

ARCH NOTES 1983

No. 83-1 Jan/Feb.

Pp. 17-25

Toronto

Ontario Archaeological Society

...neutral glass bead sequence

w r fitzgerald

FURTHER COMMENTS ON THE NEUTRAL GLASS BEAD SEQUENCE

by William R. Fitzgerald

Since Ian Kenyon (1969) defined temporal assemblages from historic Neutral sites there has been little, if in fact any, refinement of the dates proposed for the four glass bead periods he had initially defined. The past two years, however, have marked a resurgence of interest in this very important field of European commodities research. The chronology which has been generated from Neutral sites can, and should be, applied or at least tested elsewhere, particularly in New York and Pennsylvania where the temporally ill-conceived Seneca chronology of Wray and Schoff (1953) has become firmly entrenched and reinforced in the literature of those areas (Pratt 1961, 1976; Tuck 1971; Wray 1973, 1982; Lenig 1977; Smith and Graybill 1977; Bradley 1979; Hosbach and Gibson 1980; Kent 1982).

While analysing the assemblages of the Neutral Spencer-Bronte (Beverly) cluster Shaver Hill and Dwyer cemeteries (Fitzgerald 1982a), I was struck by the complete dissimilarity of the glass bead varieties. It appears that these cemeteries, and their respective villages, Christianson and Robertson, represent an occupational continuum along Spencer Creek between ca. 1615 and the Neutral dispersal in 1651. I have outlined the reasons for this contention elsewhere (Fitzgerald 1982b). At first I could not account for the absence of Christianson/Shaver Hill bead varieties at Dwyer, a continuity which would be expected if they were successive occupations.

If the discrete glass bead assemblages identified by Ian in 1969 were in fact temporally significant I then thought there must have been certain historical events which would have resulted not only in the replacement of one bead assemblage by another, but which would also have had an effect on the entire European assemblage.

Returning to the Christianson/Shaver Hill-Robertson/Dwyer continuum I had hoped that some historical event might have been responsible for the completely different glass bead assemblages, and also for the great increase in the frequency of European goods from Christianson (0.28%) to village sites contemporaneous with Dwyer (Robertson has never been excavated; however, I hope to undertake excavation there this summer), such as Hamilton (7.14%) and Hood (8.36%)(Fitzgerald 1981:243). Firstly, the Shaver Hill Jesuit rosary medalion likely entered Neutralia after 1619, and perhaps around 1626 considering Brule was in Neutralia in 1625 and Dailon in 1626 (even though Dailon was a Recollet, they and the Jesuits initially worked closely together)(Fitzgerald 1982b:8-9). Secondly, in 1633 the Company of the Hundred Associates, a French government run company operating out of Paris took control of the French trade with the intention of greatly increasing the French trading presence along the St. Lawrence. I had hypothesized that it was this change from small scale private trading companies (Rouen and St. Malo Company, de Caen Company) to a much larger government operation which was the cause of the different bead assemblages at Shaver Hill and Dwyer, and the vast increase in the quantity of trade goods present on later, apparently then, post-1633 village sites (Fitzgerald 1982b:15-16). This would not, however, account for the complete absence of ca. 1615-1632 bead varieties, such as those from Shaver Hill and Christianson, at Dwyer. What might be responsible for this feature is the fact that the Huron refused to trade with the English between 1628 and 1632 when the English occupied New France. If the Christianson villagers were moving upstream to establish the Robertson village at the time of the English-

induced interruption in the flow of European goods into southern Ontario, then once they had settled and trade was re-established along the French network with a new supplier who provided even greater quantities, then such an artifactual consequence would not be an unlikely manifestation of the historical events of this period (Fitzgerald 1982a,b).

That is why I have assigned the year 1632 to the boundary between "Shaver Hill-type" assemblages and "Dwyer-type" assemblages. In this instance European events (changing trade inventories) and native events (village movement) coincide; however, such fortune is not the rule. More frequently, site occupations overlap the temporal periods defined on the basis of European commodities, with the result being mixed European assemblages.

