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The right tarsometatarsus of an ivory-billed woodpecker has been recovered from a Late Prehistoric village site on the west bank of the Muskingum River near Philo, Muskingum County, Ohio. The Fort Ancient component at this site has been radiocarbon-dated at A.D. 1170-1320 (Gartley, Carskadden and Morton 1976), and a large osteological sample has been analyzed previously (Shane and Barber 1976). The Campephilus tarsometatarsus occurs in a second osteological sample being analyzed by the senior author.

Only three Campephilus records are known from Ohio, all occurring in osteological material retrieved from prehistoric Indian sites of southern Ohio, specifically: a tarsometatarsus from the Cramer site, Ross Co. (McPherson 1951), and a tarsometatarsus and premaxilla from the Feurt site, Scioto Co. (Wetmore 1943, McPherson 1950). The Philo II site occurrence represents a significant extension of the known prehistoric range of this extinct woodpecker in Ohio.

The Philo II tarsometatarsus (figs. 1–4) is in an excellent state of preservation and is readily recognizable as that of a member of the Order Piciformes by the striking modification of the trochlea for Digit IV, in which this trochlea is greatly enlarged and twisted posteriorly (fig. 3). It is clearly that of a woodpecker by virtue of the fact that the hypotarsus is somewhat flattened and is not as prominent or as produced posteriorly as in other families in this order. Size alone identifies it as an ivory-bill’s metatarsus.

The junior author has compared the specimen directly with Campephilus material preserved in the American Museum of Natural History collections and confirms the identification. The specimen has been donated to the American Museum of Natural History (AMNH 11016).

Some question might be raised as to whether this constitutes an actual range extension of the ivory-billed woodpecker or whether it might not be an instance of Indian trade. Audubon (1831) notes that “its rich scalp attached to the upper mandible forms an ornament for the war-
dress of most of our Indians, or for the shot-pouch of our squatters and hunters, by all of whom the bird is shot merely for this purpose," and that he has seen "entire belts of Indian chiefs chiefly ornamented with the tufts and bills of this species . . ." Likewise, Catesby (1731) reported that "The bills of these birds are much valued by the Canadian Indians, who make coronets of 'em for their princes and great warriors by fixing them round a wreath, with their points outward. The Northern Indians having none of these birds in their cold country purchase them of the Southern people at the price of two and sometimes three buckskins a bill."

Parmalee (1958) has commented upon this factor in the distribution of prehistoric ivory-billed woodpecker remains in Illinois. Although the occurrence of mandibles, skulls, or wing elements must be regarded with caution, it is very probable that leg elements such as the tarsometatarsus may be accepted as evidence of the natural occurrence of the bird. It is unlikely that the entire carcass of such a large bird would be carried far from the kill site. Wetmore (1943) reached the same conclusion in regard to the Scioto County occurrence. The Philo II specimen extends the known range of the ivory-bill some 65 miles to the northeast of the nearest previously known occurrence.
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