evidence obtained supports the view that the plan, methods and tools used in the construction of the causeway originated with the early white settlers.

NOTE: Since completion of this paper we have sawed off and removed a cross section from the small end of the white oak log and stored it for possible dendrochronological studies. The heart wood is sound and contains over 250 annual rings. The sapwood is soft but intact and was badly damaged in prying the 10 inch section from the mud. A similar 10 inch section has been taken from the butt end of the red ock log.

When the above mentioned cross sections were taken on Nov. 29, 1955, both shores of the marsh were tree-lined and showed no

evidence of disturbance. On March 15 ( $3\frac{1}{2}$  months later) we revisited the eastern approach to the causeway and were greatly surprised on looking westward across the 178 feet of marsh in the line of the causeway to see a section of the tree-lined shore, including the western approach to the causeway, had been bulldozed. The debris of trees and soil, pushed onto the marsh, had completely blocked the western end of the causeway and exposed an extensive view of a nearby field.

The area bulldozed is indicated on the plan of the causeway by a dotted line and measures: from the field to the shore line about 65 feet and along the shore line 42 feet. The bulldozed debris extends into the marsh 15 feet from the shore line. The ridge (about 9 feet wide running parallel with and 16 feet back from the shore line which was the only previous definite disturbance found on the western approach) has been completely destroyed over a distance of 42 feet.

This note has been added as supplementary information for any future investigators of this historic site.

7:

STONE MAULS O. H. Peets

Volume five, number one, of the Bulletin of the Archaeological Society of Delaware (1952) is what amounts to a reprint of Dr. Hilborne T. Cresson's "Report on Pilestructures in Maamans Creek, near Claymont, Delaware" published in 1892 by Perbody Museum, Harvard University.

Cresson, earlier, had aroused great interest - and skepticism also - by suggesting that these piles might be relies "of an ancient river folk who lived over the water in the fashion of the Swiss lake dwellers", but later he

theorized that they were parts of an Indian fish-weir. He lists, as having been collected from the site, a large number of stone specimens. This list is remarkable in the number described as "in process of manufacture" or in other ways that give us to under-stand that they are not artifacts but the abundant refuse of a place where, for a long time, the Indians had made use of a good source of raw material, and such a source according to one of Cresson's drawings - had been exposed at this place by the action of the creek. Several "natural" stonës or pebbles are included in Cresson's list, or were so designated as a result of revision by Museum authorities. Such an inclusive collection might have been pertinent as proof of a lithic industry associated with the remains of houses, but few of these items relate to the functions of a fish-weir.

However, three strongly characterized stone implements reported by Cresson could certainly be relevant to the making of a pile structure for any purpose. He does not hesitate to call them stone mauls, and beyond reasonable doubt that is what they are. One of them had been sent to Peabody Museum, so I wrote asking that it be re-examined to determine, if possible, whether it should be considered White or Indian. The reply stated that it could, with near certainty, be taken to be Colonial rather than aboriginal. It was the opinion of those who examined it that the hole through the stone was made with a metal tool.

From our experience with steel mauls and iron wedges, we expected to see signs of wear on the ends of this stone (we hope later to publish a photograph obtained from the Peabody Museum) but most of the wear was in the middle area. Wooden stakes or wedges are less likely to split if struck with the side of a maul, and good steel ones are made with flat sides so they may be used in that way. A contemporary print of Abraham Lincoln splitting rails with wooden wedges shows him using the side of a wooden maul. The small size of the hole in this stone suggests that the handle would be somewhat flexible thus absorbing much of the jar. Seemingly, then, this stone maul was an effective tool not out of place with metal ones when metal was scarce. One of them was brought to one of our meetings. Unfortunately no record was made of where it was found and by whom. We hope some one may see these lines who can help us recapture this information.

At "Parsons" causeway we have not investigated the levels on which a stone or metal tool would have rested if it had been lost, and even if we were to find a stone maul or piece of one, we should have only an approximate date as yet, but the rarity of this implement might indicate that it was in use for only a short period; probably when iron was still very scarce. Although the photograph of our piling is surprisingly like the one made by Cresson of the stake ends he found (even to the difficulty of getting a good print), that fact only suggests an avenue of investigation which, like that of log cabin construction, might show a method of dike protection more in the manner of one Colonial nationality than another. This slight possibility is what led to this inquiry as to stone mauls, but they may deserve some study for themselves.

New Items for January, 1956 Issue of "The Archaelog"

### New Members

David F. Guillaume (Supervisor of Art for Sussex County Public School) 38 Maryland Avenue, Rehoboth, Delaware

# New Subscribers

The Manta Chapter, Archaeological Society of New Jersey, Wenonah, New Jersey

# News Items

Dr. Chesleigh i. Bonine was reappointed by Governor Boggs as a member of the State Archaeological Board for a term of four years.

# Material presented at the March 15 meeting

Mr. Frank /ustin presented a fragment of a sandstone boulder exposing the caudal half of a fossil fish approximately the size of a large herring. Mr. /ustin stated that a highway construction crew working in western Sussex County uncovered the boulder and fractured it with a sledge hammer. A lamprey like fossil and a fragment of a larger fish were also exposed.

Fossils of this type are common in the sandstones of the head waters of the Delaware and Susquehanna Rivers. Presumably this boulder was brought down in an iceberg during the retreat of the ice sheet of the last glacial period and deposited near the Marshy Hope branch of the Nanticoke River.

Mrs. Helene Potter presented a section of a red oak log removed from the bank of Lewes Creek and presumably dates from the Colonial period. It has been placed in our collection of dendrochronological material for study.

Mr. Roger Vandergrift demonstrated representative types of arrow heads in his surface collection from the Mispillion River site (a current project of our Association).