

B. G. TRIGGER

(ACCEPTED APRIL 1969)

## THE STRATEGY OF IROQUOIAN PREHISTORY<sup>1</sup>

"I often think it odd that it (history) should be so dull, for a good deal of it must be invention."

Jane Austen - Northanger Abbey, Ch. XIV

### ORIENTATION

It is a vulgar superstition, now fortunately being dispelled that archaeology is an empirical discipline; that explanations proceed naturally from the data and that with more evidence our reconstructions necessarily become closer approximations to the truth. Today, it is increasingly realized that archaeological interpretations are a function not only of the evidence at hand but also of the ideas and assumptions about the nature of cultural processes that the interpreter carries about with him. Moreover, there is a growing consensus that the reconstruction of the past is not and should not be an intuitive game, but is a procedure that can be subjected to well-defined rules and procedures that should be spelled out. Many of the undisciplined interpretations of an earlier period now seem irritatingly egoistic. Archaeologists are not clairvoyants and through time an intuitive reconstruction, such as Sir Arthur Evan's history of the Palace of Minos in Crete, whatever its literary merit, grows jaded and pretentious. Our real respect is reserved for the archaeologist who did not see Theseus carrying off Ariadne, but who at least attempted to record carefully what he did see and to draw reasoned conclusions from his observations.

In recent years British archaeologists have begun to discuss the role of models in the reconstruction of prehistory. Models can be defined as the underlying assumptions about cultural processes that are implicit in an explanation of prehistory and the kind of logical framework into which such explanations are

(1) This paper was prepared for the 1968 Conference on Iroquois Research, held at Rensselaerville, New York, October 4-6. I wish to thank those who were present for their comments, particularly William N. Fenton and Gordon M. Day.

fitted. Colin Renfrew (1968) cites the following example of a model: culture change is best explained in terms of the migrations of peoples. This is very different from a proposed reconstruction such as: all the Indo-European languages are derived from the Kurgan culture of Central Asia in the third millennium B.C. Insofar as both statements can be labelled theories, the first must be qualified as a general theory about culture processes, the second as a specific theory about an event in the past. Only the first kind of theory qualifies as a model, however. By their very nature, models provide the framework and terminology by which specific culture historical reconstructions are made. The pity has been that in the past archaeologists, like historians, have preferred to regard models as being implicit and have treated as personal flashes of insight reconstructions that are in fact based on the notions about cultural processes that were fashionable at the time. As it becomes possible to look back on the history of our own discipline, the folly of such behaviour is increasingly being recognized. It is also being realized, as Renfrew aptly puts it, that "it is the choice of model which is often decisive, rather than the material evidence." Hence it behoves us to look at our models.

For the purposes of this paper I wish to distinguish two kinds of models: processual models and procedural models. Processual models are the models about cultural processes and human behavior that the archaeologist uses to interpret his data; procedural models concern the relative importance of various kinds of data and the relationship that these kinds of data bear to one another. The latter are also models of cultural behavior, but because they concern general procedures of handling data, they are one step further removed from these cultural processes than are processual models.

In order to underline the importance of procedural models it is necessary to invoke yet another British distinction; between archaeology and prehistory. Archaeology may be defined as the techniques involved in the recovery and interpretation of the material remains of the past; prehistory as the discipline concerned with the reconstruction of human history for times and places for which written documentation is not available. In practise, North American archaeologists tend to slight the importance of non-archaeological sources of information about the past, whether or not they pay them lipservice. Important among these sources are linguistics, oral traditions, physical anthropology and ethnology. Important as archaeological data are, these other sources of information are not merely ornaments on the archaeological tree; rather they are independent disciplines capable of providing information about the past; each of which requires skills and training of its own. It is the prehistorian's duty to survey the results of all these lines of investigation thoroughly before he attempts to synthesize them to produce a reconstruction of the

past. Any such reconstruction requires a variety of judgments concerning the significance and relative importance of various kinds of evidence. The assumptions on which these judgments are made constitute our procedural models.

In this paper I wish to survey critically the models of prehistory that have been utilized in Iroquoian studies to date. I do this because I believe that it is only by understanding the intellectual processes that have influenced the reconstruction of Iroquoian prehistory in the past that we can conscientiously and intelligently chart a course for the future. Moreover, it is clear that many interpretations of the past made today are influenced by conclusions reached long ago on the basis of models and evidence about which we know little. Such ideas often persist long after the reasons for which they were formulated have been discredited and abandoned. Hopefully, a review of the models that have been used to interpret Iroquoian prehistory will clear away a certain amount of this intellectual debris and help to chart a better course for the future. I am aware that this paper is only one in a series of such surveys that have been made in recent years (Wright 1966: 1-13; Ritchie 1961; Guthe 1960). I will try, however, to analyse the structure of studies of Iroquoian prehistory in greater detail than these surveys have done and to develop further some of the concepts set forth in those papers.

## THE LALEMANT HYPOTHESIS

The earliest statement about Iroquoian culture history is recorded in Father Jerome Lalemant's Huron Relation of 1641. This statement reflects growing interest in the tribes living south of the Huron as a possible field for the extension of the Jesuit missions. A careful examination of Father Lalemant's ideas constitutes a good point of departure for the discussion of later interpretations of Iroquoian culture history.

Lalemant wrote:

"We have every reason to believe that not long ago they made but one People - both Hurons and Iroquois, and those of the Neutral Nation; and that they came from one and the same family, or from a few old stocks that formerly landed on the coasts of these regions. But it is probable that, in progress of time, they have become removed and separated from one another - some more, some less - in abodes, in interests, and in affection; so that some have become enemies, others Neutral, and others have remained in some special connection and communication."

(Thwaites 1896 - 1901, XXI: 193-195).

In this statement we find expressed for the first time a number of ideas that have played an important role in the study of Iroquoian prehistory down to the present. The most important and enduring of these is the recognition of the genetic affinities among the northern Iroquoian languages. This insight reflects the keen practical interest that the Jesuits had in the Iroquoian languages, their growing contacts with the Petun and Neutral and their opportunity to converse with Iroquois (Five Nations) (2) prisoners who had been brought back to Huronia. Moreover, none of Lalemant's other deductions about Iroquoian prehistory is self-evidently improbable. His statement has a good common-sense ring about it and it is not hard to understand why the ideas he proposed have continued to influence Iroquoian historiography as long as they have. For this reason, it is worth noting that in terms of current knowledge about the nature of culture, none of the basic propositions underlying Lalemant's statement can be accepted as axiomatic. Let us examine these propositions in turn.:

(a) While it is true that related languages provide indisputable evidence of an historical connection between their speakers, it is not always the case that the groups speaking genetically related languages are the biological descendants of the original speech community from which these languages are derived. To cite a very familiar example: only a small fraction of the present speakers of Romance languages are the biological descendants of the ancient Romans. Large numbers of people became Romance-speakers either under Roman rule or during the Spanish occupation of the New World. Although it is perhaps more likely that among primitive peoples the speakers of two closely related languages are the biological descendants of an original speech community, this can by no means be taken for granted. The possibility of language diffusion must always be entertained as an alternative hypothesis. This is a major factor complicating efforts to correlate linguistic and archaeological data in cases where historical records are not available.

(b) While it is difficult to estimate in terms of calendar years what Lalemant meant by "not long ago", his assumption that the northern Iroquoians constituted a single speech community, and therefore possibly a single people, at no very remote time in the past has generally been interpreted as meaning that the Iroquoian tribes split apart only a few centuries before European contact. Yet this statement was based on a very rudimentary knowledge of variations among the northern Iroquoian languages. Later, the

(2) In this paper the word Iroquois is reserved for the Five Nations. Following common usage, the term northern Iroquoian (often abbreviated Iroquoian) is used to refer to the Iroquoian-speaking peoples of the Northeast as a whole. I mention this because certain recent publications have tended to blur this important distinction.

Jesuits were to learn that these languages were not as similar as they had at first believed. In 1664, Pierre Boucher, who had lived in Huronia and had dealings with the Iroquois was to write:

On the other hand, the Petun, Neutral, and all the Iroquois and the Andastes speak the Huron language although the dialects are as very different as Spanish, Italian and French are different from Latin. But between Huron and Algonkin[the difference is much greater]".

Although glottochronological research on the northern Iroquoian languages is still in its infancy, Lounsbury's (1961) pioneering work on Iroquois indicates the accuracy of Boucher's observations.

(c) Finally, Lalemant's can be seen as having erred in his implicit assumption that similarities among the different Iroquoian culture are necessarily the result of these cultures being derived from a common source, while the differences can be attributed to their subsequent separation. This is a dendritic, or branching, model of cultural development. It assumes that cultural similarities between different groups are an archaic residue from the time when these groups were still one and that ethnogenesis, or the separation of the original group (Ur-culture) into new groups, results in internal developments (innovations) within each group that in turn generate cultural variation. However useful for describing language relationships, or the relationship between biological species, the dendritic model is clearly inadequate in the cultural field because it ignores the important role played by diffusion. The assumption that Iroquoian culture developed prior to the formation of the various Iroquoian linguistic and ethnic divisions, is not necessarily correct. To cite another crude example: today most northern Europeans speak languages derived from Early Germanic and, despite national boundaries, share a common industrial technology and a generally similar cultural pattern. Yet this common culture is not an archaic residue from Early Germanic times but is the result of shared development that took place long after the Germanic nationalities had split apart. Diffusion is thus the Achilles heel of any a priori dendritic model of culture change.

We can formally characterize Lalemant's reconstruction as being based on a procedural model that assigns a high priority to linguistic data. Lalemant assumes that similarities in language between two groups at the present are evidence of a genetic connection between these groups in the past. His processual model is a dendritic one which assumes that cultural variation is produced by the same factors that produce linguistic and ethnic variation; namely, the splitting apart and subsequent differentiation of groups. In addition, his model is a migratory one; the Iroquoian peoples are assumed to have arrived in the northeast from elsewhere.(3)

(3) Because it plays an important role in later speculation about

There has been some discussion as to whether the Huron themselves had a myth of common origin to which they attributed the cultural and linguistic similarities among the Iroquoian-speaking peoples. The possible existence of such a belief has been interpreted as additional support for Lalemant's dendritic-migratory model. Yet, such a tradition, even if it existed, need not have been an archaic residue from the early period of Iroquoian pre-history. The British and German languages are descended from a common ancestor, but it was only in the last century that for political reasons, this historical connection was used as the basis for a myth stressing Teutonic solidarity in opposition to countries with a Latin culture. The Oneida, likewise, may have been using obvious cultural and linguistic similarities to manufacture a politically useful myth when they said to the Huron at Quebec in 1656: "Thou knowest, thou Huron, that formerly we constituted one cabin and one country. By some chance we separated. It is time to unite again" (Thwaites 1896-1901, XLII: 252). The very vagueness of their claim suggests that it was invented in an effort to persuade the Huron to leave Quebec and settle among them.

Another story reputed to reflect memories of a common origin is the tradition of Jigonsaseh which is reported by Arthur C. Parker (1916: 481-482):

There are certain Iroquoian traditions that seem to have good foundation, relating that at a certain period all the Iroquois were one people, living together and speaking the same tongue. Indeed so positive were the Iroquois of this that they could point out a certain woman and say that she represented the lineal descendant of the first Iroquoian family. Yet the confederate Iroquois knew that she did not belong in the five tribes. She was a Neuter woman. "When the bands were divided", the tradition runs, "it was found that the family of Djigonsase,

Iroquoian prehistory, it is worth noting that this dendritic migratory model of cultural development has had a long history in Western thought and that it is no accident that Lalemant and others found it so congenial. It seems to be derived from Biblical sources, especially those sections of Genesis where the nations known to the ancient Hebrews are traced in a genealogical fashion to some extent descendant of Noah or Adam. Each nation is descended from a particular man and nations that are closely related, geographically, culturally or politically, are attributed to founders who are genealogically closely related, while more remote nations are separated by greater genealogical distances. This approach, in turn, seems to be a reflection of the Semitic segmentary kinship system. The influence of these Biblical traditions upon Western thought, even as late as the nineteenth century, should not be under-estimated. They created a strong unconscious bias in favor of the dendritic-migratory model of human history.

It is significant that while some of the utterances recorded in Sagard's Dictionary locate Iouskeha, the son of the first woman on earth, among the Neutral, none of the Europeans living among the Iroquoians prior to 1649 recorded a mother of nations or any tradition that the northern Iroquoian tribes were descended from a common ancestor. Such traditions may have evolved among the Iroquois later, when they were attempting to incorporate various remnants of the other northern Iroquoian peoples into their own tribes.