Following my presentation of the temporal boundary between these successive occupations, Ian and Thomas Kenyon (1982) presented a refinement of Ian's 1969 chronology. In this modification they renamed Period 4, feeling Ian's Period 3 should be subdivided into two stages, 3a and 3b. This was undertaken on the basis of red tubular glass beads, Period 3a being defined where frequencies were less than 10-15% and Period 3b where there were more than 10-15% (Kenyon and Kenyon 1982:15).

Ian's 1969 sequence remains virtually unscathed and I am completely in agreement with his typological definitions of Periods 1, 2, and 3b as being temporally discrete assemblages. I do not, however, believe that his Period 3a represents a discrete stage of European introductions as do Periods 1, 2 and 3b. The Neutral Daniels village and cemetery, which Ian lists as a Period 3a assemblage (Kenyon and Kenyon 1982:15), aside from having less than 10-15% of red tubular beads, has bead types which are characteristic of Periods 2 and 3b. It would seem rather than being a distinct bead period, Ian's Period 3a is an assemblage that would seem to span the latter years of Period 2 and the early part of his Period 3b. The lower frequencies of red tubulars from his Period 3a sites is simply a result of mixing of two different bead assemblages. In fact then, Ian's Period 3b would be the 1632-1651 "Dwyer-type" assemblage.

What I am proposing is that (1) Ian's Periods 1 and 2 bead assemblages do in fact represent distinct phases in fur trade activities, (2) that his Period 3a classification should be eliminated, and (3) that Period 3b should simply be referred to as Period 3, for it, as do Periods 1 and 2, appears to consist of a discrete bead assemblage. With each of these periods possessing a characteristic bead assemblage, sites can then be placed within the sequence, either directly into one of the characteristic periods, or based on relative frequencies of mixed bead assemblages and in conjunction with the nature of the overall European assemblage, in a transitional stage between two of the periods.

While Ian is largely responsible for differentiating between bead assemblages, little attention has been paid to relating historical events to alterations in the assemblages, or basically, why did bead assemblages change noticeably three times between some time around 1580 and the time when the Neutral were dispersed in 1651. I have suggested (Fitzgerald 1982a,b) a boundary date of 1632 between Periods 2 and 3, and I should now present the historical data which I believe are responsible for the other boundaries. I agree with Ian that Period 1 can likely be given an initiation date of ca. 1581 (Kenyon and Kenyon 1982:4), as it was at this time that professional traders, rather than fishermen and whalers, were trading at Tadoussac (Trigger 1979:14) and this likely would have marked an increase in the amount of European goods present

prior to this (Trigger 1979:215). Such activity may have been the impetus necessary to produce quantities of European articles in southern Ontario, initially in cemeteries such as Carton, Snider, and Kleinburg. European goods were not so pervasive as to be similarly represented on contemporaneous Period 1 villages such as the Neutral Fonger site (Warrick 1979). Glass beads were not recovered, and the metallic items which were recovered were in a largely fragmented nature, indicating the extensiveness of their use.

Elsewhere (Fitzgerald 1982c) I have divided the span of time when European goods could have been present in southern Ontario assemblages into four stages (I, II, III, IV)(Table 1). Stage I (ca. 1497 - ca. 1581) marks the period when fishing, whaling, and exploration were the major preoccupations of Europeans. These orientations are reflected in the paucity of European goods on southern Ontario sites, such as the Huron Sopher ossuary (Noble 1971), where but a single iron bar celt was recovered. Stages II, III, and IV correspond to glass bead periods 1, 2 and 3.

