



Ontario Archaeological Society

Arch Notes

New Series Volume 20 Issue 4

ISSN 0048-1742

July/August 2015



The setting for the first inaugural Toronto Chapter Summer picnic could not have been more perfect. The grounds of the historic Ashbridge House (where the OAS administrative office is located) were beautiful and weather cooperated with a warm sunny day. For more views of this event, see page 19.

OAS News

3. President's Message
4. Call for Silent Auction Donations
13. Registration for the 2015 OAS Symposium
14. 2015 ABM Agenda
15. Budget comparisons 2013, 2014, and 2015

17. Proxy Form

18. Proposed constitutional amendment

19. Toronto Chapter Picnic

ARTICLES

5. Revisiting South's Mean Ceramic Formula to Date
Ontario Historic Sites

Visit us on the Web at www.ontarioarchaeology.on.ca

ONTARIO ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

President

Rob MacDonald
president@ontarioarchaeology.org

President-Elect

Paul Racher
presidentelect@ontarioarchaeology.org

Treasurer

Debbie Steiss
treasurer@ontarioarchaeology.org

Vice-President

Sheryl Smith
vicepresident@ontarioarchaeology.org

Director of Avocational Services

Bill Fox
avocational@ontarioarchaeology.org

Director of Chapter Services

Chris Dalton
chapters@ontarioarchaeology.org

Director of Heritage Advocacy

Margie Kenedy
advocacy@ontarioarchaeology.org

Director of Membership

Dana Millson
membership@ontarioarchaeology.org

Director of Member Services

Abbey Flower
memberservices@ontarioarchaeology.org

Director of Publications

Grant Karcich
publications@ontarioarchaeology.org

Director of Public Outreach

Claire van Neirop
publicoutreach@ontarioarchaeology.org

Director of Student Services

Nicole Brandon
students@ontarioarchaeology.org

Executive Director

Lorie Harris
PO Box 62066
Victoria Terrace Post Office
Toronto, Ontario M4A 2W1
Phone/fax: 416-406-5959
execdirector@ontarioarchaeology.org
(Please note that all OAS email addresses
have changed from .on.ca to .org)

APPOINTMENTS

Editor, Ontario Archaeology

Chris Ellis
oaeditor@ontarioarchaeology.org

Editors, Arch Notes

Sheryl Smith & Carole Stimmell
aneditor@ontarioarchaeology.org

Editor, Website

Jean-Luc Pilon
jlucpilon@hotmail.com

First Nations Liaison

TBA

Symposium Liaison:

Sheryl Smith
symposium@ontarioarchaeology.org

Moderator – Ontario Archaeological Society Listserve (OAS-L)

<http://tech.groups.yahoo.com/group/OAS-L/>
Vito Vaccarelli

Contact Information

PO Box 62066
Victoria Terrace Post Office
Toronto, Ontario M4A 2W1
(416) 406-5959
oasociety@ontarioarchaeology.org
www.ontarioarchaeology.org

The Ontario Archaeological Society gratefully acknowledges funding from the Ministry of Tourism and Culture through the Provincial Heritage Organization Operating Grant Program.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

EVOLUTION

Yesterday, while attending a lovely barbeque hosted by the Toronto Chapter on the grounds of our headquarters at the Ontario Heritage Trust's Ashbridges Estate, I was asked by a Toronto Chapter member when the 'main' OAS would be organizing an event. I confess I was a little puzzled by this inquiry, but later, while chatting with past president Charles Garrad, I began to understand.

Charlie pointed out that, unlike the Ontario Historical Society, which is an umbrella society for a large number of autonomous affiliates, the OAS is a unitary organization which has chartered chapters to serve as local vehicles for member activities throughout the province. This much I already knew. Charlie then offered the following observation: "Surely more than half the OAS members do not belong to a chapter." As someone who has been a member of three chapters—Ottawa, my home town; London, where I first worked; Grand River, where I now live—for decades, I had always assumed that the majority of OAS members also belonged to a local chapter. I knew, however, that there would be a certain number of members who would not have easy access to a local chapter, as well as a number of institutional and other members who would join in order to support the organization and get our journal and newsletter, but would not seek membership in a local chapter or wish to routinely participate in society activities.

A quick query of our new Wild Apricot membership database revealed that slightly more than one-third of members have self-identified as belonging to one or more chapters. Perusal of the remainder indicated that there are probably a fair number of members who have not yet indicated

chapter membership in their online member profile, although I know that some actually do belong to a chapter. Regardless, Charlie's observation would seem to be essentially correct, and although I don't have the numbers at my fingertips, if you divvy up about half our membership among our nine chapters, you would get an average chapter membership of just over thirty, which seems about right to me.

Returning to the original question, then, do members who are unaffiliated with one or more chapters constitute by default an entity considered by some to be the 'main' OAS? Or is the 'main' OAS simply the entirety of our society, as I tend to think of it? Moreover, since the original query was posed to me as OAS president, does the OAS Executive Board also function as the executive of what amounts to a tenth, unnamed chapter, capable of functioning in a similar capacity to carry out tasks such as organizing the annual symposium? This seems to be what is implied by the query, regardless of how the membership of such an entity is conceived.

I argue that it is inappropriate to think of the function of the OAS Executive Board in these terms, even if historically it may have functioned in this way.⁽¹⁾

First, the mandate of the Executive Board is to attend to the affairs of the society as a whole, including supervising the day-to-day administration as carried out by the Executive Director and to fulfil the various roles and responsibilities of our various portfolios as officers and directors. Aside from the routine activities, this also involves the on-going completion of tasks ratified by the membership in our five-year strategic plan. Together, these roles and responsibilities consume all available volun-

teer and staff resources of the Executive Board.

Second, the logistics of drawing on people spread across the province in order to organize events is unrealistic. It is enough of a challenge for the geographically dispersed Executive Board members to come together for meetings every two months, without trying to coordinate a larger organizational body. Additionally serving as the executive of a virtual tenth chapter just doesn't make practical sense.

Third, the demands on Executive Board resources have grown and evolved significantly over the years. We are constantly involved in meeting the demands, compliance requirements, and expectations of a wide range of constituencies, including but not limited to the following: our membership; the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, which is our primary source of funding as a provincial heritage organization; the Ontario Heritage Trust; other provincial agencies, such as Ontario Parks; the Canada Revenue Agency; our bank; our accountants; various vendors and service providers; the general public; the academic sector; the consulting archaeology sector; the Association of Professional Archaeologists; museums and other heritage organizations. Because much of this is carried out behind the scenes, I understand why the average OAS member may not appreciate or even be substantially aware of what the Executive Board does on a daily, weekly, or monthly basis. Clearly it would be advantageous to improve the visibility of this work and, indeed, this is one of our strategic plan objectives.