## HISTORY AND ORAL TRADITIONS

Between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries, historical sources and oral traditions were the basic source of information available to students of Iroquoian prehistory. The little bit of accurate archaeological and linguistic information that was available tended to be interpreted in terms of these data. As Hale (1894: 4) said at the end of the nineteenth century: "In the absence of other evidence we have to fall back upon tradition". The sum total of information that was available even from historical sources and oral traditions was very slight, hence the models that were used to interpret these data stand out in bold relief.

The only historical data concerning the northern Iroquoian peoples prior to the beginnings of continuous recorded history in the seventeenth century are Cartier's accounts of his visits to North America in 1534 and 1535-36 and the fragmentary reports we have of the Cartier-Roberval expedition in 1541-42. These expeditions encountered Iroquoian-speaking people inhabiting the St. Lawrence Valley between Tadoussac and Montreal. By 1603, the St. Lawrence Valley Iroquoians had vanished and the Iroquois and the northern Algonkians were locked in a struggle to control the St. Lawrence. These simple historical facts later gave rise to the theory that the St. Lawrence Valley was the original home of all the Iroquoian-speaking peoples. It was argued that historical evidence indicated that during the sixteenth century the Iroquoian peoples settled in the St. Lawrence Valley had moved westward and it was suggested that this was merely the last manifestation of a trend that could be projected far into the past. This extension of the behavior of one group of Iroquoians to the Iroquoians as a whole

(4) For a further discussion of the term Djigonsase (Jegosasa) see Thwaites 1896-1901, VIII, 305; XXI, 313-315.

was of course unsound and requires no comment. It should be noted, however, that this theme has played a very important role in thinking about Iroquoian prehistory down to the present.

For a time, the significance of Cartier's observations were forgotten. In the seventeenth century most commentators seem to have known that the people Cartier had encountered were Iroquoian-speaking. By the nineteenth century, however, the Cartier vocabularies had been forgotten and in 1860, in a paper on archaeological discoveries in downtown Montreal, John William Dawson assumed that the Indians Cartier had encountered were Algonkians, who later gave up agriculture after they had been driven from the St. Lawrence Valley by the Iroquois. This idea was, however, rendered untenable by Jean-Andre Cuoq's studies of the Cartier vocabularies in the 1860s.

The rest of the information that was used as a basis for speculation about Iroquoian prehistory was collected (or said to be collected) from Indian informants in the seventeenth century, during the early years of contact between the native North Americans and the Europeans. In the following paragraphs I wish to summarize the main data that have been construed as having a bearing upon Iroquoian prehistory. Some clearly refer to the St. Lawrence Valley Iroquoians, others have been interpreted as having more general significance. All of it has at one time or another been seen as strengthening the association between the early Iroquoians and the St. Lawrence Valley and thus tending to confirm the case for a Laurentian origin for some or all of the Iroquoian-speaking peoples. We may refer to the more developed forms of these speculations as the Laurentian hypothesis of Iroquoian origins.

(a) In his History of New France, published in 1609, Marc Lescarbot said that around 1600 the St. Lawrence Valley Iroquoians were defeated by the Iroquois, which presumably means by the Five Nations (Hoffman 1961: 203). Lescarbot does not state from whom he obtained this information, but possibly it was from Champlain since the two men spent the winter of 1606-07 together at Port Royal. Champlain's failure to mention this information may be due to his attempt to play down the importance of explorations carried out in the St. Lawrence Valley prior to his time; to have mentioned Hochelaga would have been to remind his readers of Jacques Cartier. In 1615, the Recollet Priest, Denis Jamet, who visited the Lachine Rapids that year, reported the existence of a Huron who remembered long ago having seen a village nearby, which later had been overwhelmed by the Iroquois. (Jouve 1915: 61). What seems to be a later version of Lescarbot's account is contained in Du Creux's (1951, I: 370) History of Canada.

(b) In a description of Huron settlement patterns in 1615, Champlain makes a statement that has been interpreted as meaning that while most Huron villages were moved only a short distance when



they were relocated, a group called the Antouhonorons had been forced to flee a distance of 40 or 50 leagues. The Antouhonorons have been considered by some to be the Onondaga and this account has been interpreted as referring to the latter group leaving the St. Lawrence Valley to settle in Upper New York State. The term Antouhonoron clearly refers to certain Iroquois groups, but since Champlain claims elsewhere that they had fifteen villages, it seems unlikely that the term can refer to any one tribe. It must also be noted that we do not know the source of Champlain's information or the period to which he was referring. Finally, the grammatical construction of his statement is exceedingly vague and it can be alternatively construed to mean that the Antouhonoron had forced some Huron group to move 40 or 50 leagues. This interpretation seems to fit the context better.

(c) In the Huron Relation of 1636 the Jesuits say that the Huron learned about war feasts, dream guessing and the cry wiiiiiii from a monster "when they dwelt on the shores of the sea". (Thwaites 1896-1901, X: 183). This account frequently has been construed as evidence that the Huron once dwelt along the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Elsewhere, however, the Jesuits say that dream guessing originated among a small group who later joined the Huron when they were living in a village near a lake (Thwaites 1896-1901, XVII: 195). Elisabeth Tooker (personal communication) has suggested that this seems to indicate that the "sea" might have been one of the Great Lakes.

(d) In the Jesuit Relation of 1642 it is reported that an Algonkin tribe living in the lower Ottawa Valley claimed that they had once inhabited Montreal Island and the hills to the south and east (Thwaites 1896-1901, XXII: 215-17). They called Montreal Island minitik outen entagougiban, "the island on which stood a village". In 1646, Jerome Lalemant described the Ononchataronon a tribe living in the Ottawa Valley, as a tribe whose ancestors formerly inhabited Montreal Island, adding that a man of about 80 reported that when he was young the Huron drove his people from the Island (Thwaites 1896-1901, XXII: 215-217; XXIX: 173). It should be noted that this claim was not made without self-interest, since this tribe had been discussing plans to settle under French protection on Montreal Island. This story has been repeated in Charlevoix (Shea 1900, II: 127-28) and, among other things, has been used as the basis of a claim that the Ononchataronon was Iroquoian, not Algonkin (Lighthall 1899). However, the Iroquoian name that was sometimes used to refer to this tribe (or rather to one of its close neighbours), seems to have been the name the Huron gave it. The Huron had their own names for most of the Algonkin tribes; for example, they called the Montagnais Chauhagueronon (Ganong 1964: 433).

(e) In 1697, Charles Aubert de la Chesnaye reported that there was a tradition that the Algonkians had chased the Iroquois away from Quebec and the region about it, where formerly they had lived

(Bailey 1933: 106). He says that the Algonkians used to show the French the remains of their towns and villages covered with second growth. Sagard (1866: 271) mentions that the ruins of an "Iroquois Fort" were still visible on the "high ground" near the Recollet monastery at Quebec in 1625.

(f) In 1724, Joseph Lafitau (1724, I: 101) recorded a vague tradition that in their early wanderings the Mohawk had camped near Quebec City.

(g) Pierre Radisson reports that the Huron originally lived near Lake Huron (Adams 1961: 45-48). As they increased greatly in numbers, many of them wished to search out a new home. Unable to move south, they headed for Hudson Bay. There they built large boats with sails (sic) in which they circumnavigated Quebec and Labrador and arrived at the mouth of the St. Lawrence River. There they discovered some Iroquois living in the vicinity of Quebec City and made an alliance with the Algonkians to drive them out. After a long time, the Huron decided to return to their ancestral seat on Georgian Bay, while the Iroquois in their new home south of Lake Ontario became better warriors. Not only is this story late but the latter part of it seems to be a garbled version of events that happened in the early part of the seventeenth century. It is filled with anachronisms, such as a knowledge of sailing vessels and of Hudson Strait. Radisson says that he collected this story from a Frenchman who knew the Huron language better than he did. It seems to be a hodgepodge of ideas put together over a campfire by French voyageurs and their Indian companions and reflects a good deal of French as well as Indian influence.

(h) The most influential account was recorded by Nicholas Perrot (1911: 42-47) between 1680 and 1718, although we do not know from what source. The Perrot tradition was quoted by Charlevoix and Bacqueville de la Potherie and formed the basis of Cadwallader Golden's (1750) account of the origins of the Five Nations. According to Perrot, the Iroquois formerly lived in the region of Montreal and Three Rivers. They cultivated the soil and traded corn with the Algonkians in return for furs and dried meat. One winter some Iroquois and Algonkians went hunting together. A quarrel developed between them and in the ensuing conflict the Iroquois were killed. When this became known to the rest of the Iroquois the following spring, they decided to avenge their kinsmen. In the war that followed, the Iroquois were defeated and forced to flee south of Lake Ontario, where they settled. In their new home the Iroquois grew strong and by the time the French arrived, early in the seventeenth century, they were avenging themselves on their former oppressors.

Aside from the fact that all of these stories connect one or another Iroquoian-speaking group with the St. Lawrence, there is little consistency to them. Some of the stories describe the

Iroquois driving the Algonkians from the St. Lawrence; others describe the Algonkians expelling the Iroquois; still others see the Huron as the aggressor. Moreover, little in the way of time perspective is indicated in these stories and in only a few cases are original sources indicated. Champlain's accounts suggest that at the beginning of the seventeenth century the Iroquois were in control of the St. Lawrence Valley, having expelled its former inhabitants. Elsewhere, I have suggested that the reason they did this was to be able to trade directly with the Europeans who were frequenting the lower St. Lawrence (Trigger 1962a). Later, with French help, the Huron and Algonkians managed to break the Iroquois' hold on the St. Lawrence and to open it as an artery of trade for furs coming down the Ottawa River. It is possible that at least some of these stories represent an imperfect memory of that period. Likewise, Christian Iroquois began to settle under French protection in the St. Lawrence Valley in the seventeenth century. This may have generated a further interest among the Iroquois in establishing an aboriginal claim to this area. The principal value of these studies in later times was that they furnished material that could be used to support the Laurentian hypothesis.

The stories recorded in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were seemingly supported by traditions that were current among various Iroquoian peoples at a later time. In 1826, David Cusick, a Tuscarora, wrote his Sketches of the Ancient History of the Six Nations. In it he claimed that the Iroquois had originated in the St. Lawrence Valley, but had fled to the southeastern United States (the place of origin of the Tuscarora) before returning north to their historic homeland. In 1870 Peter Dooyentate Clarke, a Wyandot living near Windsor, Ontario, set down what he claimed was the traditional history of his people. According to his story, the Seneca and Wyandot had lived close to one another, but in separate villages, in the vicinity of Montreal early in the sixteenth century. There they met Jacques Cartier. As a result of a love affair and a consequent murder involving the two groups, the two tribes began to quarrel and eventually they separated. The Seneca moved south of the Great Lakes, while the Wyandot stayed in Canada. By the end of the sixteenth century, the latter group had made its way as far west as Toronto, but because they feared the Iroquois they soon fled north to the shores of Lake Huron. In 1894 Horatio Hale published a number of traditions that he had collected among the Wyandot on the Anderdon Reserve near Windsor. According to these traditions, the Wyandot had originated near Quebec City. Hale's informant, Joseph White, had visited the Huron remnant that was settled at Lorette, near Quebec City, and they had shown him the place where they said their ancestors had come out of the ground.

All of these native claims were accepted as further support for the Laurentian hypothesis. Nevertheless, it seems fair to ask to what degree these traditions were themselves the products of the

Laurentian hypothesis, or at least of European influence. Cusick's tale appears to have been influenced, either directly or indirectly by Perrot and Charlevoix. Likewise, Clarke must have been aware of early Canadian history and of the Laurentian hypothesis. The most striking feature of his account is, as we shall note later, the lack of detailed information concerning Huron-Petun history during the seventeenth century. This suggests that it is an even less reliable source of information for still earlier times. The Lorette tradition of an autochthonous origin reflects a basic Iroquoian and pan-Indian theme: the ancestors of a particular group coming out of caves or holes in the earth. (5) It seems likely that this particular story was invented by the Lorette Huron after they had settled in Quebec. Knowledge of this story among the Wyandot at Windsor would, however, have been interpreted as native support for the Laurentian hypothesis and helped to confirm it in the minds of these people. For the ethnologist, the Wyandot's beliefs in turn became additional data providing independent support for the Laurentian hypothesis.

When Lewis Henry Morgan, who knew the Iroquois first hand, came to write his account of their origins, he based it on the Perrot-Colden tradition rather than on information supplied by his native informants. This was apparently because the Iroquois of his time could supply little information about their origins that Morgan deemed to be of historical value (Morgan 1904: 4). He noted, for example, that the Onondaga and Seneca claimed that they sprang from the ground at Nundaweo, on the banks of the Oswego River. This is a tradition similar to the Lorette one and might have been interpreted as a model of an Iroquoian origin myth. Morgan, however, was looking for information that was in accord with the dendritic migratory model of prehistory that was fashionable at the time. Hence, he interpreted the Nundaweo story as being merely an indication of how remote was the time when their migrations had taken place.

