J. H. Paarmann, Curator Davenport Academy of Science, Davenport, Iowa, in letter of 15th June, 1914, states that they have none of the types of effigy pipes under discussion (2nd and 3rd papers) in their museum.

Referring to Bird Pipe, Fig. 103, Bull. Polished Stone, N. Y. State Museum, which is reproduced on page 64, Report 1913, and also in "Comparisons of Relics of Ontario and New York," in which Mr. Beauchamp says on page 169, No. 3, Vol. XII, American Antiguarian, 1890: "I made a drawing of a fine bird pipe from the Oneida River, New York, the material being stone, the crested bird resembling a woodpecker. was gratified to find its counterpart in Toronto, although in a battered condition. There could be no doubt of their being made by the same hand, but like many other stone pipes this was done after the introduction of iron tools." Mr. A. C. Parker, N. Y. State Archaeologist, remarks in a letter of 20th June, 1914: "I note that you cite Dr. Beas hamp's view that the best pipe of this sort that he has seen seems to be of modern anufacture. At present we have this pipe in our museum, and I have studied it with some care. There is nothing about it which would indicate the use of steel implements as far as my opinion has weight. The pipe is nicely worked, but all the incisions might easily have been done with a sharp flint, as experiment will show. The drilling for the stem hole and bowl are both conical, just as the apparently older forms are, but this drilling seems to have been smoothed with some fine abrasive and lafer polished. I am thus inclined to take issue with Dr. Beauchamp in his belief that the pipe is of modern manufacture and am inclined to believe that the doctor would be willing to admit that his statement was debateable.

Also referring to the Silverheels Owl Pipe, p. 62, Report 1913, which is from a site stated to be Erlean, Mr. Parker in same letter further explains: "Referring to my statement about the Silverheels owl pipe from Brant Township, Erle County, N.Y., Mr. Harrington and myself, after a considerable debate, involving field research, came to the conclusion that the site and the greater portion of the artifacts were not Erle but probably the remains of a Seneca settlement, made after the destruction of the Erles. At the time our original excavation was conducted neither one of us had the extensive field experience to draw upon in forming our conclusions that we now have: thus the owl pipe we have concluded was interred by Seneca hands. . . . My investigations lead me to believe that pipes of this character are Iroquoian, or, as milght be better termed Huron-Iroquois. I have never found one of these pipes, or even a fragment of one, on a purely Algonkin site. The Algonkin pipes are entirely different and few if any ever rise to effigy forms, except the more modern forms, which are known by such names as "Miemacs," etc."

After quoting Mr. Parker as per above, it is only fair to quote also from Mr. Beauchamp, referring to the sketches reproduced in the 2nd paper on effigy stone pipes in 1913 Report in particular, and to this class of effigy pipes in general. Letter of 25th June, 1914, says: "If I had supposed my drawings were to be reproduced I would have been more exact in details. They are correct in form and markings, but borings are not made exactly circular, nor did I shade them so as to show the exact minor curves. I am inclined to modify my opinions of age for several reasons; the sharpness of boring can be accounted for and is perhaps no sharper at the surface than in many ceremonial objects. The material is a strong point, for while not invariably of ornamental slate, some are made of choice specimens of that, naturally inclining me to place them with the banner stones, amulets, gorgets and tubes of quite early date. Perhaps a yet stronger point here is that they never have been found here, according to my experience, on any distinctly Iroquois side. Mr. Parker (page 67, Report 1913) speaks of their occurring side by side with Iroquois clay pipes, which strikes me as merely a general statement. On camp sites I find several periods represented, but not in villages and forts. There is one striking difference between these and the early clay pipe-in the latter the face is usually toward the smoker; in the latter it is always This, of course, would imply a distinct period, early or late. In regard the reverse. to the lizard type, in its broad sense I have seen about a dozen here (N. Y. State), all but two of clay.'

Mr. Christopher Wren, of Plymouth, Pennsylvania, Curator of Archæology, Wyoming Historical and Geological Society, of Wilkesbarre, Pa., in reply to query re effigy pipes, states in a letter of June 19th, 1914: "We find nothing here, so far as I know, in the line of pipes which at all resembles the designs of those you illustrate (Report 1913). . . Some fine soapstone pipes are found here with animal figures or the human head and face on them. . . the lizard is a favorite figure on such pipes." Again in letter of July 1st, 1914, in response to further inquries: "I know of no

Again in letter of July 1st, 1914, in response to further inquries: "I know of no pipes in this region (Wyoming Valley, Pa.), showing the entire human figure. Pipes with the human face (portrait pipes) are occasionally found here, but may be called very rare. I have seen a few of them made of soapstone, and more commonly of clay.

In disc C. Par their p charac

Mr York, Septem type de lection, Coastal York fi

of the Mr have n that he

M

follows too cau plenty some e purcha said sh them. a lizar buffalo