So to answer the original question, the 'main' OAS—however conceived—will not be organizing an event under the sole

1. For example, the Executive Board assumed responsibility for organizing the 2013 annual symposium in Niagara Falls, with support from the Hamilton Chapter. Although it was a very successful symposium, the Executive Board thereafter deemed this to have been a significant burden which drew valuable volunteer and staff time and effort away from our primary mandate and was therefore an inappropriate use of Executive Board resources.

leadership of the Executive Board anytime soon. Instead, we will be working to support and enhance the ability of our chartered chapters to organize events. This is a much more efficient and effective way of leveraging geographical clusters of members in order to achieve our collective goals as a society. This does not preclude the possibility of the Executive Board or its individual officers or directors working in partnership with one or more chapters to carry out a project or event. Indeed, several such initiatives are currently under development. Here are some examples:

- Coordinating Archaeology Day activities amongst our chapters province-wide.

- Providing chapters with corporate promotional materials (e.g. brochures, business cards, banners, publications, buttons, pens, etc.) that they can use for public outreach activities.

- Consolidating all chapter web sites onto the Wild Apricot platform⁽²⁾ in order to save costs while facilitating membership enrollment functions and retaining the ability of chapters to develop and maintain their own individual web presence but with a design that is more consistent and identifiable with the OAS 'brand'.

- Renewing our material culture 'Edu-kits' and avocational manual for the use of chapters engaged in public education activities.

Many other initiatives are on the drawing board, all of which seek to provide chapters with the tools and resources they need to further our joint objectives. These recognize the fact that the OAS achieves the majority of its objectives through the efforts of volunteers, and the stewardship of this invaluable resource needs to be done thoughtfully and effectively to ensure that we get the most bang for our buck.

The same prudent approach is being applied to our limited financial resources. Currently the Executive Board is reviewing all aspects of our operations to see where efficiencies and cost savings can be realized. These include such things as a review of our telephone and internet service provider with respect to the competition, acquisition and control of our own internet domain (ontarioarchaeology.org) and transition to a new web hosting service, upgrading and on-going maintenance of our IT technology to reduce staff down time (and frustration), and transition of our costly teleconferencing system to new and

more functional voice-over-internet-protocol (VOIP) options. Included in this review has been examination of our on-going publication and distribution costs for our journal, *Ontario Archaeology* (OA), and our newsletter, Arch Notes. Whereas members already pay a premium beyond the base membership fee if they wish to subscribe to OA, Arch Notes continues to be provided to some members in hard copy format at no additional cost. Due to rising production, mailing, and administration costs, this practice is unsustainable, so the Executive Board has approved a subscription premium (the amount to be determined) for members who still wish to receive a hard copy of Arch Notes. Digital versions will remain a free download from our website for all members.

As always, I welcome feedback from members regarding any of the topics discussed in this message, or anything else that is of concern to you. I can be reached via our new email system at president@ontarioarchaeology.org. Please have a safe and happy summer.

Rob MacDonald
President

2. Pilot projects to transfer the web sites of the Peterborough and Grand River chapters to the Wild Apricot platform are nearly complete and we expect to launch their new sites shortly.

ONTARIO ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY 42ND ANNUAL SYMPOSIUM

CALL FOR SILENT AUCTION DONATIONS

The Silent Auction is a popular event during the OAS Symposium and a great way to raise money for the Society. To ensure the success of our one and only annual fundraiser, we need your help!

Please consider donating new or gently used items such as archaeology and history books, services, jewelry, antiques, crafts, tools, gift certificates, gift baskets, etc. This is also a great opportunity for businesses to showcase their products and services. All donations will be acknowledged on

silent auction donor boards during the symposium and in the program package. You will also receive much personal gratitude from your silent auction organizing committee!

Last year, several OAS chapters assembled and donated unique one-of-a-kind gift baskets with items that showcased their chapter and regions. These were a big hit with our bidders and we hope that more chapters will participate this year!

Silent auction donation items are now being accepted for the OAS 2015

Symposium. Please contact Ellen Blaubergs at eblaubergs@rogers.com by October 13 and include the following information: donor name and contact info, description of item(s) to be donated, value of donation, minimum/starting bid (if you like).

Please also indicate if you are bringing the donation to the symposium, giving it to someone to bring, or would like to send/courier it. We'll provide an address if you prefer this last method.

Thank you for your support!

REVISITING SOUTH'S MEAN CERAMIC FORMULA TO DATE ONTARIO HISTORIC SITES

by Tom Arnold

During the summer of 2014, I was doing some house cleaning and came across a file with some old (1970s/1980s) historic archaeology articles. Among other documents in this file was a copy of an ArchNotes article dated 1980 by J.K. Jouppien (1980:24-29) entitled 'The Application of South's Mean Ceramic Formula to Ontario Historic Sites', a single page dated February 14, 1988 with the title 'Ceramic Dating (sic)' (Figure 1), that as I recall was given to me by Ian Kenyon, and finally a document by Ian Kenyon entitled 'A History of Ceramic Tableware in Ontario: 1780-1890' which, according to the acknowledgments "was a paper prepared for distribution at the 'An Introduction to English Ceramics for Archaeologists Workshop', sponsored by the Association of Professional Archaeologists, and held on 20 April 1991 in Toronto" (Kenyon 1991:13). This latter document was apparently an update and amalgamation to Ian's research published throughout the 1980s in ArchNotes (Kenyon 1985a:41-57; 1985b:13-28; 1985c:14-21; 1987:22-25; 1988a:5-8; 1988b:7-9).

Despite having read many – and even written a few – consulting archaeology reports that dealt with historic sites, I have not seen the use of South's Mean Ceramic Date (MCD) mentioned to help date sites. It is certainly possible that people have used the formula in their analysis and have simply not reported it, but I suspect that in fact it is simply not used. This may be due in part to the fact that most historic sites dealt with by consulting archaeologist in Ontario date to the 19th century and can be readily identified with some degree of certainty from documentary sources. In addition, the debate surrounding South's technique (see below) may have also lead people to question its usefulness.

Due to the recent technical bulletin for consulting archaeologists concerning work conducted on rural historical farmsteads (Government of Ontario 2014) it may be time to reassess the usefulness of this dating technique. In the technical bulletin, the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport stresses the importance of being able to effectively date a site to either before AD 1900 or AD 1830 using either a complete surface collection or the 20 artifact rule during a Stage 2 assessment (Government of Ontario 2014: 8). Thus, the use of the South's Mean Ceramic Date may provide one more tool to help in this determination. The following paper reviews this technique and its potential usefulness to the study of historic sites in Ontario.