Morgan's version of the Perrot story resembles the earlier ones in general outline, but not in detail. According to Morgan, the Iroquois originally lived near Montreal, in subjugation to the Adirondack, and there they learned from their masters how to grow crops. Both the idea of subjugation and this unlikely source for Iroquoian agriculture appear to have been Morgan's innovations and they are unsubstantiated by the sources he used. The Iroquois were defeated in an attempt to shake off the Algonkian yoke and were forced to flee to the Seneca River, where they lived for a time. Once in their new land, they split into five tribes. Morgan

(5) Compare the Pueblo Indians of the Southwest. Both the Aztec and Inca origin myths tell of their coming out of caves or holes in the earth and wandering until they reached their historic homeland. The Huron believed that in the beginning all the animals had been imprisoned in a cave before they were released by Iouskeha.

described the Indians the French had visited at Hochelaga as being Huron, although he decided on the basis of Cartier's descriptions of their settlements that the Indians encountered farther down-river, at Stadacona, must have been Algonkians. By locating the Huron along the St. Lawrence, Morgan began the transformation of the Perrot-Colden account of the early history of the Five Nations into a more general theory of Iroquoian Origins.

In 1882 Horatio Hale proposed that Huron and Mohawk were the two oldest Iroquoian languages, because their words had the least contracted forms. He argued that these two tribes must have remained longest in the place of origin of the Iroquoian-speaking peoples and proposed that the Iroquoian-speaking peoples as a whole had originated in eastern Canada, probably in the vicinity of Montreal.

"the clear and positive traditions of all surviving Iroquoian tribes . . . point to the lower St. Lawrence as the earliest abode of their stock . . . centuries before [Cartier's] time . . . the ancestors of the Huron-Iroquois family had dwelt in this locality, or still farther east and nearer to the river's mouth. As the numbers increased, dissensions arose. The hive swarmed, and band after band moved off to the west and south."  
(Hale, 1963)

In this way, a simple account of Iroquois origin was finally transformed into a general scheme of Iroquoian origins.

Hale's theory influenced speculation about Iroquoian origins for the rest of the century. There appears to have been a virtual mania for discovering tribal origins on the St. Lawrence. In 1894, C. G. Wake was to quote with approval a claim that the Kickapoo, Sac, Fox, Ottawa and Potawatomi all said their original home was in the St. Lawrence Valley. It would be interesting to know to what degree such claims were based on an unwarranted selection of data and to what degree they represent traditions that had won general acceptance among the tribes involved as a result of the center of much of the northern fur trade being in Montreal.

While the experts in different regions tended to be interested in the tribes nearest them, most sought to accommodate their findings to Hale's general theory. Daniel Wilson (1884) used material from Hale and Clarke to support his argument that the Huron had originated along the banks of the St. Lawrence. According to Wilson, the St. Lawrence Valley had been the homeland of all the Iroquoian-speaking peoples, but the Huron had remained behind the longest. Like Morgan, Wilson believed that Hochelaga was a Huron village and in favor of this theory he cited similarities between some of the pottery from the Dawson site ("Hochelaga") and that from historic sites in Huronia. While such use of archaeological evidence marks a significant new trend, it must be noted that no

detailed comparisons were offered of the pottery from the two regions, nor did archaeological evidence play more than an auxiliary role by comparison with historical records and "native traditions". In 1914, Orr described the St. Lawrence as the generally admitted home of the Huron, but argued that Hochelaga was a Petun village, since he believed that the Petun were the last group to move west. Later, when the Laurentian hypothesis went out of favor, Orr (1921: 18-20) accepted an idea originally advanced by Hewitt (1907: 585) that the Attignawantan and Attingueenongnahac tribes of the Huron confederacy might have developed in western Ontario but that the Ahrendarrhonon and Tohontaenrat, the two tribes that joined the confederacy about 1590 and 1610, probably came from the St. Lawrence Valley. In this he has been followed by Emerson (1954; 1959) and, more tentatively, by Elisabeth Tooker (1964: 3).

In 1894 William Beauchamp made a strenuous effort to identify the inhabitants of Hochelaga as Mohawk. Beauchamp noted an apparent dearth of prehistoric sites in the historic tribal territory of the Mohawk and decided that they must have come directly from the St. Lawrence Valley in the latter half of the sixteenth century. As Wilson did for the Huron, Beauchamp claimed that the artifacts from historic Mohawk sites are very similar to those from the Dawson site, but the claim was not based on a detailed comparison of the material in question. The main driving force behind his claims remained the accounts of Lafitau and Perrot.

In 1899 W. D. Lighthall proposed a variation on the Laurentian hypothesis. He was impressed by Hale's evidence concerning the morphological similarities between the Huron and Mohawk languages, but did not accept Hale's conclusion that these groups had a common origin on the St. Lawrence. Beauchamp had argued that the Mohawk were relative newcomers to New York State. On the other hand, the Jesuit Relations reported that the Huron had said they lived on the shores of Georgian Bay for at least two centuries prior to the arrival of the French. Lighthall considered it significant that no claim of similar antiquity was made by any other tribes, to his knowledge.- He therefore suggested that the northern Iroquoian peoples had originated in Huronia and that some of them had moved eastward and settled in the St. Lawrence Valley to become the historic Mohawk. Structurally this theory is little different from the Laurentian hypothesis. It assumes dendritic-migratory cultural development and locates the origin of the northern Iroquoian-speaking peoples within the area they occupied in historic times. The Laurentian hypothesis proposed the St. Lawrence Valley as the original home of the Iroquoians, because some of them were found living there at the time of Cartier's arrival but not later. Lighthall proposed Huronia because of the native tradition of its long occupancy.

The Laurentian and Huronia hypotheses are also alike in that both are based on a processual model that assumes similarities

between closely related cultures to be an archaic residue from a time when the possessors of these cultures constituted a single people. Differences between them are seen arising as a result of internal development that occurred after the subsequent dispersal of this people and their breaking up into a number of tribal entities. The principal role played by migration in these two theories was to provide the dispersal needed to initiate cultural differentiation.

The procedural models underlying both of these hypotheses assigned a high value to fragmentary historical accounts and to native traditions, or what were believed to be native traditions, as sources of information about the past. Hale clearly realized that this was being done in the absence of evidence of more reliable sort, but many other writers displayed much less self-awareness. It is clear that for the most part archaeological and linguistic evidence was being treated not as independent sources of information about Iroquoian prehistory but as material that could be used to round out or provide confirmation of reconstructions of Iroquoian prehistory that were based on history and folklore. In other words at that time history and folklore occupied much the same dominant position in the study of Iroquoian prehistory that archaeological evidence does today. It is, however, perhaps symptomatic of the undeveloped nature of prehistory at that time that no effort was made to synthesize the various traditions about Iroquoian origins or to survey these traditions in a systematic fashion; each scholar seemed to sustain a pet theory based on some limited amount of evidence which he then proceeded to defend against all comers. In part, this may reflect the difficulties scholars encountered in gaining access to much of the early documentation about Iroquoian culture, most of which was not easily available. It also reflects the regionalism then prevailing in Iroquoian studies.

The Laurentian and Huronia hypotheses were quickly abandoned around the turn of the century. In particular, this abandonment involved a rejection of the procedural models on which these theories were based. Their rejection amounted to a real revolution in thinking about Iroquoian origins; a revolution that is the more striking because it involved little discussion and no general explanation was given for it. Nevertheless, there seems to have been a growing consensus that scanty historical sources and native traditions, often of doubtful authority or unknown origin, did not constitute an adequate basis for the reconstruction of Iroquoian prehistory.

It is significant, however, that for the first time some thought was given to the role of origin myths in Iroquoian culture and the Iroquoian attitude towards history in general. Hitherto, such kinds of data had been accepted, without any questions being asked about the role they played in the native culture. In 1916 Parker (pp. 480-481) devoted several paragraphs to discussing the

Iroquois view of history. In the most important of these he observed:

"The writer at one time showed some of the Lafitau drawings of Iroquoian villages to a Seneca Indian, who was a tribal authority on the modern religious ceremonies of his tribe. "Our people never lived that way," he said. In this it is seen that the Iroquois of today have totally forgotten their early fortifications and architecture, although Cusick in 1825 wrote of "forts". Of another native authority the writer asked the date when the Iroquois confederacy originated. "With the teachings of our great ancestor, Handsome Lake, I think," he replied. Then he added after hesitation, "No, it was before that, I remember now it was in the time of Dekanawideh." In these answers, incorrect or uncertain as they are, may be found material for serious consideration. They point out two men with whose names are linked two distinct periods of cultural revolution. Each blotted out the memory of a former period. The people of each period systematically forgot the history of the preceding periods. Today the Iroquois of New York base nearly all their tribal ceremonies on the doctrines of Handsome Lake, who flourished between 1800 and 1815.

Here Parker stated something that should have been noted long before: that the Iroquois and Iroquoian prehistorians were not interested in the same kind of history. For the Iroquois, "history" was a guide to the social, political and moral order in which they lived; to the latter it was a literal account of what had happened in the past. Clearly "history" that has been created to satisfy the first aim cannot be used uncritically to satisfy the second. The pattern of passing on council names from one office holder to the next and their lack of interest in genealogies indicate a rejection among the Iroquoian-speaking peoples of history in the European sense.

Seen in this light, it becomes obvious why when Morgan wished to describe the history of the Five Nations, he chose to rely on the Perrot-Colden tradition rather than on information supplied by his Iroquois informants. It also explains why, by the late nineteenth century, the Iroquois were unaware that they had formerly lived in fortified villages or why Peter Clarke did not seem to know that his people had ever been more numerous or lived differently than they did after they were driven from the shores of Lake Huron by the Iroquois in 1649. Indeed, there are few better illustrations of the incapacity of the folklore of certain groups to preserve accurate traditions over a relatively short period of time. The tacit realization of this and a growing conviction that the study of traditions from an historical point of view had reached a point of diminishing returns seems to have killed the northern theories of Iroquoian origins.



## ETHNOLOGICALLY-BASED THEORIES

A new direction to speculations about Iroquoian origins seems to have been initiated by a growing awareness of the linguistic affiliations between the northern Iroquoian languages and Cherokee. Similarities between the two had been recognised as early as 1798 by Barton. Horatio Hale gave formal expression to his belief in a genetic affinity between Cherokee and Iroquois in 1883 and in 1891 Cherokee was classified as an Iroquoian language by J. W. Powell in Indian Linguistic Families of America North of Mexico. Thus advances in the field of linguistics had the effect of enlarging the frame of reference for Iroquoian studies.

The foundations for a new theory of Iroquoian origins were laid in the last decade of the nineteenth century. In 1894, Beau-champ (p. 62), still much influenced by the procedural models of the past, noted that certain Iroquoian traditions seemed to indicate a western origin, but he chose to disregard them. Later, he seems to have postulated a southern origin for Iroquoian culture, although he did not publish his ideas. The record of them is preserved in Lighthall's (1899: 200) mention of some letters Beauchamp had written him.

In 1904 the main principles of the southern hypothesis were spelled out by H. M. Lloyd in his annotations to a new addition of Morgan's The League of the Iroquois. Lloyd did not see the Northeast as a suitable place of origin for an agricultural people and he rejected Morgan's suggestion that the Iroquois had learned about agriculture from the Adirondack, whom he describes as "mere hunters and fishers". The Iroquois, in his opinion were more likely to have learned about agriculture from tribes such as the Illinois, Powhatan or Ottawa. (6) Lloyd suggested that the Iroquoians had originated in the vicinity of Puget Sound. He gave no reason for choosing this area, but perhaps it was because the tribes there had matrilineal clans; according to Morgan such resemblances are an indication of common origin. (7) From there the Iroquoians wandered east and somewhere in the Mississippi Valley they learned about agriculture and how to build permanent villages. At that point the Cherokee split off from the rest. The Onondaga, Oneida, Mohawk and Huron migrated north of Lake Erie,

(6) Early in the seventeenth century, the latter grew corn along the shore of Georgian Bay.

(7) It should be noted that in 1869 Morgan himself postulated that the Columbia River region with its rich salmon resources was a possible place for the expansion of Indian population.

while the Cayuga, Seneca and Erie settled south of the Great Lakes. Much of the rest of Lloyd's reconstruction is merely a variant of Lighthall's speculations, with some further elaborations. According to Lloyd, the Onondaga, Oneida and Mohawk continued to press for-ward along the north shore of Lake Ontario. At Kingston, the Onondaga turned south into New York State. The Mohawk, however, continued down the St. Lawrence as far as Quebec City, where they were found living when Cartier arrived. Other Indians from south-western Ontario, identified as Huron, settled at Hochelaga. After 1535, the Mohawk drove the Huron from Hochelaga and settled there themselves. With this as their capital, they ruled most of the St. Lawrence Valley. Their close friends, the Oneida, were already in contact with the Onondaga and by 1450 the Oneida, Onondaga, Cayuga and Seneca had formed the nucleus of the Iroquois confederacy. After this time there was a hunters' quarrel between the Hochelagan-Mohawks and the Algonkians and this led to a joint Huron-Algonkian attack on Hochelaga that forced its inhabitants to flee south and join the Iroquois confederacy about 1570.