The next threshold, marking the end of glass bead Period 1 and the beginning of Period 2, would appear to be the initiation of direct contact between Iroquoian groups and Europeans in southern Ontario and New York between 1609 and 1615. As they would not have to deal with Algonkian intermediaries, a greater variety of trade goods would be expected on sites of Period 2. This seems to be the case, not so much in quantity, as the Period 1 Fonger village site had 0.87% European goods in its assemblage (Warrick 1982: personal communication) compared to the 0.28% on the Period 2 Christianson village site, but rather in the variety of European manufactured goods present in village contexts. While Spanish and Portuguese manufactured shell beads (Whitbourne 1620), likely traded through the Susquehannock (Fitzgerald 1982c:13-14), appear in Period 1 cemeteries, as did glass beads, these items only begin to appear on villages in archaeologically recoverable quantities in Period 2, and in even greater quantities in the cemeteries. While Kleinburg had 33 glass beads and some 367 pieces of worked shell, Shaver Hill had 407 and 12,030 respectively. The sudden increase in lathed discoidal and tubular shell beads was likely caused by the Dutch involvement in the shell bead industry after 1610 along the Hudson river (Trelease 1960:48, Fitzgerald 1982c:14). It is interesting to note that short white tubular glass beads (Ia5) begin to appear in Period 2 assemblages suddenly and in quite large quantities in Ontario. Such quantities are not observed in New York or Pennsylvania, and I have suggested that this increase on primarily French-supplied sites (Neutral, Petun, Huron) may have been an attempt by the French to imitate the Dutch-supplied tubular shell beads which began to flood the market and divert Huron traders to the Hudson river as early as 1610. The appearance of white tubular glass beads would tend to corroborate a 1609/1615 beginning date for Period 2, a period characterized by these white tubular glass imitations (Fitzgerald 1982c:14).

While direct contact may have been responsible for increased amounts, the appearance of northern French coastal private trading companies during this period in the St. Lawrence (Rouen and St. Malo Company: 1613-1620, de Caen Company: 1621-1627) may account for the different glass bead assemblage.

I previously mentioned that the replacement of these private companies by the Paris-based Company of the Hundred Associates in 1633 likely caused the changed glass bead assemblage. Ian disagrees with my date for the end of Period 2 (Kenyon and Kenyon 1982:18); however, the implementation of historical events to account for change in European assemblages is the only method which I can see as being of any value. Ian, however, produces no valid evidence for

Table 1: Historic events related to the establishment of the artifact stages

| Stages of European goods introduction | | Historic Events | Glass bead periods—Ontario |
|---------------------------------------|------|---|----------------------------|
| I | 1500 | European explorers along east coast 1497 | |
| | | French in Gulf of St. Lawrence 1506 | |
| | | Spanish discover Chesapeake Bay 1521 | |
| | | Cartier at Hochelaga 1535 | |
| II | 1550 | Beaver near extinction in Europe | |
| | | Whalers trading at Tadoussac 1560 | |
| | | Spanish Florida settlement begins 1565 | |
| | | Professional traders at Tadoussac 1581 | |
| III | 1600 | English Roanoke colony 1585-1590 | 1 |
| | | English Jamestown colony 1607 | |
| | | Huron on St. Lawrence, Dutch on Hudson 1609 | |
| | | Rouen and St. Malo Company 1613-1620 | |
| IV | 1650 | French among Huron and Neutral 1615 | 2 |
| | | deCaën Company 1621-1627 | |
| | | English disruption 1628-1632 | |
| | | Company of One Hundred Associates 1633-1645 | |
| V | 1650 | Company of Habitants 1645-1658 | 3 |
| | | Neutral dispersal 1651 | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

substantiation of his terminal Period 2 date. Gut feelings, guesses, and intuition should be placed aside when there is a wealth of historical information which can be used when attempting to assign dates to European assemblages. While this criticism is not directed at Ian, it is aimed at those individuals who refuse to accept the usefulness of historical analogy and fact. I will be the first to admit that my methodology is at this point only a hypothetical one; however, the facts seem to substantiate it, at least at this time. Fortunately, the work on Neutral sites initiated by Ian (Kenyon 1969) has been of a more critical nature, and later refinements (Fitzgerald 1982a,b,c.; Kenyon and Kenyon 1982; Kenyon and Fox 1982) should start to displace certain of the misconceived early dates currently in vogue in New York and Pennsylvania.