South's Mean Ceramic Date

Mean Ceramic Date was proposed by Stanley South, a prominent American historic archaeologist. The dating technique is described in depth in his book titled *Method and Theory in Historical Archaeology* (South 1977). For those interested in the

history of the development of archaeological method and theory, this volume should be seen as a classic Processual Archaeology approach to the subject.

Before the dating formula can be used, a list of ceramic types must first be established along with the beginning and ending manufacturing dates of each ceramic type. This is done through detailed documentary sources. The list and manufacturing dates used by South (1977:210-212) was based on work by Noël Hume (1970).

The Mean Ceramic Date is a relatively simple formula where the median date of ceramic types (defined by South as the date half way between when a ceramic type was first produced and the date when it was last produced; see discussion of unimodal assumption below) is multiplied by the frequency of ceramic sherds of each type found in the context under study (e.g., site, feature, stratigraphic profile). These totals are then summed and divided by the total frequency of sherds (South 1977:217) or the following expression:

$$Y = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n Xi \times fi}{\sum_{i=1}^n fi}$$

Y = calculated mean ceramic date

Xi = the median date for the manufacture of each ceramic type

fi = the frequency of each ceramic type

n = the number of ceramic types in the sample

Thus the mean ceramic date is a weighted mean of the median dates of the type sherds found in the context under study.

It should be noted that South viewed the mean ceramic date as simply one of two tools to help with the chronological analysis of historic sites (South 1977:213). The other was visually interpreting the occupation period using the manufacture duration dates and the presence and absence of specific types through the use of a graph and what he termed 'visual bracketing'. The latter is a subjective method of visually determining site occupation. These are the same manufacture duration dates used in the mean ceramic dating formula. Since the purpose of this article is to discuss only the usefulness of the mean ceramic date and not South's overall approach, I refer the reader to South's original description for a detailed explanation of his method (South 1977:214-217).

South initially created these tools to analyze 17th and 18th century British-American sites but felt that it could be extended into the 19th century through the addition of more types and their manufacturing dates (South 1977:213). The foundation of the technique is based on two assumptions: the horizon concept and the unimodal curve.

The former as defined in archaeological terms is "a primarily

spatial continuity represented by cultural traits and assemblages whose nature and mode of occurrence permit the assumption of broad rapid spread" (Willey and Phillips 1958:31-34, as referenced in South 1977:203). South was convinced from his excavations and documentary sources that groups of British made ceramic types reflect the same time period regardless if they are found in a port city or a frontier settlement and thus constituted a horizon. His reasoning went something like this: ceramics were made in Britain, then transported by ship to east coast American ports, where they were distributed throughout the colonies relatively quickly. Thus, each ceramic type was a horizon marker in South's view (South 1977: 203, 204-207).

The unimodal assumption is based on the idea that each ceramic type had an inception, a period of peak production followed by a decline and end date of production (South 1977:203). Although he does not state it, this may be why he uses the term median manufacturing date since this would more or less correspond with the period of peak production, but you would also have to assume a normal distribution (a bell shaped curve) as well.

South used sherd count because at that time, in the 1970s, historic archaeologists often used simple vessel occurrence (presence or absence) on a site, which meant that "...a single sherd of creamware...[had] the same weight as 500 sherds of white salt-glazed stoneware...(South 1977: 217) in determining the time period of a sample. He noted that his mean date formula took both into account. The date obtained from his formula was not meant to be used alone in determining a site mean date. It was to be used in concert with dates derived from other artifact classes and documents that together would allow the researcher to obtain a period of occupation for the site. South was so convinced of the strength and usefulness of this approach that he thought that it could be used with other historic artifact types once manufacturing period lists could be established. He even thought it could be used for Pre-contact ceramic types from First Nations sites (South 1977:237, 249). In fact, Christenson (1994) did that with Pre-Contact ceramics from the Kayenta Anasazi area of the American Southwest dating to between AD 1100 and 1300.

Sherds vs. Vessels

Not everyone agreed with South on the use of sherd versus vessel counts. Adams (2003:42) states quite emphatically that one of the greatest flaws in the way researchers used the MCD was applying it to ceramic fragments instead of vessel counts. Fragment counts are entirely meaningless for most kinds of analysis, so multiplying fragment count of ceramic types with a

Ceramic Dating		
CLASS	* TYPE	DATE No.
SEMI-PORCELAIN	1 any type	1910
PLAIN	2 Creamware	1805
	3 White Granite - Brace/Angular	1852
	4 White Granite - Other	1882
EDGED	5 Early Scalloped	1807
	6 Late Scalloped - Blue	1828
	7 Late Scalloped - Green	1826
	8 Moulded Edge	1830
	9 Unscalloped	1857
PAINTED/SPONGED	10 Sponged	1856
	11 Stamped	1865
	12 Painted - Blue Pencilled	1800
	13 Painted - Early Palette/Pearlware	1817
	14 Painted - Late Palette/White ware - black rim line	1836
	15 Painted - Late Palette/White ware - red rim line	1854
16 Painted - Late Palette/White ware - Other	1846	
PRINTED	17 Early Chinoiserie	1796
	18 "Old" Blue	1826
	19 "New" Blue	1847
	20 Willow	1860
	21 Red, Purple and Green	1836
	22 Black	1840
	23 Early Brown	1840
	24 Late Brown	1885
	25 Flow & Mulberry	1855
PORCELAIN	26 Chinese - Blue & White	1800
SITE NAME		<input type="text"/>
TOTAL		<input type="text"/>
MEAN DATE		<input type="text"/>
STD. DEV.		<input type="text"/>
14-Feb-88		

Figure 1. Ian Kenyon 1988 Historic Ceramic Dating Form

median date for that type can only produce garbage.

As I recall, Kenyon himself recommended using vessel counts in his list for Southern Ontario or more precisely, determining the minimum number of vessels from the sherds collected from a site.

Yet others would not agree with this assessment of the usefulness of sherd counts. Christensen (1994:309) noted that "...the evidence from both historic and prehistoric assemblages is that sherds can provide useful and sensitive dating information." Hull (2007:86-87) noted that in her limited comparison between three Irish sites that sherd count and vessel count provided more or less the same information, suggesting that calculation of the latter was not necessary.