Lloyd's speculation about a Mississippian origin for the Iroquois was stimulated by an attempt to account for new linguistic data. A new procedural trend can be seen in the growing use of ethnological data, particularly to back up his speculations about the earliest origins of the Iroquoian peoples. This tendency was to become increasingly strong in later studies. On the other hand, Lloyd continued to employ the dendritic-migratory model of Iroquoian development and by incorporating many generally accepted speculations about specific tribal origins he managed to produce a pseudo-history of unparalleled complexity. It is questionable how aware he was of the precise evidence on which these speculations had been built. After 1904, we note a tendency to treat as historical facts earlier speculations about the origin of specific tribes. Moreover, every effort was made to fit these various speculations into the currently accepted general framework of Iroquoian prehistory. Thus, while the outline of Iroquoian prehistory were changed, the local reconstructions remained intact, but like the elements in a kaleidoscope, they changed their individual relationship to one another to accommodate themselves to the new general theory. Through this process, which we may term incorporation, many old ideas about Iroquoian culture history not only managed to outlive their usefulness, but by being divorced from the procedural models that had created them, passed the point where they could be intelligently assessed or criticised.

In 1906 David Boyle espoused the southern hypothesis. He argued that there was nothing specific about Iroquoian culture to connect it with the north, while its rituals and agricultural practises definitely seemed to be southern. He suggested that the original home of these tribes was in Kentucky and southern Ohio.

Lloyd's theory inspired Parker's (1916) influential paper,

The Origin of the Iroquois as Suggested by their Archaeology. Parker noted that the theories of a northern origin were "not entirely without serious flaws". Many of the Five Nations' myths, particularly those that spoke of a tree "with long sword-like" leaves suggested a southern origin. He also noted that many features of Iroquois culture, such as the corn-beans-squash complex, the torture of prisoners and the distinction between civil and military chiefs seemed to come from the south. These, as well as a possible relationship between the Iroquoian and Caddoan languages Parker interpreted as evidence of a southern origin for the Iroquois. While he made an extensive review of Iroquoian archaeology, the main purpose of this review was to prove that Iroquoian culture had little time depth in the Northeast and showed few developmental trends. Assemblages that we now know were early Iroquoian were interpreted as mixtures of Iroquoian and Algonkian culture resulting from contacts between these two peoples.

Parker proposed to locate the ancestors of the Iroquoian family near the mouth of the Ohio River. Already they were agricultural, sedentary and had fortified villages. Gradually, they pushed their way up the Ohio Valley, the Cherokee leading the way. There they overcame the Mound Builders and acquired certain traits from them. Jealousies arose and the other Iroquoian tribes, along with their allies, the Delaware, drove the Cherokee across the Appalachians. Still raided by the Cherokee, the Huron and Neutral began to push their way into southwestern Ontario, while related groups fought their way along the north shore of Lake Ontario to the mouth of the St. Lawrence. Meanwhile the Erie, Seneca, Susquehannock and Tuscarora settled south of the Great Lakes. For a time all of the groups along the St. Lawrence had their headquarters near Montreal. Soon, however, the Onondaga moved south into Jefferson County. Adirondack raids forced the Mohawk, Oneida and Onondaga to form a league, which later took in the Seneca and Cayuga. The principal differences between Lloyd and Parker are their views concerning the steps involved in the formation of the Iroquois confederacy. These are matters of a totally speculative nature, that were in no way capable of resolution within the framework the two men were using.

Parker was careful to point out that he regarded his theory as a "working hypothesis ... for the benefit of further discussion". Without any further documentation, however, it was soon accepted as a valid framework for the interpretation of Iroquoian culture history. By 1919, R. B. Orr (pp. 13-17) was expressing the opinion that the northern hypothesis never had any solid evidence to back it up and claimed that it was based entirely on the fact that Cartier had found Iroquoian-speakers in the St. Lawrence Valley early in the sixteenth century. For almost thirty years the southern hypothesis was to remain the dominant theory of Iroquoian origins.

The most important theoretical exposition to be written during these years was William N. Fenton's (1940) Problems Arising from the Historic Northeastern Position of the Iroquois. Although Fenton was not certain that the northern Iroquoian-speaking peoples had ever lived in the Southeast, he argued that the principal features of their culture, such as clans, moieties, town councils and community-centered agricultural rituals, were not only fundamental to Iroquoian culture but also its oldest attributes. North-ern features, such as shamanistic curing societies and birchbark canoes, were seen as a thin veneer of culture that had been acquired after the Iroquoians had arrived in their historical homeland. While Fenton went to considerable lengths to stress continuing diffusion as one means by which traits of southeastern origin were transmitted to the Iroquois, even in historic times, the principal model that is implicit in his thinking is a dendritic-migratory one.

It is thus clear that the processual model that underlay the southern hypothesis was the same one that previously had been associated with the Laurentian and Huronia hypotheses. The various northern Iroquoian cultures of historic times continued to be viewed as derived from the breakup of a single Ur-culture which contained the basic features that had remained common to all Iroquoian cultures in later times. What had changed was the idea about the original homeland of this Ur-culture. Growing awareness of the status of Cherokee as an Iroquoian language and of the features that the Iroquoian and southeastern cultures had in common turned scholars' eyes away from the frozen north as a cradle of Iroquoian culture and towards the south, exposed as it was to 'Mesoamerican influences.

What did change when the southern hypothesis was introduced was the procedural model that was used. Although traditions continued to be cited in support of various theories, the main evidence that was produced to support the new reconstructions of Iroquoian culture history was ethnological. The archaeological evidence, insofar as it was used, was interpreted in terms of a migratory model. Sites were assigned either to the Iroquoians or to the Algonkian peoples who were presumed to have preceded them in the Northeast. These two groups of cultures were believed to be clearly distinct; creating a sharp break in the archaeological record that was bridged only by a few sites in which a "mixed culture" occurred. The goals of Iroquoian archaeology were seen as being to prove that the Iroquoian occupation of the Northeast had a shallow time depth during which very little culture change had taken place. The close similarities between historic and pre-historic Iroquoian sites was a common theme. This was interpreted to indicate that little cultural change had taken place since the Iroquoians had arrived in the Northeast and in fact served to rule out an interest in in situ changes in Iroquoian culture. For the most part, the archaeological record of the Iroquoian occupation

of the Northeast was considered sufficiently well-known that for a considerable period archaeologists switched their interest to the pre-Iroquoian "Algonkian cultures" of the region. This was especially true in New York State. There, the very important work of William A. Ritchie did, however, provide the basis for a reinterpretation of the culture history of the whole region once the southern hypothesis was abandoned.

The real failure of the archaeological data in terms of the southern hypothesis was to provide evidence of the original homeland of the Iroquoians and of the routes by which they had arrived in the Northeast. It was hoped, however, that work farther south would eventually provide the solutions to these problems. Meanwhile, the greatest source of support for the southern hypothesis was found in the realm of ethnology. Those features of Iroquoian culture that resembled traits in the Southeast were judged to constitute the oldest and basic substratum of northern Iroquoian culture; traits that were clearly of Northeastern origin were judged to be recent accretions of a superficial nature. A similar approach was adopted for explaining similarities and differences between the historic Iroquoian and non-Iroquoian cultures of the Northeast. The Iroquoian features of Delaware culture, for example, generally were explained as a product of recent cultural diffusion. Conversely the northern riverine adaptation of the Iroquoian that Cartier had encountered around Quebec City was seen as resulting from the collapse of Iroquoian culture in an inhospitable northern environment (Fenton 1940: 172, 167). Without a careful control over the temporal dimension, which only archaeological data can provide, such speculations were entirely reasonable; unfortunately, they also remained completely inconclusive.

The southern hypothesis also lent support to a special brand of interpretation of historic intertribal relationships in the Northeast. The northern Iroquoians were seen as being intrusive. All disputes between Algonkian and Iroquoian-speaking groups were interpreted as being occasioned by Algonkian efforts to regain their lost territory (Hunt 1940: 15-16). There was even suspicion that the Huron trade with the northern Algonkians was an act of "treason" that had led to their war with the Iroquois. Speculations of this sort were indulged in in spite of the fact that in early historic times warfare among the Iroquoians was at least as common as it was between Algonkian and Iroquoian-speaking groups.

The period in which the southern hypothesis was dominant was the one in which ethnological data played a key role in thinking about the past. Oral traditions, linguistic evidence and archaeological findings were made use of in so far as they tended to confirm speculations based on ethnological data. The southern hypothesis remained conservative inasmuch as it was based on a view of cultural processes identical to that on which previous hypotheses had been based. It therefore managed to incorporate

into the new reconstruction of Iroquoian culture history large numbers of theories about specific tribes and their history that had been arrived at previously. Ultimately, however, the theory was beneficial because the ethnological speculations that were related to it began to prompt a closer and more critical examination of the processual model on which it had been constructed.

### AN ARCHAEOLOGICALLY—BASED THEORY

If the concept of migration had long been part of the stock-in-trade of culture historians; the concept of diffusion was scarcely less so. Indeed, the two concepts have been closely linked in anthropological theorizing and it was unlikely that even when one of them was preferred for speculating about the culture history of a particular region, this speculation would go on forever without the other concept being considered. Parker clearly believed that an original Iroquoian culture had become fragmented into tribal divisions, but he also noted, very perspicaciously, that much of the unity of Iroquoian culture since that time must have been maintained by the communication that existed among the various tribes. In 1916 (pp. 480-81) he came close to formulating something approaching the in situ theory of Iroquoian cultural development:

"650 years ago, might not Iroquois art and artifacts have been different? Or, if there were no Iroquois in this region then, might they not have had differently decorated pottery, for example, when they came than that which later developed and is known as Iroquoian?"

Unfortunately, Parker was firmly committed to the dendritic-migratory model and he did not pursue the important implications of this observation. In 1940, however, Fenton stressed the importance of diffusion in the development of at least some aspects of Iroquoian culture. These suggestions that internal development and diffusion might have had a role in the development of Iroquoian culture independently of migration played an important part in preparing Iroquoianists to accept a new model of Iroquoian cultural evolution.

Thus in 1944 the field was ready for James B. Griffin's proposal that the Iroquoian peoples had been living in the Northeast for a longer period than prehistorians had hitherto believed and that the historic Iroquoian cultures of the Northeast might have developed out of the so-called pre-Iroquoian cultures in that region. The main thrust of Griffin's argument was for the first time an archaeological one; namely, that no evidence of the antecedents of Iroquoian culture had been found anywhere in the Southeast or traces of migration routes in the Ohio Valley or

elsewhere. Under these circumstances, it became reasonable to enquire if there were not antecedents for Iroquoian culture in the Northeast itself. Griffin suggested that Iroquoian culture developed in some fashion out of the Hopewell complex of the Middle Woodland period. According to Griffin, the Iroquoians probably migrated north at this time and developed a regional variant of Hopewellian culture from which the historic Iroquoian cultures were derived. The same year, Bertram Krause (1944) published a paper entitled Acculturation, a New Approach to the Iroquoian Problem. This paper stressed more strongly than ever before the role of diffusion in the development of Iroquoian culture, although it stopped short of explicitly rejecting the dendritic-migratory model. One of the most interesting substantive contributions of this paper was its emphasis upon the cultural continuity from Uren times through to the historic period in the section of Ontario directly north of Lake Erie. In 1952 Russell Harper proposed an evolutionary sequence for the development of Iroquoian culture in the historic Huron region. Unfortunately, Harper's conclusions were overshadowed by Ridley's (1952a; 1952b) suggestion that the population associated with the prehistoric Lalonde culture, which developed in Huronia out of a Uren and Webb (Middleport) base, expanded to give rise first to the eastern tribes of the Iroquois and later to the historic Seneca, Erie and Neutral, as well as to the Huron themselves.

This theory of Ridley was a revival or recreation of Light-hall's Huronia hypothesis. Like earlier work, it was based on a dendritic-migratory view of Iroquoian cultural development, even if archaeological evidence had now replaced native traditions or ethnological trait distributions as the cornerstone of his documentation. Ridley clearly was protesting the effort to attribute a migratory origin to Huron culture and rightly insisted that proper attention should be paid to the archaeological evidence of unbroken cultural development in Huronia. Unfortunately, he did not extend a similar concern to the archaeological record of other regions. The result was a Huronia-centered migration theory of Iroquoian origins rather than a contribution to the in situ theory.