Returning to my 1632 terminal date for Period 2, there is corroborative evidence for an early 1630's date for the end of the Period 2 assemblage, from all places, Florida. Independently derived from historical events pertaining to phases of Spanish exploration and settlement in Florida, Marvin Smith has noted that glass beads between the years 1570 and 1630 (he doesn't distinguish between Periods 1 and 2 as such) appear to be similar to those from the northeast (Smith 1982:12), with those from the later years of this span being similar in many respects to those from Shaver Hill and the Huron Ball site to name a few.

I believe there is more than enough corroborative archaeological and historical evidence to indicate that Period 2 did not end until some time around 1632 (Shaver Hill medallion, changing trading companies, Florida evidence). Quantities of the European assemblage is also a feature which reflects the increased trading activity during Period 3. Remember, villages of Periods 1 and 2 had less than 1.0% of European goods in their artifact assemblages, but later sites such as Walker (3.76%), Hamilton (7.14%), and Hood (8.36%) exhibit exponential increases, and as I have said previously, were likely caused by the trading practices of the Company of the Hundred Associates (1633-1645) and later the Company of Habitants (1645-1658). It is interesting to note Walker's frequency, suggestive of an intermediary, transitional stage, is substantiated by the mixed glass bead assemblage, possessing glass beads characteristic of Periods 2 and 3. It would appear then that not only would glass bead types be mixed if the site was occupied during the span of two European eras, but as would be expected, the amounts of goods received. This would tend to lend more credibility to the association of European historic trade related events to artifact patterns on Neutral sites. Such a practice elsewhere would likely lead to a re-evaluation of chronologies among other groups.

Ian's sequences have perhaps one fatal, but likely subconscious, presumption. With his placement of a native site into one particular period he is attributing that assemblage to a temporally defined period, a period whose dates he has, however, derived from European, not native events. Native events (e.g. village movements) and European events (e.g. changes in suppliers) rarely coincide and I was particularly lucky to have been able to develop my refinement from the Shaver Hill and Dwyer samples as they were discrete, completely different assemblages. More often than not, however, when Europeans changed bead assemblages, native villages continued to be occupied, with the result being an assemblage which had beads from both eras.

While Ian's 1969 and 1982 chronologies appear to have made an attempt to account for transitional assemblages, I have decided that it would be best to isolate distinctive glass bead assemblages (Periods 1, 2, 3) and assign dates derived from European activities, political and economic events which may have

Table 2: Glass Bead Periods and Sites

| Glass Bead Period | Dates | Characteristic Beads (only the most common types) | In Period Sites | | Transitional Sites | |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|------------------------|--------------------|
| | | | Villages | Cemeteries | Villages | Cemeteries |
| 1 | 1580 - 1609/1615 | Fert core IIa31 IIa55,56 IIb1- (13,14 stripes) IIb18,19 IIb67 IIb23 IIIa1 | | (Carton (N)) Fonger (N), Snider (N) | | |
| | | | | Kleinburg (H-N) | (1-2) | |
| | | | | | Ball (H) | |
| 2 | 1609/1615 - 1632 | IIa5 IIa19 IIb'2 IIa13,14,15 IIa55,56,57 IIg4 and other eyed varieties IIb1 IIIb9 IIIk3 IIIm14 IIIb63 IVk3,4 | Christianson (N) C. Smith (N) Donovan (N) Cahiagué (H) Alonso (H) Vints (H) Frank Bay (Nip.) | Shaver Hill (N) Fradenberg (N) Smith- Saeger (N) | Indian Hills (A) | |
| | | | | | (2-3) | |
| | | | | | Walker (N) | Walker (N) |
| | | | | | Mount (N) | Daniels (N) |
| | | | | | Daniels (N) | Sealey (N) |
| | | | | | Sealey (N) | Grimsby (N) |
| | | | | | Sharpe/ Lindley (N) | St. David's (N) |
| | | | | | Robitaille (H) | Ossossané (H) |
| | | | | | Angoutenc (H) | |
| | | | | | Santino (H) | |
| | | | | | Gignac Lake (H) | |
| 3 | 1632 - 1651 | IIa1 IIa12 IIc'1 IIa1,2,7 IIa31, 31- (circular) IIIc1 IIIc3 IIIk3,4* IIIm1* IVa1, 1- (circular), 2, 3, 5, 6 IVa12,13 IVb23 IVb34 | Hamilton (N) Hond (N) Martin (N) Point Abino (N) Edwards (H) Ossossané II (H) St. Marie I (H) St. Marie II (H) | Cooper (N) Dwyer (N) Burke (N) Port Colbourne (N) Maurice (H) Christian Island (H) | | |