Accuracy

Another critique is that the MCD is grossly inadequate compared to historical documentation. This appears particularly true for sites of long occupation (i.e., more than a century). Turnbaugh and Turnbaugh (1977) noted that for this reason some re-

searchers abandoned the technique. They claim, in fact, such inconsistencies validate the basic tenets of the technique (1977:90). Their research used the MCD separately in three different approaches; intrasite/intrafeature, intersite/interfeature and intrasite/interfeature, essentially subdividing a site ceramic assemblage into smaller units based on areas of concentrations or features. They concluded that the MCD used in this way along with quantitative and qualitative analysis, documentary sources, architectural features and stratigraphy will provide a consistent

site explanation (1977:103).

As noted above, Christenson (1994) used MCD on Pre-Contact ceramics from the American Southwest. He concluded that this dating technique was as accurate as either radiocarbon dating or tree ring dating for that area and period he investigated (Christenson 1994: 312).

Discussion

Jouppien (1980) appears to have been the first to suggest

Table 1. Jouppien Ceramic Dating List (after Jouppien 1980:26-27)

Class	Type	Date Range	Median Dates
Waretype			
	Creamware	1760 to 1820	1790
	Pearlware	1796 to 1830	1813
	Vitreous white earthenware	1820 to present	1917.5
	Highly vitrified white earthenware, Ironstone	1840 to present	1927.5
	Tin glaze, or tin enamelled	1796-1840	1818
	Bone china	1805 to present	1910
	Stoneware (salt glaze)	1796 to 1900	1848
	Yellowware	1830 to 1920	1875
	Coarse red earthenware	1796 to 1920	1858
Decoration and Colour			
	Blue shell edge	1800 to 1850	1825
	Green shell edge	1800 to 1835	1817.5
	Embossed beaded edge	1830 to 1840	1835
	Chicken claw edge	1840 to 1850	1845
	Arrow impressed edge	1840 to 1850	1845
	Edge decoration with scalloped rim	1800 to 1840	1820
	Blue sponge	1840 to 1870	1855
	Polychrome sponge	1850 to 1880	1865

	Tri-colour trailed slip or finger slip	1796 to 1840	1818
	Trailed slip	1796 to 1840	1818
	Mocha	1835 to 1900	1867.5
	Rockingham-type glaze	1855 to 1890	1872.5
	Blue transfer	1800 to present	1907.5
	Olde Blue	1815 to 1835	1825
	Flowing blue transfer	1844 to 1900	1872
	Pink or light red transfer	1828 to present	1921.5
	Brown transfer	1828 to present	1921.5
	Green transfer	1828 to present	1921.5
	Pale blue transfer	1830 to 1850	1840
	Black transfer	1800 to 1850	1825
	Mulberry transfer	1930 to 1850	1840
	Slip inlaid	1800 to 1850	1825
	Dark brown/black thin annular banding	1830 to 1850	1840
	Polychrome heavy annular banding	1850 to 1920	1885
	Fine painted polychrome with floral pattern in pastel colours	1796 to 1820	1808
	Heavy painted polychrome with floral patterns in chrome-based colours	1820 to 1850	1835
	Painted chinoiserie	1796 to 1820	1808
	Lustre	1820 to 1880	1850
	Jackfield	1796 to 1830	1813
	Black Basalt	1796 to 1813	1804.5
	Cyplesware	1796 to 1850	1823
Form			
	Drainage pipe, coarse red earthenware, extruded	1848 to 1890	1869
	Drainage pipe, coarse red earthenware, moulded	1890 to present	1947.5
	Drainage pipe, stoneware	1900 to present	1957.5

South's MCD be applied to Ontario historic sites. He constructed a list of 43 ceramic types with date ranges and median dates (Jouppien 1980: Table 3, 26-27) (Table 1). This list, however, does not list manufacturing date ranges as South had constructed based on Colonial American sites. Instead Jouppien adjusted these date ranges to account for temporal and historic difference between Colonial America and Ontario. In particular he adjusted the date ranges based on the recovery of ceramic artifacts from known historic military sites in Ontario (Jouppien 1980:25, Table 1). This included adding diagnostic traits and types to the list. He then confirmed these adjustments by conferring with material cultural experts (Jouppien 1980: 25, Table 2).

In making these adjustments Jouppien is taking into account what Adams (2003:47) calls global market context of consumer goods. It should also be noted that South (1977:213) also anticipated the need for such adjustments by stating that: "...the need for separate models for different cultural traditions...It should be kept in mind that additional types can be added by the archaeologist, provided the manufacturing dates are known. Thus the degree of refinement of the tool is dependent upon the degree of sophistication of the archaeologist's ceramic knowledge."

Jouppien noted that his list was based on military sites. He reasoned that this would be accurate for non-military historic sites because military sites often purchased goods from local merchants and these would have provided ceramics to the local farming community as well. Kenyon took a different approach: he based his ceramic list on a variety of archived general store and family records. He researched general store invoices, day books, ledgers, inventories, memoranda, probate inventories and newspaper advertisements. Family records included bills of account, household account books as well as probate inventories (Kenyon 1991:9). In this sense he follows Majewski and O'Brian (1987:102) who note that the use of such historical documents to

group or classify historic ceramics (or an archaeological object) may be more historically 'real' since store owners and consumers made conscious decisions to stock and purchase certain objects.

Although Kenyon does not state it directly, his research focused on the stores that catered to those farm households at some distance from the larger urban centres of Ontario at that time. He notes that such stores from the early to mid-19th century provided goods to roughly 300 people or 50 families (Kenyon 1991:1) in a township or county. It is some of these farmsteads that are now being impacted by urban expansion and that require mitigation by consulting archaeologists. Again, the use of these sources of data should be seen as another 'refinement of the tool' as noted in South's quote above.

It is from these records that Kenyon developed his initial list (Figure 1). In this list, there are no ranges for the dates, only median dates. When compared to those from Jouppien, there are some differences. These I believe can be attributed to the differing data sources.

Kenyon's approach covers what Adams calls the 'Popularity of Consumer Goods and the Effect of Dating Sites' (Adams 2003:48-49). Essentially, as in today's market place, if an item does not sell well, than stores stop carrying the item. Kenyon (1991:4-9) gives several examples where he thinks consumer preference impacted what stores would carry. In several cases it appears that some areas of rural 19th century Ontario had conservative consumer tastes and older, more familiar, ceramic wares remained popular and stocked store shelves thus delaying the acceptance of newer styles in those areas.