The honor for establishing upon a firm basis what has come to be called the in situ hypothesis clearly belongs to Richard S. MacNeish and his publication Iroquois Pottery Types (1952). In this study MacNeish concentrated on demonstrating that the pottery types associated with all the historic northern Iroquoian peoples could be shown to have evolved from local Middle Woodland antecedents. MacNeish concluded that during the Owasco period, which he dated c. A.D. 600-1100, a more or less homogeneous Point Peninsula culture gave rise to four regional subdivisions. This he felt, represented, the primary differentiation of the proto-Iroquoians into tribal units. The most easterly regional variant (represented by the Wickham, Castle Creek and Bainbridge sites) was probably

ancestral Mohawk, while the related north-central variant (Pillar Point and Calkins Farm) seemed to be ancestral Onondaga-Oneida. In western New York State the Levanna to Canandaigua sequence apparently gave rise to Cayuga and Seneca, while in Ontario an Owasco variant produced the ancestral Neutral-Erie and Huron cultures.

Basic to MacNeish's theory was the rejection of the processual model of migration that had dominated Iroquoian studies up to this time. In place of it, Iroquoian culture was seen developing as a cultural horizon among people already living in the Northeast. The various cultural features that the northern Iroquoian peoples had in common in historic times were perhaps to a small degree an archaic residue from the Point Peninsula culture, but the most distinctive features of the Iroquoian culture pattern were the result of shared common development at a later date. Through pottery types, MacNeish felt able to trace the development of local groups, each of which was represented by local traditions within this field of shared cultural development. Probably because of his concentration on pottery types, MacNeish chose to stress local continua of development rather than the interconnections between different Iroquoian groups. The result was a model that rejected migration and stressed local development, leaving open the further question of the relative importance of the roles played by on-the-spot innovation and diffusion. This procedure was, of course, perfectly reasonable in view of the need to counteract the view that migration was the primary explanation of cultural differences among the various northern Iroquoian groups.

MacNeish's theory also effected a major change in procedural models. Archaeological evidence for the first time had come to play a key role in the interpretation of Iroquoian prehistory. The answers it provided were not only clear, but revolutionary. Moreover, the Iroquoian archaeology of the Northeast was far from exhausted. Additional fieldwork could simultaneously test MacNeish's general theory and refine its specific details. No theory of Iroquoian culture history up to this time had the power to generate so much new data capable of testing it on its own grounds. The result was a renaissance of Iroquoian archaeology.

#### CRITIQUE

The vitality of the in situ theory is shown by the amount of research and thinking that it has generated over the past sixteen years. It should also be noted that all the archaeological findings during this period have served to strengthen rather than weaken it as a general model for Iroquoian prehistory. It is not surprising that various modifications in detail have been made to MacNeish's original reconstruction during this period. Among these



is the growing recognition that the historic Oneida and Mohawk cultures are more closely related than are the Oneida and Onondaga ones. It is not my purpose, however, to discuss revisions of a purely descriptive or historical sort for their own sake. Instead I wish to investigate some of the theoretical implications of the in situ model itself.

#### CHARACTERISTICS OF THE IN SITU THEORY

(a) An anti-migratory bias.

The first and most obvious feature of the theory of Iroquoian in situ development is that it is based on a model of cultural development that minimizes the importance of migration as a source of culture change. Iroquoian culture is viewed as having evolved amidst populations that were resident in the Northeast at an earlier period. No sudden incursions of new populations are seen as having occurred during the course of this development, nor are such incursions postulated as being in any way necessary to explain the record of cultural development as we now understand it. While individual Iroquoians undoubtedly moved from tribe to tribe and while there is historic evidence of intermarriage between Iroquoians and neighbouring Algonkians peoples, the resulting gene flow was gradual and the cultural implications of this behavior were not such as to disrupt local sequences of development. The in situ theory thus rejects any major connection between movements of people and cultural development in the Northeast during the period of Iroquoian cultural development.

It should be noted that this rejection of a migratory model by Iroquoianists follows a more general trend in archaeology. Since 1945 there has been growing disillusionment with migratory explanations of cultural change in different parts of the world and an effort has been made to perceive evidence of continuous cultural development in different regions. In a striking number of cases it has been found that an impression of discontinuity in the archaeological record has, in fact, resulted from a lack of sufficient archaeological data. The migratory model encouraged the acceptance of such gaps as having an historical reality and interpreting them as evidence of cultural discontinuities. Today a model of continuous local cultural development encourages archaeologists to seek to fill-in apparent cultural gaps. Efforts to do this frequently meet with success and serve to eliminate false discontinuities from the archaeological record; where these efforts fail, they are nevertheless useful because they help to confirm that the originally postulated migration has taken place. Hence a growing number of archaeologists are taking the stand that one should assume continuous local development unless evidence to the contrary can be produced. Considerations of this sort underly the very stringent rules that Rouse (1958) has proposed for con-firming that a postulated migration has taken place. The initial

assumption of continuous development thus becomes a procedural model of growing importance.

The effects of this re-orientation can be seen in recent archaeological studies and interpretations of archaeological findings in the Northeast. A growing number of archaeologists now attempt to invoke the minimal amount of movement necessary to explain Iroquoian cultural development. This has been particularly successful in New York State where the outlines of archaeological sequence leading to the historic Mohawk, Seneca and Onondaga are being traced in the general vicinity of their historic tribal territory. Efforts along these lines are encouraging archaeologists to re-examine, and where possible to eliminate, the last vestiges of the migratory hypothesis that became incorporated into MacNeish's reconstruction of Iroquoian prehistory. MacNeish saw the early Ontario Iroquoian culture developing along the north shore of Lake Erie, with the Huron and Petun migrating northward by way of the Toronto region some-time after A.D. 1530. This reconstruction has now been rejected in favor of one that views the Uren and Middleport cultures (A.D. 1300-1400) as covering most of southern Ontario west of Kingston, with the Huron-Petun and Neutral-Erie cultures crystallizing out of the latter more-or-less in their historic tribal areas. The various movements of population that are now countenanced in Ontario are those of some of the Huron tribes north from the Toronto area and west out of the Trent Valley into historic Huronia and a drift of the Neutral population eastward. It should be noted that the precise routes followed in these micromigrations have not yet been worked out in detail.

A second feature of the elder migratory reconstructions of Iroquoian prehistory that MacNeish incorporated into his in situ theory was the belief that some of the historic eastern Iroquois tribes were descended from groups that had been living in the St. Lawrence Valley as late as the sixteenth century. Using archaeological data, MacNeish (1952: 71) showed conclusively that the Mohawk were not involved in these migrations as earlier writers had assumed on the basis of alleged native traditions. However, he suggested that the Onondaga or Oneida were, although he provided no evidence of migration routes to back up this suggestion (pp. 71-72). Recent work seems to indicate that at least a major portion of the Onondaga and Oneida developed in situ in or near their historic tribal territories (Tuck 1968). More-over, recent work in the St. Lawrence Valley is producing evidence of a long, apparently unbroken sequence of development in that area. There is growing evidence of cultural variation in different parts of the valley and this suggests that more than one group of people, perhaps several Iroquoian-speaking tribes, lived in this area. Thus it becomes necessary to consider as an alternative hypothesis that the cultural similarities between the St. Lawrence Iroquoian culture or cultures and the so-called Onondaga one may

be attributable to diffusion rather than to ethnic identity. This is especially so because of the very general nature of the comparisons that have been made so far between the material culture associated with these two groups. MacNeish's comparisons, in particular, were based on small samples and in his effort to arrange sites into developmental sequences, temporal factors were emphasized at the expense of giving detailed consideration to regional variations. It is also worth noting that none of the evidence produced to date for the St. Lawrence Valley suggests either a rapid advance of "Laurentian Iroquois" culture down the St. Lawrence around A.D. 1100 or its retreat into New York State after 1535 (Trigger 1968). In another paper (Trigger 1962a) I have suggested that the Iroquoian inhabitants of the St. Lawrence Valley may have disappeared as a result of tribal conflicts that arose over the fur trade in the course of the sixteenth century, much as the Huron, Neutral and Erie did a century later. While refugees from these groups may have joined other tribes, the desire to derive some historic tribal entity in toto from the St. Lawrence Iroquoians seems to be an over-zealous application of the direct historical approach. The effective disappearance of an entire people or group of peoples through the death and wide dispersal of their members could have happened as easily in the sixteenth century as it did in the seventeenth. While much more work must be done on the Iroquoian cultures of the St. Lawrence Valley before the history of this region becomes clear, it is worth remembering that the commonly accepted interpretation of the fate of these cultures is a relatively uncritical incorporation into the in situ theory of a culture historical reconstruction that was originally part of the Laurentian hypothesis.

(b) An anti-dendritic, pro-diffusionary bias.

In the Laurentian and southern hypotheses the dendritic model of cultural development was closely linked with the migratory one. In Iroquois Pottery Types, MacNeish did not attempt to examine in detail the implications of the rejection of the migratory model for understanding the general processes of Iroquoian cultural development. Indeed, in spite of certain references to the role of diffusion, it is clear from *MacNeish's* reconstruction of Iroquoian prehistory that he implicitly accepted a dendritic model of cultural development. MacNeish conceived of the various Iroquoian ceramic complexes of historic times as being the product of gradual changes in the course of *which*, by Owasco times, a more-or-less uniform Point Peninsula culture had given rise to a limited number of regional traditions, which in turn differentiated to produce the still larger number of tribal cultures that were encountered in historic times.

Until recently, relatively little concern has been expressed about this aspect of MacNeish's theoretical framework. However, a considerable advance in the overall conceptualization of Iroquoian prehistory was made in James V. Wright's (1966) The Ontario

Iroquois Tradition. Wright made convergence an essential aspect of his reconstruction of Iroquoian cultural development in Ontario and, as we shall see, also made ample provision for diffusion in his overall model of Iroquoian cultural development. Nevertheless, in his formal nomenclature he continues to adhere to a dendritic model. Wright conceives of Iroquoian prehistory in terms of three traditions that give rise to the Mohawk-Oneida-Onondaga; Seneca-Cayuga-Susquehannock; and the Neutral-Erie-Huron-Petun tribes respectively. Wright's reconstruction differs significantly from that of MacNeish in that it makes no attempt to trace these traditions back to a common source.

MacNeish's version of the in situ theory tended to assume that once tribal groups were formed, they remained isolated from one another, as a result of either geographical or cultural factors, and that the primary source of change was innovation within each group. Thus local innovation eventually led to the cultural differentiation of one group from another. Change was consequently primarily a process of differentiation. A local innovation model of this narrowly conceived variety is clearly a variant of the diverging or dendritic model of cultural process and is better suited to describing the cultural differentiation of expanding and migrating groups of people than it is for analysing the development of a cultural horizon. The identification of the in situ theory with such a processual model has caused Iroquoian ethnologists the greatest difficulty in sharing the archaeologists' enthusiasm for it. As we shall see, innovation that brings about local changes was only one of the forces at work bringing about northern Iroquoian cultural development.

The most obvious weakness of a too great reliance upon a local innovation model is its assumption that for the most part, traits that are widespread and are shared by a number of different, although historically related, peoples tend to be older than traits that are specific to individual groups of peoples. In terms of what ethnologists know about Iroquoian culture, this assumption appears to be patently false. Basic and common features of most Iroquoian cultures, such as their agricultural system, longhouses, fortified villages, warfare patterns and political system, as well as archaeological traits such as globular cooking pots with incised decoration are not all of equal antiquity nor are they likely to have been re-invented independently by each of the Iroquoian-speaking tribes. The geographical proximity of these tribes makes the latter process highly unlikely. It is clear that while in the early stages of the development of the in situ theory diffusion was not emphasized as an important concept; given the in situ theory, diffusion is essential to explain northern Iroquoian cultural development.

While historic northern Iroquoian culture may be seen as having developed out of a more-or-less similar Middle Woodland

socioeconomic milieu, very little of the unity of Iroquoian culture that has so impressed the ethnologists can be described as archaic residue. Most of these common features appear to be the result of shared development in later times, in the same sense that European industrial civilization is a product of common development involving many ethnic groups. The key to this shared development is, of course, diffusion; both of traits invented by the northern Iroquoian peoples from one tribe to another and of ideas from outside, particularly from the south, into the Iroquoian culture area. Once this is admitted, our very concept of an Iroquoian culture pattern requires modification. Although the northern Iroquoian languages may have facilitated the flow of ideas from one group to another, the spread and acceptance of new ideas need not necessarily have affected all Iroquoian groups to the same degree nor was their spread restricted to Iroquoian-speakers. After all, the Pueblo culture pattern in the South-west was shared by a number of tribes speaking several wholly unrelated languages (Byers 1961). It is clear that some Algonkian tribes living nearby were active participants in the development of certain features of Iroquoian culture rather than merely the beneficiaries of what was happening among the Iroquoian-speakers (MacNeish 1952: 74). Mohawk and Mahican pottery appears to have diverged from a common ancestor no less than Susquehannock and Cayuga (Witthoft 1959: 39) and the diffusion of pottery styles from the Susquehannock to the Munsee, or from the Huron to the Algonkians of the upper Great Lakes region, was probably a process little different from that which took place between any two Iroquoian tribes.

