

jectural. Radiocarbon dating techniques will have to be employed before any reliable figure can be stated. However, such dates in other places suggest an age of about one thousand years for the earliest Iroquoians. Since the Guyatt Site is of middle prehistoric age, calling it about five or six hundred years old does not seem unreasonable.

The key to the identity of the Guyatt Site people may lie in local historic sites. Future research should eventually unearth this key.

REFERENCES

- Jury, Wilfrid
1941. *Clearville Prehistoric Village Site in Orford Township, Kent County, Ontario*. Bulletin of the Museums, No. 2, University of Western Ontario; London, Ontario.
- Ridley, Frank
1952. "The Huron and Lalonde Occupations of Ontario"; *American Antiquity* 17:197-210; Salt Lake City.
- Wintemberg, W. J.
1939. *Lawson Prehistoric Village Site, Middlesex County, Ontario*. National Museum of Canada, Bulletin No. 94; Ottawa.
1948. *The Middleport Prehistoric Village Site*. National Museum of Canada, Bulletin No. 109; Ottawa.

Book Reviews

Oneida Iroquois Glass Trade Bead Sequence, 1585-1745 by Peter P. Pratt. Indian Glass Trade Beads Color Guide Series No. 1; Fort Stanwix Museum, 117 E. Dominick St., Rome, N. Y. 1961. 20 pp; 4 color plates; 1 chart. \$3.00.

The history of glass beads is the history of glasshouse technology and styles. Rapid changes in techniques and in patterns seem to have had international scope, and the archeological history of glass beads is a clean-cut series of dated steps. Despite the recency of this European technology, our data have come entirely from American soil. Historical sources and data from Europe have contributed nothing to our knowledge of glass trade beads. Sequence dating and other techniques of prehistory have been the main tools which have provided information on bead types. The dates and type concepts which are coming into laboratory use must be pegged to sites with satisfactory datings. For example, Huron sites destroyed in 1648, the Seneca towns burned by Denonville in 1688, the Susquehannock towns destroyed in 1675, and other sites which are unusual because they can be dated and tied into history, are the key sites. Sites with unknown dates or with guess-dates are of limited use for working out a dating tool.

Since glass beads are the most important and most sensitive dating device for American Indian sites of Colonial times, they are being studied intensively. Most of our knowledge of bead typology and dating is so new and so much in formation that little of it has yet been published. A forthcoming book by Kenneth Kidd will offer the pooled data from the Northeast.

Pratt's booklet on beads from Oneida sites

is a useful but derivative contribution to the scattered bead literature. It offers no notes on the chemistry or the technological details which are fundamental to recognizing types, and it uses many of the technical terms found in glass literature incorrectly. The color illustrations are of good quality, but are designed to show only shape and color, with no attention to structure or to clues to manufacturing process. The sequence dating is relatively correct, but not refined enough to be applicable elsewhere without much additional information. Dates are, I believe, actually derived directly from Charles Wray's dated bead sequence in the Seneca sites.

With each rederivation of a dated sequence, based upon small samples and less sharp cut-off dates for sites, more inaccuracy creeps into sequence dating. This is a primary difference between derivatory studies and collaborative studies. Pratt's sample sizes are small, and many of the most common and important bead types of Iroquoia are entirely missing from the Oneida series. This suggests that the Oneida site series is not a continuum, as interpreted by Pratt, but that it has major gaps, representing undiscovered or unsampled sites.

Pratt's Oneida towns are simply sites with unknown numbers of components, unknown dates, unnoted locations, and other unresolved complexities. They can be dated by bead interpretations from better-documented sites, but cannot themselves be considered as sources of data for serious bead studies. Since this premature Oneida study represents bad typology and sloppy chronology, the student must use it with extreme caution.

JOHN WITTHOFT

(Continued on Page 34)