Burke (1991:85) has suggested that new ceramics types are most popular soon after their introduction, not at the mid-point of their production range as suggested by South's unimodal assumption. At least in one instance in Ontario, Kenyon would suggest otherwise. His data suggests that ironstone or white



Typical ceramic assemblages encountered by the author (from site BbHj-45, in Tiverton, ON)

Table 2: Kenyon Revised Dating List (after Kenyon 1991)				
Class	Type	Initial Date	Median Dates	Terminal Date
Plain				
	Yellowware	1842	Median Dates	1882
	Wheat	1865	1862	1885
	White Granite – other	1846	1875	1889
			1867.5	
Edged				
	Blue Edged	1798		1873
	Green Edged	1800	1835.5	1836
			1818	
Painted/Sponged				
	Sponged	1843		1885
	Stamped		1864	
	Painted - Blue	1797	1865	1831
	Painted - Red	1798	1814	1809
	Enamelled Painted	1796	1803.5	1831
	Painted	1796	1836	1872
Printed			1834	
	Blue	1802		1867
	Willow	1833	1834.5	1885
	Pink	1832	1859	1864
	Black	1832	1848	1845
	Brown	1832	1838.5	1868
	Grey	1854	1850	1858
	Flow	1845	1856	1866
	Mulberry	1851	1855.5	1868
			1859.5	
	Mulberry	1851	1855.5	1868
			1859.5	

granite was first introduced into Ontario in the latter half of the 1840s and then slowly gained popularity over the next several decades until it almost completely replaced the earlier decorated ceramics (Kenyon 1991:6-8, 11).

In my opinion both Jouppien and Kenyon provide sound arguments for their respective lists and the date ranges and median dates associated with each. Jouppien's list is more extensive and detailed but its reliance on ceramics from military sites may not always be relevant for all areas of rural 19th century Ontario, in particular, those that were not in the immediate vicinity of military establishments. The extensiveness of Jouppien's list includes rare types (Jouppien 1980:24) that were quite possibly seldom seen on the dinner tables of most 19th century Ontario farms. Kenyon's initial list from 1988 and his updated research in his unpublished 1991 distributed paper were obviously a work in progress. I can only imagine that he would have further updated and refined his list if it had not been for his untimely passing in 1997 at the age of 50. The fact that the Ontario Archaeological Society dedicated an entire issue of *Ontario Archaeology* in his memory attests to his influence (Ferris 2007).

Although Kenyon's list may be more relevant and possibly more accurate for dating 19th century farmstead sites removed from military establishments, it does remain unfinished. I have taken the liberty of constructing a revised list based on the results in his distributed paper that I have labeled Kenyon 1991. Yet even this remains unfinished, since the data provided by Kenyon's research ends at 1890. Additionally, the updated Kenyon list does not include some types such as creamware due to the nature of his archival resources. He notes (Kenyon 1991:9) that: "...undecorated earthenwares, known in the 19th century as 'cream coloured', 'C.C', 'plain' or 'white'. These C.C. wares are mentioned throughout the 1795-1890 period, using similar terminology. The historical records consulted give no clue to the fact that about 1830 the glaze of C.C wares changed significantly. Before about 1830, most C.C. wares had distinctive yellowish tinge...After about 1830, undecorated tea and dinner wares unusually had an early clear glaze (whiteware)."

In this case, Jouppien's more extensive list would be more useful with the major difference between the two being the established date ranges and median dates.

Conclusion

Initially I had hoped to be able to conclude, for my own purposes, which list would be useful in helping to date 19th century sites encountered during consulting work. In particular I wanted to help resolve the issue of when a relatively small number of early ceramic sherds (e.g., creamware) is found mixed in with a large number of more recent (20th century) artifacts. This is similar to the situation that South discussed (noted above) in the early 1970s where a single sherd of one ware type held the same weight as multiple sherds of other types. The Mean Ceramic Date corrects this problem to some degree, whether one uses sherd or vessel counts. Despite the debate among historic archaeologists about the usefulness and accuracy of the technique, South's Mean Ceramic Date is the only technique I have come

across in the literature that provides a quick and possibly dirty date, which is sometimes needed in the consulting industry, for historic period sites.

Despite these uneven results, as Majewski and O'Brien (1987:171) call it, the fact is, it is sometimes effective and should not be rejected out of hand. As an example, Burke (1991) used a modified MCD, similar to Kenyon's popularity based mean ceramic dates, on ceramics from a seasonally occupied site on Saddle Island near Red Bay, Newfoundland and Labrador. He obtained a date of 1859.4 using vessel counts, a date of 1861.2 using sherd counts and a date of 1862 using makers' marks. All of these fall midway through the 1830-1890 occupation of the site (Burke 1991:85-86). In this particular case the MCD does provide an accurate mean date of the site occupation, which is its purpose. Anything more profound than that must come from more detailed ceramic analysis. This single example can of course be countered with examples of where the technique failed. What this suggests is that the technique needs refinement, not abandonment.

Jouppien (1980:28) had requested that other historic researchers help him refine the date list. I am uncertain how successful he was at this request since I have found no updated list published by him. I suspect he was not very successful in getting responses. It can only be assumed that the inconsistent success of MCD and methodological and possibly theoretical critiques of the technique may have unduly influenced the few historic archaeology practitioners in Ontario at that time.

Another factor of equal importance is the lack of assemblages being generated by consulting archaeologists. As I recall few historic sites were mitigated late 1970s and early 1980s by consulting archaeologists, with a few exceptions. Thus there were few assemblages to analyze or submit. This practice changed over the course of the decade in part due to Kenyon's presence at the London Office of the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (or one of its various incarnations). Yet despite these critiques and lack of hard data from the field, Kenyon felt the MCD technique had merit since he persisted in his documentary research to refine the date ranges of ceramic types throughout the 1980s and into the 1990s.

In that same vein as Jouppien, I have concluded that, in order to use MCD in Ontario, what is needed is to first determine which MCD list provides the most accurate date, or alternatively to determine that the technique truly is of no use whatsoever. In addition, it may be useful to add a Skew statistic and graph to deal with the popularity effect that some researchers have noted. The popularity effect is when new styles become very popular early in their manufacturing life followed by a slow decline (Majewski and O'Brien (1987:171)).

To this end, and for my own purposes, I have set up a spreadsheet with the three lists mentioned above that calculates the Mean Ceramic date and the Standard Deviation, modifying the formula provided by Christensen (1994:306) (as of yet I have not programmed the list with a Skew statistic). If anyone would like a copy of this list, please email me at tarnold@sympatico.ca. I

have programmed the spreadsheet in both WordPerfect Quattro-Pro and Microsoft Office Excel formats, so please specify which you prefer. I plan on creating a database in order to record my own results. I would recommend that others do the same.