Under these conditions, a new interpretation of the fishing and hunting orientation of the Iroquoians that Cartier encountered in the vicinity of Quebec City becomes possible. This group, which seems to have had a basic subsistence pattern little different from that of adjacent Algonkian-speaking peoples used to be described as having "adapted themselves toward an Algonkian type of hunting and fishing economy, although they had taken maize agriculture as far northeast as Quebec" (Fenton 1940: 172). Today, they can alternatively be viewed as an Iroquoian group that had not accepted the more complex patterns of intensive agriculture that mark their neighbours to the southwest. Only archaeological data will be able to resolve which of these two views is the correct one. Nevertheless, if we accept the full implications of the in situ theory, it is no more surprising to find Iroquoian-speaking peoples who did not participate in important phases of so-called Iroquoian cultural development than it is to find Algonkian-speakers who did. The main point to remember is that we are dealing with the cultural development of a region; a development in which linguistic affinities are only one factor affecting communication, interaction and common development.

(c) The independent study of individual cultural traits

The migratory approach to Iroquoian culture history encouraged the study of the development of archaeological cultures as wholes. Linguistic and cultural differences were all seen as resulting from a single process; the ethnic differentiation of an originally homogeneous population. However, once diffusion is recognized as playing an important role in Iroquoian cultural development, it becomes necessary to examine the history of each attribute of Iroquoian culture separately from the rest. It is impossible from an a priori point of view to predict what the diffusion pattern of one trait will be from that of another. This kind of approach is supplementary to the study of the development of cultural wholes, but is an essential one if we are to gain an understanding of Iroquoian culture history that is in harmony with our understanding of the cultural processes that have molded the Iroquoian way of life. The tendency to study the development of cultural assemblages at the expense of individual items of culture has been all the greater because most Iroquoian archaeologists have concentrated their work in one particular region. The effect of this has been an undue emphasis on the peculiar characteristics of each region and a lack of awareness of the characteristics that these regions share in common (Ritchie 1961: 27).

MacNeish (1952: 73) drew attention to this problem when he noted the occurrence of all the so-called "Mohawk" pottery types in the "Onondaga-Oneida series". He described this as an example of "intra-cultural influence". It seems clear to me that if we are to understand Iroquoian prehistory in a realistic manner, growing attention must be paid to mapping the distribution of individual attributes of Iroquoian archaeological culture at different points in time. In this way we should be able to learn much about the origin and diffusion of individual traits throughout the Northeast. In particular, investigation of the origin and spread of pottery attributes seems to me to be of special value at this time.

The relationship between this kind of study and more traditional studies of the development of particular cultural assemblages is analogous to the relationship between Wellentheorie and "family tree" studies in linguistics. There, the study of the influences that adjacent languages and dialects have upon one another is seen not as conflicting with, but rather as being complementary to, the study of the genetic relationship between different languages. Moreover, no conflict is seen between tracing the gradients in particular traits from one language to another and tracing the development and divergence of whole languages.

Utilising a diffusionary model, one would predict that groups that lived near one another for considerable lengths of time would tend to have more traits in common than would groups separated by greater distances. There is growing evidence that archaeologists

recognize this to be the case. For example, James V. Wright (1966: 3) has recently suggested that:

"The pattern of relationships among the Iroquoian tribes of the Northeast appears to be almost circular, and the resulting cultural interplay relegates . . . postulated (regional) traditions to the role of taxonomic tools . . . For example . . . the Seneca possess a closer relationship to neighbouring Ontario Iroquoi(an) 'Tradition members than do either the Cayuga or the Susquehannock. Both of the latter tribes, on the other hand, reflect closer relationships to the Mohawk-Onondaga-Oneida Tradition than does the Seneca tribe."

If population movements in the Northeast have been minimal since about A.D. 500, cultural differences should by and large follow clines of variation, rather than there being sharp breaks. Where this is not the case, special factors, either geographical or cultural, must be sought out. For the most part clinal variation seems to prevail. It does not appear to be an accident that the two poles of Iroquoian cultural variation can be represented by the Huron and Mohawk cultures respectively, with the approximation of other cultures to these two types being largely a function of distance. In early times, when Iroquoian settlement was more widely and thinly distributed, clinal variation seems to have been even more gradual. This suggests that as we move further into the past, the boundaries between cultures, which in historic times are generally well-defined because of the tendency of closely related sites to be grouped together in well-defined clusters, may become increasingly arbitrary and their definitions increasingly heuristic.

The implications of the acceptance of a diffusionary model of cultural development and a clear recognition of the culture historical independence of many traits are of enormous importance to the study of Iroquoian prehistory. This is true even when the history of different attributes of pottery decoration is being studied. It is more true, however, when we consider cultural traits belonging to different major areas of culture. It is important to remember that most of the studies of Iroquoian cultural development to date have been based on potsherds. The reason for this is clear; pottery is the most ubiquitous item that is recovered in the archaeological record. Moreover, because it was manufactured by women, traditions may have tended to be handed down in particular family lines. As a result, similarities in pottery styles generally tend to reflect the ongoing traditions of local groups and are useful for tracing these groups through time. The general conservatism of Iroquoian pottery increases the utility of pottery for this objective.

However, the conservatism of Iroquoian pottery raises another question. Pottery is prominent in the archaeological record, but what role did it play in Iroquoian culture? Iroquoian vessels have

only one functional form and although they were declining in importance in early historic times as a result of the introduction of the copper kettle, the early ethnographic records suggest that even in prehistoric times they were not a focus of intense cultural interest. The conservatism of Iroquoian pottery may well be a reflection of its humble status in the eyes of its makers. In a recent survey of Huron ethnography I have found that in areas of the culture that were foci of cultural interest, such as ritual, there was not only a great deal of innovation but also a considerable borrowing of traits from other tribes (Trigger n.d.). It seems to be a mistake to assume that all areas of Iroquoian culture were as conservative or as relatively impervious to outside influences as was pottery. The fact that pottery styles did diffuse suggests that the rate of diffusion in other areas of culture may have been much higher. Cultural convergence resulting from such diffusion may explain the high degree of similarity that ethnologists note in areas of Huron culture such as clan structure, government and religious beliefs and practises. Archaeological evidence of the rapid spread of types of artifacts that seem to have been more highly valued than cooking pots can be seen in the swift adoption of a wide range of new pipe styles in Ontario in Middleport times. According to Wright (1966: 63) this pipe complex appears suddenly in a well-defined form and with no evidence that it evolved out of earlier Uren styles. It appears likely that this pipe complex was derived from the eastern Iroquois tradition. Further work on other areas of Iroquoian archaeological culture may help to modify and enrich the view of Iroquoian cultural development that has been gained from pottery.

A diffusionary approach also calls into question efforts to characterize certain phases of Iroquoian cultural development as being ones of convergence or of divergence. Such terms are useful only in relationship to particular items of culture. Looking at Iroquoian culture as a whole and including non-archaeological as well as archaeological traits, the growth of this culture complex can be described as one of parallel development among different groups; with parallelisms largely resulting from diffusion. In so far as diffusion was not strong enough to obliterate local traditions, Iroquoian cultural development meets some of the criteria of a co-tradition (Wright 1966: 100). Nevertheless the growth of confederacies and the tendency, best illustrated among the Huron, for larger numbers of people to live in closer proximity to one another and to interact more closely suggests that the basic trend in Iroquoian culture was one of convergence. Thus we reach a point where our view of the reason for the close similarities among the Iroquoian tribes is the exact opposite of Father Lalemant's. Lalemant regarded these similarities as an archaic residue and attributed the differences among the various tribes to changes that had occurred after the Iroquoian peoples separated from one another. Today we attribute most of these features to convergent development among a group of indigenous and related peoples. In



discussing the Iroquoian populations of the Northeast, James A. Tuck (1969) has cogently argued that the branching model, often proposed to account for tribal divisions, seems better abandoned, at least in some cases, in favor of a model of village convergence or fusion.

(d) The rejection of a privileged status for archaeological data

Culture history, unlike linguistics, has not managed to devise techniques for making distinctions on theoretical grounds alone between cultural similarities resulting from convergent development and those that we have labelled archaic residue. To solve these problems we must rely upon the archaeological record. Because of this, however, it is often difficult to determine to what degree similarities in adjacent archaeological cultures may disguise ethnic diversity. Prior to the development of sizable agricultural communities, the Iroquoian population of the North-east appears to have been more evenly dispersed than it was in later times; so much so that the boundaries between some of the archaeological cultures that existed at that time may be delineated as clines than as sharp breaks. Under these circumstances it becomes particularly difficult to determine the boundaries of various ethnic and political divisions.

Some additional information about what went on in the past can be derived from linguistics. Speaking about New York State, Ritchie (1964: 299-300) has noted that as far as the archaeological evidence is concerned "tribal differentiation corresponding to historically recognized entities seems largely to have been a very late prehistoric phenomenon". Nevertheless, glottochronological evidence for the same region suggests that the Seneca, Cayuga and Oneida languages were effectively separate by sometime between A.D. 500 and 750. There is no reason to believe that linguistic criteria are not as meaningful an indication of what we loosely call "ethnic" differences as is archaeological evidence. At least some of the five Iroquois tribes appear to have been separate from one another prior to the development of the Owasco culture, although this does not mean that these tribal entities necessarily were recognised as such at the time. It is worth noting as well that not only do all three of these linguistic splits appear to ante-date the development of regional cultural traditions leading to historic tribes but also one of them separates the Seneca and Cayuga who are credited by archaeologists with sharing in the development of one of these traditions. To my mind, this dashes any hopes that a detailed accommodation can easily be found between the archaeological and linguistic data.

In Ontario, the linguistic situation is less clear. The five Iroquois languages all appear to be more closely related to each other than any of them is to Huron (Hoffman 1959). This suggests that one of the primary splits among the northern Iroquoian languages

may have been between the tribes living north and south of Lakes Erie and Ontario (with the Erie perhaps migrating south of Lake Erie at a later date). A glottochronological date for this split has unfortunately not yet been obtained. Huron and Neutral are implied by the Jesuits and by Huron folk-classifications to have been noticeably less different from one another than the Iroquois languages were from Huron. Nevertheless, the difficulty the Jesuits had learning Neutral (Thwaites 1896-1901, XX: 195) suggests that the separation of Huron and Neutral did not begin with the crystallization of the "Huron-Petun" and "Neutral-Erie" cultures out of the Middleport horizon about A.D. 1400. Possibly the Huron-Neutral linguistic distinction found expression in the contemporary Pickering and Glen Meyer cultures that preceded the Middle Ontario stage of Iroquoian culture development which began about A.D. 1300. It might also be noted that the Jesuits perceived what appear to be dialect differences among at least some of the Huron tribes. These appear to have formed when the Huron tribes were considerably more spread out in the region north of Lake Ontario than they were in historic times. Possibly at that period each of the Huron tribes lived in the middle of its own hunting territory, as the Iroquois tribes did in the seventeenth century. The coming together of these tribes in historic Huronia may have initiated a process that was tending to level out linguistic differences by the historic period.

From the failure of the linguistic evidence to conform neatly to the archaeological record, I think a major lesson is to be learned. We have seen that in the course of a century oral traditions, ethnological data and archaeological findings have in turn come to play a key role in the reconstruction of Iroquoian prehistory. Each of these types of evidence has at various times been used as a scaffolding on which to reconstruct the past, while other types of data have been referred to only insofar as they are useful in confirming the resulting reconstruction. It seems to me that as the study of Iroquoian prehistory enters a more mature phase, this assigning of a priority to one kind of evidence will come to an end and increasing attention will be paid to the kind of information that each type of data can provide and how the various kinds can be used in combination with one another to construct a more rounded picture of the past.

Archaeology will certainly continue to play a very important role in the study of Iroquoian prehistory. It will be realised increasingly, however, that archaeological data do not reflect all aspects of culture with equal facility and that therefore the archaeological record should not be used as the sole basis for reconstructing the past when other forms of data are available. Instead, archaeology will take its place alongside other anthropological techniques for the study of the past. It is perhaps worthwhile to survey briefly what these techniques are and what contributions each of them can be expected to make.