caused the distinctiveness. While some sites would have been occupied exclusively during the span of one of these periods, just as many, if not more, would be expected to span portions of two of the European-defined eras (Table 2). The relative frequencies of beads could then provide a means to assess the amount of time the village/cemetery occupied in each of the eras. Such a procedure would then permit a means to date sites, based on the frequencies of particular period characteristic beads, and which could be implemented elsewhere.

Basically what I am trying to present here is that distinctive European assemblages do exist and no doubt in some instances overlap on native sites, with the result that bead varieties from two typically discrete periods can have filtered into a village/cemetery. Remember, these time and bead periods are based on European events and that the placement of native sites into this European-derived sequence is only that. We have European assemblages from native sites in one hand and in the other we have a sequence derived from European commodities. What I have attempted to do is align the two as best as possible, calibrating native site assemblages with European and New World fur trade events.

While the Kenyons and myself agree on the basic presence of three distinct glass bead periods, largely derived from Ian's 1969 pioneering study, I have attempted to clarify the dates assigned to the periods by attributing the change in the type and quantity of European goods to changes in New and Old World suppliers and the developing intensification of fur trade activities from ca. 1580 onward.

Perhaps a table (Table 1) would best summarize my arguments and perception of what the dates for the sequence should be.

References

- Bradley, J.W. 1979 The Onondaga Iroquois: 1500-1655, A Study in Acculturative Change and its Consequences. Ph.D. dissertation, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York.
- Fitzgerald, W.R. 1981 Lest the Beaver Run Loose: The Early 17th Century Christianson Site and Trends in Historic Neutral Archaeology. M.A. thesis, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario.
- 1982a In the Shadow of the Great Beaver: Alterations in Burial Offerings in the Spencer Creek Area of Historic Neutralia. Report submitted to the Ontario Heritage Foundation, Toronto.
- 1982b A Refinement of Historic Neutral Chronologies: Evidence from Shaver Hill, Christianson, and Dwyer. Paper presented at the 15th annual Canadian Archaeological Association meeting, Hamilton, Ontario.
- 1982c The Neutral and the Fur Trade: Historical and Archaeological Evidence. Paper presented to the Toledo Area Aboriginal Research Society, Toledo, Ohio.
- Hosbach, R.E. and S. Gibson 1980 The Wilson Site (OND 9): A Protohistoric Oneida Village. Chenago Chapter, New York State Archaeological Association Bulletin 18(4A).
- Kent, B.C. 1982 The Susquehanna Bead Sequence. Paper presented at the Glass Trade Bead Conference, Rochester, New York.