Ideally, what is needed is a central database where all results could be recorded. The logical location would be the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, however, staffing and other concerns at the Ministry would appear to make this unlikely. Thus, such a responsibility would fall to someone in the consulting industry, or preferably an academic historic archaeologist who would be independent of both consulting archaeology and government regulators. This individual would take on the task of setting up the database, maintaining it and periodically (i.e., once a year) publishing the results of which list or which ceramic types appear to be the best for dating historic sites. Perhaps, eventually, a composite list or lists for different parts of the province could be developed from this data that would be useful to all archaeologists in Ontario.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Bruce Stewart, Sara Beanlands and Mike Brand all provided useful comments and suggestions on earlier drafts of this paper. I appreciate and thank all three for taking the time to review these drafts and for their patience at my constant hounding of them to return their comments to me.

REFERENCES

- Adams, William Hampton
2003 Dating Historical Sites: The Importance of Understanding Time Lag in the Acquisition, Curation, Use and Disposal of Artifacts. *Historical Archaeology*, 37(2): 38-64.
- Burke, Charles Alexander
1991 Nineteenth Century Ceramic Artifacts from a Seasonally Occupied Fishing Station on Saddle Island, Red Bay, Labrador. Unpublished Master of Arts thesis, Department of Graduate Studies, Memorial University of Newfoundland
- Christenson, Andrew L.
1994 A Test of Mean Ceramic Dating Using Well-dated Kayenta Anasazi Sites. *Kiva* Vol. 59, No. 3. 297-314
- Ferris, Neal (editor)
2007 An Ian T. Kenyon Memorial Volume. *Ontario Archaeology* No 64.
- Hull, Katherine
2007 Beyond the Mean Ceramic Date: The Interpretive Potential of Historic Ceramics in Cultural Resource Management. *Ontario Archaeology* No. 83/84: 80-91.
- Hume, Ivor Noël
1970 *A guide to artifacts of Colonial America*. Knopf, New York.
- Jouppien, J. K.
1980 The Application of South's Mean Ceramic Dating Formula to Ontario Historic Sites. *Arch Notes* May/June 1980:24-29.
- Kenyon, Ian
1985a A History of Ceramic Tableware in Ontario 1780-1840. *Arch Notes* May/June 85-3:41

1985b A History of Ceramic Tableware in Ontario 1840-1870. *Arch Notes* Sept/Oct 85-5:13-28.

1985c A History of Ceramic Tableware in Ontario 1870-1890. *Arch Notes* Nov/Dec 85-6:14-21.

1987 A History of Ceramic Tableware in Ontario: 1795-1890, Historical Date Ranges. *Arch Notes* Nov/Dec 87-6:22-25.

1988a A History of Ceramic Tableware in Ontario: Quantitative Trends in Plates. *Arch Notes* March/April 88-2:5-8.

1988b A History of Ceramic Tableware in Ontario: Quantitative Trends in Teaware. *Arch Notes* Nov/Dec 88-6:7-9.

1991 A History of Ceramic Tableware in Ontario: 1780-1890. Unpublished distributed paper at the "An Introduction to English Ceramics for Archaeologists Workshop", Sponsored by the Association of Professional Archaeologists, 20 April 1991, Toronto, ON.
- Government of Ontario
2014 The Archaeology of Rural Historical Farmstead: A Draft Technical Guideline for Consulting Archaeologists in Ontario. Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport.
- Majewski, T. and M. O'Brien
1987 The Use and Misuse of Nineteenth-Century English and American Ceramics in Archaeological Analysis. In *Method and Theory* Vol. 11. edited by V. M. Schiffer. Pp.97207. Academic Press, New York.
- South, Stanley
1977 *Method and Theory in Historical Archaeology*, Academic Press, New York.
- Turnbaugh, William and Sara Peabody Turnbaugh
1977 Alternative Applications of the Mean Ceramic Date Concept for Interpreting Human Behavior. *Historical Archaeology* 11:90-105.
- Willey, Gordon R. And Phillip Phillips
1958 *Method and theory in American archaeology*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.



*Circles of interaction:
The Wendat and their neighbours
in the time of Champlain*



The Huronia Chapter of the OAS invites you to the 42nd annual symposium. This will be a joint meeting with the Eastern States Archaeological Federation.

Hotel information:

The conference will be held from Oct. 16 to 18, 2015 at the Best Western Highland Inn and Conference Centre in Midland, Ontario. The Best Western is providing special conference rates for rooms starting at \$84.99 per night, including a hot buffet breakfast. Book online at the con-

ference rates using this link <http://book.bestwestern.com/bestwestern/groupSearch.do?groupId=5X0UZ8D2> or book by phone (1 800 461 4265) and request the OAS symposium rate.

Program and Registration information:

A full preliminary program and registration information can be found online at www.wendatcircles.org.

Registration (before Sept. 18): (For registration after Sept. 18, add \$10 to the registration fee.)

Advanced registration – OAS or ESAF Member	\$60	
Advanced registration - Non-Member	\$65	
Student (with ID at registration)	\$35	
Friday morning bus tour of archaeological sites in Huronia	\$20	
Friday morning tour of the Huronia Museum and Ste. Marie among the Hurons	\$20	
Friday afternoon MTCSI/OHT workshop	NC	
Friday evening reception	NC	
Saturday evening banquet: Member, Non-member or Guest	\$55	
Saturday evening banquet: Student	\$35	
Sunday tour of Ahatsistari site	NC	
Sunday tour of Martyrs' Shrine and Archives	NC	
Donation to support the symposium		
Total		

Name: _____
Affiliation: _____
Address: _____
Email: _____
Phone: _____

Register on-line at <http://www.wendatcircles.org> or print this out and send a cheque payable to Huronia OAS Symposium. Registration forms and cheques should be sent to:

Kristin Thor
PO Box 2164, 14 Bill Street
Walkerton, ON N0G 2V0



The Ontario Archaeological Society



**AGENDA FOR THE
ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING
SATURDAY, OCT. 17, 2015 FROM 4:30 TO 6:00PM AT THE
BEST WESTERN HIGHLAND INN, MIDLAND ON**

1. President's opening remarks
2. Minutes of the previous meeting
3. Matters arising from these minutes
4. President's report
Constitutional amendment(s) (see Page 19)
5. Treasurer's report
Financial statement
Discussion of membership rate for e-mailed versions of *Arch Notes*
Endowment funds
Appointment of auditors
6. Election of Directors
7. Next Symposia – 2016? 2017?
8. Progress of 2014–2019 Strategic Plan
9. Other business
10. Motions of thanks
11. Adjournment