Ethnohistorical studies by themselves are probably not very useful for the reconstruction of Iroquoian culture prior to the seventeenth century. If anything, the growing awareness that ethnohistorians have of the rapid changes in Iroquoian culture in the historic period make them wary of projecting the culture of any period into the past. Work currently being done by ethnohistorians is, however, of immense importance to an understanding of Iroquoian prehistory because it is establishing a new picture of Iroquoian culture in the seventeenth century that will affect the prehistorians' interpretations of earlier times. It is invidious to single out one paper for special praise, but as the best example of what ethnohistorians are accomplishing at the present time I wish to cite Elisabeth Tooker's (1960) Three Aspects of Northern Iroquoian Culture Change which, among other things, calls into question the importance of calendric ceremonies in seventeenth century Iroquoian culture. Another provocative and important paper is Cara Richards' (1967) study of early historic Huron and Iroquois residence patterns. This paper questions Morgan's assumption of a common uxori-local residence pattern at this period.

Possibly the field with the greatest untapped potential for the study of Iroquoian prehistory is linguistics. Linguistics is important in two ways: first through its studies of the genetic relationship among the various Iroquoian languages and secondly through efforts to reconstruct the content of prehistoric Iroquoian culture by lexical means. Earlier discussions in this paper have demonstrated the value of glottochronological findings for the study of Iroquoian prehistory. Even if one does not accept glottochronology as an accurate method for dating linguistic separations in calendric terms, it is nevertheless effective for reconstructing genetic relationships and indicating at least relative degrees of linguistic relationship. Evidence of the long separation between the northern Iroquoian languages and Cherokee (on the order of 3500 to 3800 years) (Lounsbury 1961) has done much to clear up ideas about the nature of the relationship between these two groups and to undermine what was formerly one of the bases of the southern hypothesis. Clearly more work on the genetic relationships among the northern Iroquoian languages must be regarded as highly desirable.

Recent work has also shown the important role that can be played by linguistic studies in the reconstruction of various aspects of prehistoric Iroquoian culture. Wallace Chafe (1964) has provided linguistic support for Tooker's theory that shamanistic cults antedate the present emphasis on calendrical rituals in the Northeast and Lounsbury (1961) has done some work on proto-Iroquoian kinship terminology. I doubt that any greater untapped source of information about prehistoric Iroquoian culture remains to be unlocked than by these methods.

Physical anthropological data are also providing a new understanding of the physical development of populations in the Northeast. Although few general conclusions have been published in this field, the work that has been done to date has not only revealed a good deal about the health and longevity of prehistoric Iroquoian populations but it has also tended to support the *in situ* hypothesis, inasmuch as physical changes in the Northeast appear to have been gradual. As data accumulate and our understanding of the physical evolution of individual populations becomes more detailed many interesting conclusions may emerge.

While time perspective remains difficult to control, ethnological comparisons between the cultures of the Northeast and those in the southeastern United States, and elsewhere, will also be of importance for understanding the development of Iroquoian culture. These studies also help to set Iroquoian culture into a proper hemispheric perspective. In spite of their *in situ* development, it is clear that the northern Iroquoian cultures have at different times and perhaps to different degrees, adopted many features from the agricultural societies of the Southeast. Many of these traits appear to have been borrowed in turn from Mesoamerica (Griffin 1966). In the Northeast, these borrowings were incorporated into a new cultural context, the study of which is of extreme interest as an end in itself. An emphasis on the individuality of the Iroquoian cultural pattern should not, however, lead us to abandon an interest in the origin of the external traits that were used in building this pattern or in its cultural connections with the nuclear areas of New World civilization. As a culture complex, incorporating through a chain of intermediaries, traits that appear to be derived from Mesoamerica, the Iroquoian cultures stand in much the same relationship to Mesoamerican culture that the Celtic or Viking cultures of Europe stood in relationship to the cultures of the Near East.

Finally there is the area of oral tradition and the seventeenth and early eighteenth century accounts of these traditions. About these studies I am frankly pessimistic. I do not believe that at the present time or perhaps ever these traditions can be relied on as an independent means for studying the past. Where they are confirmed by other sorts of data, well and good; where not, they should not be used even to supplement other sorts of information about the past. What is required is a careful study of the oral traditions of the Iroquoians to attempt to discern styles and general themes and the manner in which the latter affect the content of these accounts, as well as historical research to try to determine the time perspective that is involved. I have already stated my belief that a considerable number of traditions that have been used as a basis for culture historical reconstruction will be found to have a very shallow time depth. Many of them seem to refer to events that occurred subsequent to the latter part of the sixteenth century.

## Settlement Archaeology

I have already noted that difficulties have been encountered in equating the linguistic and cultural developments that have been reconstructed for Iroquoian prehistory. Nevertheless, particularly because Iroquoian studies are concerned not only with the past but with living peoples, there has always been a strong desire to transcend the limitations of the archaeological record and to see in it a history of the Iroquoian peoples who are known to us in historic times. Hence, it is not surprising that a strong effort has been made to identify prehistoric sites and cultures with known historic tribes and to see in the record of Iroquoian cultural development a record of the development of these tribes. This has resulted in an emphasis on temporal genetic relationships within Iroquoian culture at the expense of studying the mutual influences that contemporary Iroquoian cultures have exerted upon one another. MacNeish (1952: 88) was of the opinion that each tribe (with the exception of the Onondaga-Oneida) had its own distinctive pottery types and that his identification of the ceramic complexes with tribal units was on a firm foundation. He admitted, however, that his scheme for the origin and development of these tribes was still hypothetical. More recently, Wright (1966: 16) has affirmed that among the Iroquoian-speaking peoples similarities and differences in material culture are a sensitive measure of tribal affinities. Ritchie (1965: 299) is, however, less optimistic about the possibility of tracing historic tribal divisions far back in the archaeological record.

I believe that the optimistic view about the correspondence between tribes and archaeological cultures among the Iroquoians is based on a double fallacy. On the one hand, there has been a failure to understand what an Iroquoian tribe was and, on the other, an undue forcing of the archaeological evidence to accommodate it to presumed ethnographic facts. MacNeish himself points out that had he not been trying to fit the historic end of his developmental sequence into a known pattern of tribes, but been considering the evidence solely from an archaeological point of view, it is unlikely that he would have distinguished more than four cultures among the historic Iroquois.

Tribe is a political concept. In historic times an Iroquoian tribe was a well-defined, named group of people who shared a common territory and derived their sense of identity from their proprietorship over this territory. Among the Iroquois, this is very clear from the toponymic nature of tribal names: "People of the Dig Hill" (Seneca), "People on the hill" (Onondaga), "People of the Flint" (Mohawk). Under normal circumstances, most of the people who belonged to any one tribe had ancestors who were members of the same tribe. In the other hand, prisoners of war were sometimes adopted into the tribe as well as refugees. After 1649, vast numbers of Huron, Neutral and Erie were adopted by the five Iroquois

tribes and at least one Huron tribe was allowed to found a village of their own among the Seneca. These people became absorbed into the various Iroquoian tribes, but not, so it would seem, without leaving their mark on the native culture of these tribes and in the archaeological record (MacNeish 1952: 46). Often a tribe had a language or dialect of its own, but sometimes the linguistic distinctions between one tribe and another were very small, if not non-existent. Mohawk and Oneida are very close and the similarities among the speech patterns of the four Huron tribes led the French to classify them as a single language. Likewise, the proximity of tribes tended to vary. Among the Iroquois, each tribe settled near the center of its own hunting territory; hence the villages belonging to different tribes were some distance apart. Although similar distances may have separated the four Huron tribes at the beginning of the sixteenth century, they disappeared as growing involvement in trade caused these tribes to congregate along the south shore of Matchedash Bay (Trigger 1962b). In spite of this, however, each of the four Huron tribes settled in its own part of the new territory, much as the Iroquois settled side by side, but in separate tribal groups, along the Grand River in Ontario after the American Revolution. The cultural distinctiveness of tribes likewise tended to vary. For all of their resemblances to the Mohawk, the Oneida were no less a distinctive political entity than were any of the other tribes of the Five Nations. It is likewise worth noting that tribes<sup>s</sup> were not always cohesive units. The breaking away of Christian Iroquois from their tribes to go and settle along the St. Lawrence is one example of this. Thus the possibility of various political realignments taking place in prehistoric times should not be discounted. It appears to me that nothing but needless difficulties can be gained by confusing political entities with "ethnic divisions" and by this muddled process further confusing them with archaeological cultures.

In historic times, the Seneca and Cayuga seem to have had clearly distinct archaeological cultures. At present, the other three Iroquois tribes appear to have shared two archaeological cultures. One of these may have been associated with the Onondaga, the other with the Oneida and Mohawk. It is thus clear that even among the Iroquois, where tribal divisions were geographically separated from each other by considerable distances, the cultural differences among the five tribes were not of an equal order. Nor can a meaningful correlation be obtained by taking account of the distinction that the Iroquois themselves made between the senior and junior tribes of the confederacy; since while one of the latter, the Cayuga, had a recognisable archaeological culture of its own, the other, the Oneida, seems to have lacked this. It seems that, if historical data were lacking, the political divisions of the Iroquois could not be reconstructed in terms of coefficients of similarity in material culture using the evidence that is presently available.

If work on the Iroquois provides an example of accommodating archaeological data to ethnological requirements, that among the Huron provides an example of tailoring the ethnological data to fit the requirements of the archaeology. While slight differences are noted among Huron sites from the historic period, these differences are not such as to suggest that we are not dealing with a single archaeological culture. Fifty percent or more of all the pottery from historic Huron and Petun sites is either Huron incised or Sidey notched (Wright 1966: 76). As a result, the practise has been for archaeologists to attribute this culture to the "Huron tribe". This unfortunate designation arose as a result of the tendency of translators of early French documents to render the word nation as "clan" in contexts where the present concept of a tribe is clearly indicated. The current retention of the word "clan" for groups such as the Attignawantan and Attignueenongnahac by Wright (1966) and others is a confusing anachronism from an ethnological point of view. The Attignawantan, Attingueenongnahac, Tohontaenrat and Ahrendarrhonon were clearly political units analogous to the Seneca, Onondaga or Mohawk and they were joined together to form a confederacy similar to that of the Iroquois. All but the Tohontaenrat were made up of more than one village, located in a specific tribal area of settlement, and the archaeological evidence suggests that in earlier times each tribe was territorially distinct in the same manner that the Iroquois tribes were. An erroneous ethnological concept cannot be preserved merely to facilitate a neat correlation between tribe and culture. Instead, the four tribes of the Huron confederacy must be recognized as distinct political entities that shared an archaeological culture as similar as that of the Oneida and Mohawk is currently believed to be.

The political concept of tribe is not a particularly useful one from an archaeological point of view. This is particularly true for prehistoric times. The development of the Iroquoian tribes is still highly speculative. Prior to the rise of agriculture, the population of the Northeast probably lived in scattered hunting bands. Loose political ties may have united various bands and at least some of these larger groupings may have provided rough prototypes for some of the later tribes. Moreover, it is not unreasonable, in spite of the impossibility of proving it, that at least some of these political groupings of hunting bands may have roughly corresponded to linguistic divisions. In this way the long separation of some of the Iroquois languages may be explained. The shift to an agricultural economy appears to have led to the formation of small villages, perhaps out of the old hunting bands. Through time these small villages appear to have joined together to form larger **ones**. Within **the larger villages**, the inhabitants of the original small communities and perhaps of individual hunting bands, may have preserved their identity as localized clan segments. Among the Huron at least, each of these local clan segments appears to have had its own war chief and civil chief, so

that these units enjoyed considerable political autonomy. Ethnological studies have emphasized the important role that was played by the village in Iroquoian culture and the importance of locality in Iroquoian social structure (Fenton 1951). Since villages can be easily recognized in the archaeological record and because they relocated a short distance away at fairly regular intervals, the feasibility of tracing particular communities through time in the archaeological record has been increasingly realized. This sort of study has been carried out most effectively in New York State where the geographical area covered by these movements appears to have been minimal and where groups were less crowded together than is the case, for example, among the Huron. In western New York State, Marian White has had success in tracing Seneca villages through a series of successive moves. Around Syracuse, James Tuck (n.d.) has managed to trace not only the movement of villages but also the processes of fusion by which, through time, smaller villages joined together to form larger ones. There is now good hope that this prehistoric sequence may be tied in with the historic Onondaga. Studies of this sort are exceedingly valuable because they give us an insight into the precise movement of local groups that were involved in the evolution of the historic tribes. Once these social developments are understood, it will be possible to obtain an increasingly sophisticated understanding of the cultural changes that are associated with them.

In Ontario, detailed settlement archaeology of this sort has scarcely begun. However, as further work reveals more about the nature of prehistoric Iroquoian settlement north of Lake Ontario, it may be possible to define local sequences of settlements and to trace these settlements, move by move, into their historic homeland. The best-researched area is around Toronto, where J. N. Emerson has excavated numerous sites. Signs that intensive work may be beginning in the Trent Valley are also encouraging.