- Kenyon, I.T. 1969 Glass Beads: A Technique for Dating Historic Neutral Sites. Unpublished manuscript.
- Kenyon, I.T. and T. Kenyon 1982 Comments on 17th Century Glass Trade Beads from Ontario. Unpublished manuscript. Archaeology and Heritage Planning, Ministry of Citizenship and Culture, London.
- Kenyon, I.T. and W.A. Fox 1982 The Grimsby Cemetery - Second Look. KEWA 82-9:3-16.
- Kenyon, W.A. 1982 The Grimsby Site: A Historic Neutral Cemetery. Archaeological Monograph, Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto.
- Lenig, D. 1977 Of Dutchmen, Beaver Hats and Iroquois. In Current Perspectives in Northeastern Archaeology, Essays in Honor of William A. Ritchie. Edited by R.E. Funk and C.F. Hayes. Researches and Transactions of the New York State Archaeological Association XVII(1):71-84.
- Lennox, P.A. 1978 The Hood Site: A Historic Town of 1640 A.D. Report submitted to the Ontario Heritage Foundation, Toronto.
- 1981 The Hamilton Site: A Late Historic Neutral Town. National Museum of Man Mercury Series, Archaeological Survey of Canada Paper 103:210-403.
- Motykova, K. 1969 Seventeenth Century Huron Glass Beads. Paleoecology and Ontario Prehistory, edited by W.M. Hurley and C.E. Heidenreich. Department of Anthropology, University of Toronto Research Report No. 1:88-104.
- Noble, W.C. 1971 The Sopher Celt: An Indicator of Early Protohistoric Trade in Huronia. Ontario Archaeology 16:42-47.
- Pratt, P.P. 1961 Oneida Glass Trade Bead Sequence, 1585-1745. Onondaga Printing Company, Syracuse, New York.
- 1976 Archaeology of the Oneida Iroquois, Volume 1. Occasional Publications in Northeastern Anthropology, No. 1
- Smith, I.F. and J.R. Graybill 1977 A Report on the Shenks Ferry and Susquehannock Components at the Funk Site, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. Man in the Northeast 13:45-65.
- Smith, M.T. 1982 Chronology from Glass Beads: The Spanish Period in the Southeast, 1513-1670. Paper presented at the Glass Trade Bead Conference, Rochester, New York.
- Trelease, A.W. 1960 Indian Affairs in Colonial New York: The Seventeenth Century. Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York.
- Trigger, B.G. 1979 Sixteenth Century Ontario: History, Ethnohistory, and Archaeology. Ontario History LXXI(4):205-223.
- Tuck, J.A. 1971 Onondaga Iroquois Prehistory: A Study in Settlement Archaeology. Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, New York.
- Warrick, G.A. 1978 1978 Archaeological Investigations of the Fonger Protohistoric Neutral Village Site (AhHb-8): Preliminary Results. Report submitted to the Ontario Heritage Foundation, Toronto.

- Warrick, G.A. 1982 A Report on the Archaeology of the Cooper Sites. Report submitted to the Ontario Heritage Foundation, Toronto.
- Whitbourne, R. 1620 A Discourse and Discovery of New-found-land. William Barrer, London.
- Wray, C.F. 1973 Manual for Seneca Iroquois Archeology. Cultures Primitive, Inc., Honeoye Falls, New York.
- 1982 Seneca Glass Trade Beads 1550-1820. Paper presented at the Glass Trade Bead Conference, Rochester, New York.
- Wray, C.F. and H.L. Schoff 1953 A Preliminary Report on the Seneca Sequence in Western New York, 1550-1687. Pennsylvania Archaeologist 23(2):53-63.
- Wright, M.J. 1981 The Walker Site. National Museum of Man Mercury Series, Archaeological Survey of Canada Paper 103:1-209.

Addendum for Table 2 (see page 22)

- | | |
|-------|---------------------------------------|
| * | Beads persisting from previous period |
| (N) | Neutral |
| (H) | Huron |
| (A) | Assataronon |
| (Nip) | Nipissing |

Sources: Fitzgerald 1981, 1982a, personal observations
 Kenyon 1969
 Kenyon and Kenyon 1982
 W. Kenyon 1982
 Lennox 1978, 1981
 Motykova 1969
 Warrick 1982
 Wright 1981

* * * * *