The Ontario Archaeological Society

Budget for 2015 compared to results from 2013 and 2014

INCOME/EXPENSE STATEMENT	2013	2013	2014	2014	2015	2015
	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget
	Jan - Dec		Jan - Dec.		Jan - July	
Membership fees (excl OA subscription)	18,946	19,000	18,000	19,000	18,167	19,000
Grants						
PHO Grant (Note 1)	42,000	42,000	42,000	42,000	42,000	42,000
SEP Grant	2,785	2,785	2,990	2,785	5,750	5,750
Income - Other grants						
Symposium net income (Note 2)	6,217	3,500	767	3,500	(1000)	3,500
Other income						
Sales	203	300	500	300	1,643	600
Other Income	391	400	780	400	417	400
Chapter fee adjustment	115					
Total Operating income	83,149	67,985	82,656	67,985	66,977	71,250
Office Expenses						
Salary and payroll costs (incl. SEP)	39,397	40,200	43,000	40,200	24,500	44,000
Rent	6,009	6,100	6,130	6,100	4,700	6,100
Insurance	4,216	4,970	5,160	4,970	2,450	5,000
Audit fees	467	600	468	600		600
Legal fees						
Travel mileage (excl symposium)						
Telecom	2,249	2,200	2,411	2,200	1,340	2,000
Office supplies	558	500	553	500	942	600
Postage	1,184	1,200	1,137	1,200	160	1,000
Office equipment	-	100	61	100	255	200
Bank charges	858	900	1,465	900	735	1,500
PayPal charges	572	600	515	600	282	600
Depreciation						
ABM Expenses (inc ED)	1,819	1,300	1,208	1,300		1,300
Program Expenses						
Promotion expenses	34	200	1,500	200	400	500
Grants awarded						
Web Site Upgrades	1,491	3,000	1,500	3,000	1,810	2,000
Outreach expenses	60	500	740	500		500
Board meeting expenses	119	120	93	120	93	120
Exec Board conference calls	318	350	434	350	150	300
Other expenses	1,433	900	970	900	1,842	1,000
Arch Notes Expenses						
Production AN	2,197	2,250	2,160	2,250	1,020	2,250
Postage AN	2,042	2,300	3,075	2,300	1,500	2,000
Packing Arch Notes	600	600	500	600	300	600
Total Arch Notes costs	4,839	5,150	5,735	5,150	2,820	4,850

Total Administration Expenses	65,623	68,890	73,080	68,890	42,479	72,170
Administration Surplus (Deficit)	17,526	(905)	9,576	(905)	24,498	(920)
Ontario Archaeology						
Subscription Income	4,687	4,800	4,100	4,800	3,250	4,800
Production OA	5,158	5,500	6,950	5,500	5,220	5,500
Mailing preparation OA	250	250	500	250	250	250
Postage OA	2,767	2,800	4,050	2,800	2,700	2,800
Total OA costs	8,175	8,550	11,500	8,550	8,170	8,550
OA Surplus (Deficit)	(3,488)	(3,750)	(7,400)	(3,750)	(4,920)	(3,750)
Money Deposited to Funds (note 4)						
Reinvested Income Earned	12,492		17,619			
Life membership (Future Fund)	800		800		800	
Future fund	2,038	2,000	369	2,000	407	2,000
OA publication fund	678	500	308	500	140	500
Awards fund	80	500	176	500	31	500
Valerie Sonstenes Fund	1,009	2,000	1,378	2,000	645	2,000
Peggi Armstrong Fund	171	-	546	-		-
	17,268	5,000	21,196	5,000	2,023	5,000
Money Charged to Funds						
Awards Fund Purchases	3,809	800	560	800		800
Total Funds Surplus (Deficit)	13,459	4,200	20,636	4,200	2,023	4,200
Combined Surplus (Deficit)	15,005	(455)	5,193	(455)	21,601	(470)

2014 Budget approved by Board Jan 18, 2014

Last update: July '15 by D. Steiss

Notes:

- 1 PHO annual operating grant is generally received later in the year
- 2 symposium 2015 advance payment recorded here



The Ontario Archaeological Society

Proxy Form

I _____, a member in good standing of the Society, hereby exercise my right of proxy by identifying:

- _____, a voting member in good standing, or
- the President of the Board of Directors

As my proxy to attend, act, and vote on my behalf at the Annual Business Meeting of members to be held on Oct. 17, 2015

- 1 Regarding agenda items in the Notice of Meeting for which I have full knowledge and understanding - circle one of – For, Against, Abstain, At Proxy’s Discretion
- 2 Regarding amendments from the floor regarding agenda items in the Notice of Meeting -circle one of – For, Against, Abstain, At Proxy’s Discretion
- 3 Regarding items that arise in Other Business -circle one of – For, Against, Abstain, At Proxy’s Discretion

Optional

I wish to present the following amendment to Agenda Item No _____ which I wish my proxy holder to propose:

Further, I wish to register the following limitations to the exercise of my proxy with respect to any Agenda Item or amendments thereto;

Signature _____

Date _____

Name _____

**Please ensure delivery to the OAS Office on or before
Thursday, Oct 1, 2015**

Proposed Amendment to the OAS Constitution

The following amendment to Article 7, Section 7 of the OAS Constitution is proposed in order to up-date the title and role of the current Membership Director portfolio, as follows:

Existing Title/Description in OAS Constitution:

Article 7 – Duties of Directors

7. The Membership Director shall maintain and update the Society's membership list, ensure notifications of membership renewals and proof of memberships are being issued, review and propose to the Executive Board membership fee structure and categories, and develop membership drives.

Proposed Title/Description Amendment:

7. The Director of Member Recruitment will develop and supervise member recruitment programs, assist members with the creation and maintenance of their profiles in the online membership system, supervise and help maintain the online membership database, and undertake periodic analyses of membership data to inform recruitment and other Executive Board initiatives.

WHY WE NEED YOUR EMAIL ADDRESSES

By **Debbie Steiss,**
Treasurer

We are missing current email addresses for a number of members. If you have not added or updated your email address in your membership profile on the new OAS website, please take a moment to log on to <http://www.ontarioarchaeology.org> and review your contact details

for missing or out of date entries (emails have also been returned as undeliverable due to inactive/ incorrect addresses).

For those with Family memberships, consider adding a separate email address for the family member so they may receive communications individually.

Mailing address should also be verified for those members subscribed to

Ontario Archaeology to prevent returned mailings.

Keeping your contact information current helps the OAS stay in touch with members and ensures delivery of membership news, Arch Notes and OA. Your personal information will be kept in strictest confidence and is never shared with outside organizations.

Thank you.