It should be emphasized that tracing communities through time will shed important light not only on the development of these communities, but also on the social and political processes that are associated with it. Tracing a series of sites requires very great attention to small local differences and to cultural changes over short periods of time. Because of this, our understanding of the archaeological evidence becomes considerably refined. As they persist in their investigations of archaeological cultures, archaeologists find themselves no longer discussing general cultural patterns or even cultures in the traditional archaeological sense; rather they are dealing with the microcultures of particular communities. Hence, the study of communities not only breaks new ground in the study of social institutions, it also improves our traditional understanding of cultural content. In this way, too burning questions such as the ethnic identity of the St. Lawrence Valley Iroquoians can be solved in a definitive fashion; instead of the present speculation concerning whether similarities in material culture



betoken ethnic identity - assuming that we know what ethnic identity means. Moreover, a concern with communities and, hence with real populations, will help to correct a former tendency of archaeologists to speculate about the expansion and spread of cultures, unaccompanied by any concern about the populations involved and whether or not from a demographic point of view such events were probable or even possible.

## CONCLUSIONS

One of the chief shortcomings of culture historical studies in most regions of the world has been that authors have confused linguistic, cultural, racial and political units; all too often assuming a one-to-one correlation between them. In many instances, these speculations have proven false (Wagner 1967: 62). Iroquoian studies have not been free of this tendency. I would suggest that urgent consideration should be given to the question of nomenclature, in an effort to sort out these categories. One step in the right direction has been the abandonment of the distinction between Mississippian and Woodland cultures in the Northeast. Yet, consider the confusion that arises when archaeologists continue to speak about the Iroquoian and pre-Iroquoian cultures of the Northeast; a terminology that continues to reflect the Mississippian/Woodland dichotomy in many respects. The term Iroquoian is a linguistic one. While such identifications are difficult, it is clear that at least some possessors of so-called "pre-Iroquoian" cultures must have been Iroquoian-speakers. Moreover, some historic archaeological cultures that from a typological point of view seem a part of the Iroquoian cultural tradition are associated with Algonkian-speaking peoples. What is needed is a clear distinction between archaeological and linguistic terminology. Since linguists enjoy priority in the use of the term Iroquoian, I would suggest that archaeologists should find another blanket term for the co-tradition (Wright 1966: 100) with which they are dealing. For ethnologists, the situation is less serious; when they speak of Iroquoian culture, they mean the cultures of the Iroquoian-speaking peoples they are studying.

Likewise, it seems to me that the growing practise of assigning special names, such as Uren, Middleport or Oak Hill, to the various archaeological cultures (I use the latter term as a compromise among various ones employed; it will probably satisfy no one) that are distinguished, is a good trend and should be encouraged. It is, however, a procedure that should be carried through into the historic period. Tribal names are the names of political units; hence even when the identification of historic sites with particular tribal groupings is unimpeachable, the confusion of these two categories seems to me to be in error. Archaeological cultures are constructs; as a result of new evidence or a tendency towards

greater lumping or splitting, names tend to get changed or are even abandoned. Such a process is far more convenient when the labels involved are those created by the archaeologist. It may be objected that it is ridiculous or redundant to refer to the archaeological culture of the historic Huron (assuming that historic Huron and Petun sites can be distinguished) as the Orr Lake culture. I would reply that the convention is at worst harmless and may prove conducive to clearer thinking about many culture-historical problems. Moreover, in the case of problem cultures such as that embracing the St. Lawrence Valley Iroquoians and the "Onondaga" (Oneida?), a neutral archaeological term that could cover this proposed entity would be very useful. Such a term would have the great advantage of not prejudicing in advance discussions of the ethnic or linguistic correlates of this postulated culture.

Finally, I wish to reiterate my conviction that the study of Iroquoian prehistory should not be regarded as the exclusive domain of the archaeologist. Most aspects of Iroquoian studies have an historical dimension and thus have important contributions to make to the study of Iroquoian prehistory. What is needed is more historical interest among Iroquoianists outside the area of archaeology and a growing interchange of ideas among the practitioners of the various subdisciplines.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, A. T. (ed.), 1961. *The Explorations of Pierre Esprit Radisson*. Minneapolis: Ross and Haines, Inc.
- Bailey, A.G. (1933). "The Significance of the Identity and Disappearance of the Laurentian Iroquois". *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 27, Third Series, Section ii; 97-106.
- Beauchamp, W. M. (1894). "The Origin of the Iroquois". *The American Antiquarian*, 16 (2): 61-69.
- Boucher, P. (1664). *Histoire veritable et naturel des moeurs et productions de la Nouvelle France, vulgairement dite le Canada*. Paris: F. Lambert.
- Boyle, D. (1906). "Ethnology of Canada and Newfoundland, Part V, The Iroquois". *Ontario Archaeological Report*, 1905: 146-158.
- Byers, D. S. (1961). "Second Comment on William A. Ritchie's Iroquois Archaeology and Settlement Patterns". Washington: *Bureau of American Ethnology*, Bulletin 180: 47-50.
- Chafe, W. L. (1964). "Linguistic Evidence for the Relative Age of Iroquois Religious Practices". *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, 20: 278-285.

- Clarke, P. D. (1870). *Origin and Traditional History of the Wyandots*. Toronto.
- Colden, C. (1750). *The History of the Five Nations of Canada*. London: John Whiston.
- Dawson, J. W. (1860). "Notes on Aboriginal Antiquities Recently Discussed in the Island of Montreal." *Canadian Naturalist and Geologist and Proceedings of the Natural History Society of Montreal*, 5: 430-49.
- Du Creux, F. (1951). *The History of Canada*. (P. J. Robinson, trans.). Toronto: The Champlain Society.
- Emerson, J. N. (1954). *The Archaeology of the Ontario Iroquois*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago.
- Emerson, J. N. (1959). "A Rejoinder Upon the MacNeish-Emerson Theory". *Pennsylvania Archaeologist*, 29: 3-12.
- Fenton, W. N. (1940). "Problems Arising from the Historic North-eastern Position of the Iroquois." Washington: *Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections*, 100: 159-251.
- Fenton, W. N. (1951). "Locality as a Basic Factor in the Development of Iroquois Social Structure." Washington: *Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin* 149: 35-54.
- Ganong, W. F. (1964). *Crucial Maps in the Early Cartography and Place-Nomenclature of the Atlantic Coast of Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Griffin, J. B. (1944). "The Iroquois in American Prehistory." *Ann Arbor: Papers of the Michigan Academy of Science, Arts and Letters*, 29: 357-74.
- Griffin, J. B. (1966). "Mesoamerica and the Eastern United States in Prehistoric Times." Robert Wauchope (ed.), *Handbook of Middle American Indians*, 4: 111-31. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Guthe, A. K. (1960). "The Cultural Background of the Iroquois." G. E. Dole and R. L. Carneiro (eds.), *Essays in the Science of Culture*, pp. 202-15. New York: Thomas Crowell.
- Hale, H. (1894). "The Fall of Hochelaga." *Journal of American Folklore*, 7: 1-14.
- Hale, H. (1963). *The Iroquois Book of Rites*. (Reprinted, with an introduction by William N. Fenton). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

- Harper, J. R. (1952). "The Webb Site, a Stage in Early Iroquoian Development." *Pennsylvania Archaeologist*, 22/(2): 49-64.
- Hewitt, J. N. B. (1907). "Huron". F. W. Hodge (ed.). *Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico*. Washington: Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 30: 584-91.
- Hoffman, B. G. (1959). "Iroquois Linguistic Classification from Historical Materials." *Ethnohistory*, 6: 160-86.
- Hoffman, B. G. (1961). *Cabot to Cartier: Sources for a Historical Ethnography of Northeastern North America*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Hunt, G. T. (1940). *The Wars of the Iroquois*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Jouve, O. M. (1915). *Les Franciscains et le Canada, I: L'établissement de la Foi, 1615-1629*. Quebec: Couvent des SS. Stigmates.
- Krause, B. S. (1944). "Acculturation: a New Approach to the Iroquoian Problem." *American Antiquity*, 9: 302-17.
- Lafitau, J. F. (1724). *Moeurs des sauvages américains, comparées aux mœurs des premiers temps*. Paris: Saugrain Paine.
- Lascarbot, M. (1907-14). *The History of New France*. (W. L. Grant, trans.). 3 volumes. Toronto: The Champlain Society.
- Lighthall, W. D. (1899). "Hochelagans and Mohawks, A link in Iroquois History." *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 5, second series, section ii: 199-211.
- Lloyd, H. M. (1851). (See Morgan, H. L. 1904).
- Lounsbury, F. G. (1961). "Iroquois-Cherokee Linguistic Relations." Washington: *Bureau of American Ethnology*, Bulletin 180: 11-17.
- MacNeish, R. S. (1952). *Iroquois Pottery Types*. Ottawa: National Museum of Canada, Bulletin 124.
- Morgan, L. H. (1869). "Indian Migrations." *North American Review*, 109: 391-442.
- Morgan, L. H. (1904). *League of the Ho-de-no-sau-ne, or Iroquois*. New York: Herbert M. Lloyd edition (first published 1851).
- Orr, R. B. (1914). "Tionnontates." *26th Ontario Archaeological Report*, 1-18.
- Orr, R. B. (1919). "The Iroquois in Canada". *31st Ontario Archaeological Report*, 9-54.

- Orr, R. B. (1921). "The Hurons." *33rd Ontario Archaeological Report*, 9-23.
- Parker, A. C. (1916). "The Origin of the Iroquois as Suggested by their Archaeology." *American Anthropologist, N.S.*, 18: 479-507.
- Perrot, N. (1911). "Memoir on the Manners, Customs and Religion of the Savages of North America." B. H. Blair (ed.), *Indian Tribes of the Upper Mississippi Valley and the Region of the Upper Great Lakes*, 1: 42-293. Cleveland: A. H. Clark Co.
- Powell, J. W. (1891). "Indian Linguistic Families of America North of Mexico." *Bureau of American Ethnology, Annual Report*, 7: 1-147.
- Renfrew, C. (1968). "Models in Prehistory." *Antiquity*, 42: 132-34.
- Richards, C. (1967). "Huron and Iroquois Residence Patterns, 1600-1650. E. Tooker (ed.), *Iroquois Culture, History and Prehistory*, pp. 51-56. Albany: The University of the State of New York.
- Ridley, F. (1952a). "The Huron and Lalonde Occupations of Ontario." *American Antiquity*, 17: 197-210.
- Ridley, F. (1952b). "The Fallis Site, Ontario." *American Antiquity*, 18: 7-14.
- Ritchie, W. A. (1961). "Iroquois Archaeology and Settlement Patterns." Washington: *Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin* 180: 27-38.
- Ritchie, W. A. (1965). *The Archaeology of New York State*. New York: The Natural History Press.
- Rouse, I. (1958). "The Inference of Migrations from Anthropological Evidence." R. H. Thompson (ed.). *Migrations in New World Culture History*. Tuscon: University of Arizona Press.
- Sagard, G. (1866). *Histoire du Canada*. Paris: Edwin Tross.
- Shea, J. G. (1900). *History and General Description of New France, by P. F. X. Charlevoix*. (6 volumes) New York: J. G. Shea.
- Thwaites, R. G. (1896-1901). *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents*, (73 volumes). Cleveland: The Burrows Brothers Company.

- Tooker, E. (1960). "Three Aspects of Northern Iroquoian Culture Change." *Pennsylvania Archaeologist*, 30: 65-71.
- Tooker, E. (1964). "An Ethnography of the Huron Indians, 1615-1649." Washington: *Bureau of American Ethnology*, Bulletin 190.
- Trigger, B. G. (1962a). "Trade and Tribal Warfare on the St. Lawrence in the Sixteenth Century." *Ethnohistory*, 9: 240-56.
- Trigger, B. G. (1962b). "The Historic Location of the Hurons." *Ontario History*, 54: 137-48.
- Trigger, B. G. (1968). "Archaeological and Other Evidence: A Fresh Look at the Laurentian Iroquois." *American Antiquity*, 33: 429-40.
- Trigger, B. G. (n.d.). *The Huron: Fanners of the North*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston (in press).
- Tuck, J. A. (n.d.). "Some Recent Work on the Prehistory of the Onondaga Nation." *Pennsylvania Archaeologist*, (in press).
- Wagner, E. (1967). *The Prehistory and Ethnology of the Carache Area in Western Venezuela*. New Haven: Yale University Publications in Anthropology, No. 71.
- Wake, C. S. (1894). "Migrations of the Algonkians." *The American Antiquarian*, 16, (3): 127-39.
- Wilson, D. (1884). "The Huron-Iroquois of Canada: a Typical Race of American Aborigines." *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 2, First Series, Section ii: 55-100.
- Witthoft, J. (1959). "The Ancestors' of the Susquehannocks." J. Witthoft and W. F. Kinsey III (eds.), *Susquehannock Miscellany*, pp. 19-60. Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission.
- Wright, J. V. (1966). *The Ontario Iroquois Tradition*. Ottawa: National Museum of Canada, Bulletin 210.