TORONTO CHAPTER HOSTS BBQ FOR ITS MEMBERS AND EXECUTIVE BOARD

by Mima Kapches, Toronto Chapter President

On a beautiful sunny summer's day, Saturday July 19 to be precise, the Toronto Chapter hosted a BBQ lunch for members and the executive of the OAS. We sat in the shade of the trees surrounding the Ashbridge Estate house and barely noticed the blistering and stifling heat that had invaded our city. Ably organized by Sylvia Teaves and the Clarence family (Christine, Brian and Garnet) and the Gray family (Neal and Ann) it went off with nary a glitch. Neal did

the BBQ honours and everyone else brought salads and desserts. The OAS executive provided fruit and veggie trays, as well as applying for permission to have the event at the house (Thanks to Lorie!) As well, my sister in law Mary Kapches of Bosley Real Estate paid for the rental of the BBQ that made the day possible (thank you Mary!).

The chapter was happy to host this social event and everyone had a good time. Since this is only the first BBQ we have hosted it can't be called an annual event, but by next year that's what we will title it, the Toronto Chapter's Annual Picnic and BBQ!



Some of the members of the Executive Board (such as President Rob MacDonald – far right) managed to join in the fun after the Executive Meeting ended.



Executive Director Lorie Harris gets a hug and well deserved thank you for all her work from a former Executive Director Charlie Garrad



Toronto Chapter President Mima Kapches takes a break in the shade with her sister in law Mary Kapches of Bosley Real Estate who paid for the rental of the BBQ.



And, of course, the food was great.

Photos courtesy of Lynna Nguyen



The ONTARIO ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY Inc.

Grand River

chapter

President: John MacDonald
Treasurer: Bonnie Glencross
Secretary: Kathryn McLeod

Hamilton

chapter

President: Gary Warrick
Vice President: Jacqueline Fisher
Treasurer: Ruth Macdougall
Events Co-ordinator: Meagan Brooks
E-mail: hamiltonOAS@hwc.org

Web: <http://hamilton.ontarioarchaeology.on.ca>
Mail: c/o Dr. Gary Warrick, Laurier Brantford,
73 George St. Brantford, ON N3T 2Y3
Phone: (866) 243-7028

Meetings: 3rd Thursday of the month, 7:30, Sept. to
May, Fieldcote Museum, 64 Sulphur Springs
Road, Ancaster
Membership: Individual \$11, Family \$18

Hurononia

chapter

President: John Raynor
Vice President: Jamie Hunter
Secretary: Marg Raynor
Treasurer: Kristin Thor
The Pot Editor: Bill Gibson

Mail: P.O. is PO Box 638 Midland On L4R 4P4
Meetings: 2nd Thursday of every month Sept.
to May at the Midland Public Library
Membership: Individual \$15, Family \$18
Student \$10

London

chapter

President: Nancy Van Sas
Vice President: Darcy Fallon
Treasurer: Jim Keron

Directors: Chris Ellis, Chris Watts and Darryl Dann
KEWA Editors: Christine Dodd, Chris Ellis &
Chris Watts

Web: www.ssc.uwo.ca/assoc/oas
Mail: Museum of Ontario Archaeology, 1600
Attawandaron Rd.,
London, ON N6G 3M6

Phone: (519) 473-1360 Fax (519) 473-1363
Meetings: 8 pm on 2nd Thursday of the month
except May–August; at MOA
Membership: Individual/Family \$18, Student,
\$15, Institutional \$21

Ottawa

chapter

President: André Miller
Vice President: Stacey Girling-Christie
Secretary: Karen Lochhead
Treasurer: Bill MacLennan

Directors at large: Bradley Drouin, Elizabeth
Imrie, Glenna Roberts & Ben Mortimer
Ottawa Archaeologist Editor: Marion Clark
Web master: Yvon Riendeau
Peggy Armstrong Public Archaeology Award:

Lois King
Web: www.ottawaoas.ca
Email address: contact@ottawaoas.ca
Mail: PO Box 4939, Station E,
Ottawa ON K1S 5J1
Meetings: Every 2nd Thursday of the month
from Sept. to May; usually at Routhier
Community Centre, 172 Guigues Street,
Ottawa (in the Byward Market)
Membership: Individual \$20, Family \$25,
Student \$12

Peterborough

chapter

President: Tom Mohr
Treasurer: Harry Johnson
Vice-President: Bill Fox
Sec: Dirk Verhulst
Directors: Julie Kapyrka, Morgan Tamplin,
Pat Dibb, Pat Asling & Deb Mohr
Meetings: the fourth Tuesday of each month,
Membership: Individual \$12, Family \$15,
Student \$8

Strata Editor: Dirk Verhulst
Web: peterborough.ontarioarchaeology.on.ca

Thunder Bay

chapter

President: Clarence Surette
Vice-President: Bill Ross
Secretary/Treasurer: Tasha Hodgson
Director: Jill Taylor-Hollings
Newsletter Editor(Wanikan): Jason Stephenson
& Scott Hamilton

Web Design/Photography: Chris McEvoy
Event Volunteers: Cory Vickruck, Jacque Berry
& Daniel Szo

E-mail: clarence.surette@lakeheadu.ca
[http://anthropology.lakeheadu.ca/?
display=page&pageid=80](http://anthropology.lakeheadu.ca/?display=page&pageid=80)

Meetings: 7 pm on the last Friday of the month
in Room BB0017, Braun Building, Lakehead
University
Membership: \$5

Toronto

chapter

President: Mima Kapches
Past President: Marti Latta
Vice President: Christine Caroppo
Treasurer: Jane Simser
Secretary: Neil Gray
PROFILE Editor: Carole Stimmell

Web: <http://toronto.ontarioarchaeology.on.ca>
Email: TorontoArchaeology@gmail.com
Meetings: 7:30 pm on the 3rd Wednesday
of the month, except June–August
in U of T Anthropology Building,
Room 246, 19 Russell St.
Membership: Individual \$12, Family \$14

Windsor

chapter

President: Amanda Black
Past President: Katherine Graham
Vice President: Rosemarie Denunzio
Secretary: Barbara Johnson
Treasurer: Bob Drago
Website/Newsletter Editor: Katherine Graham
Web: <http://sites.google.com/site/windsoroas>
Contact: oaswindsor@gmail.com
Membership: Individual \$15, Family \$20,
Students \$ 5

MEMBERSHIP

(Canadian \$. Second figure in-
cludes a subscription to
Ontario Archaeology)

Individual	36 / 48
Family	40 / 52
Student	25 / 34
Institutional	62
Life	800

ARCHNOTES SUBMISSIONS

Contributor Deadlines:

January 15

March 15

July 15

September 15

November 15

Send Articles to:

aneditor@ontarioarchaeology.on.ca

or

Arch Notes editor

PO Box 62066

Victoria Terrace Post Office

Toronto, Ontario M4A 2W1