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The growth of the Massachusetts Archaeological Society is very encouraging, but with this growth there comes also increased work for all of us. Because there seemed to be some difficulty in tying the work of the various committees together, our President called a meeting of the Officers and Committee Chairmen at Ned Brooks's house on December 2. Under his right to appoint committees, the President formalized this group as the Executive Committee to handle the administrative details, consider reports from committees, and to recommend the proper action, but with its recommendations subject to the approval of the members at the next business meeting of the Society.

At the meeting it was proposed that two new classes of membership be added to the list. Of these, the first was family membership, which would allow husband or wife or children of an active member to become members subject to dues of one dollar each, with all privileges of active members except that of receiving publications, of which only one copy would be sent to a family; the second, college group memberships, with a minimum of six constituent members in each group, at dues of fifty cents per member. This is to be offered as an amendment to the Constitution and By-laws.

Benny Smith reported that he had had a letter from Miss Mable Choate regarding an Indian Council Ring near Stockbridge. Doug Byers was going to look it over with Clay Perry of Pittsfield, but he never got out there because one of the kids had the measles. When the snow goes we are promised a report on the situation. If it's all that it's cracked up to be, the Society ought to do something about protecting it.

Howard Torrey wants to have an extension course in anthropology or archaeology given by Harvard under the auspices of the Commission on Extension Courses. If they will give such a course it will be a great opportunity for us to learn a little more than we can by reading and poking around. Here's hoping that something comes of Fred Orchard's efforts to get the dope.
Lee Hallett has been having a swell time trying to get local chapters started. You remember we talked like a bunch of crows about the pros and cons of this idea at the organizing meeting. It seems that this is really the foundation of the Society. If we don't keep interest going by means of local chapters it gets to be as the two governors once remarked - a long time between drinks, and interest may die down. Anyway, Lee has a swell group going at Attleboro, and he is trying to stir up some of our other members to get to work on local groups. You'll hear more about this later, and an account of what the Attleboro bunch is doing will give some of the rest of us something to shoot at.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

We don't have to spend all our time thinking about digging up specimens, it's just as much fun to dig up facts in libraries. By the way, don't forget that the Bibliography Committee wants all references to books that have anything to do with archaeology or Indians, alive or dead; the live ones are just as important, as you can't interpret the dead ones without knowing how the live ones lived. Don't wait to hear from the chairman of the bibliography committee if you haven't already heard - and some of us haven't. Just send him your titles, and remember that the full information is necessary, author, title, publisher, place and date of publication, and if there have been several editions of a work be sure to state which edition you refer to. You'll find his address on another page, but just to remind you, it's Donald F. Brown, 39 Ellery Street, Cambridge. Remember that local histories sometimes have more real information than any other source around here unless you're lucky enough to find an unpublished manuscript.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Rip Bullen writes in to say that Dr. Delabarre has given the Society a complete set of his publications. Dr. Delabarre is well known for his work in connection with Dighton Rock and the nearly forgotten site on Grassv Island; the latter has an occupation level that is now below sea level. The books are now in the Repository in Andover.
Rip has also written in about the fun he is having as Chairman of the Survey Committee. Wherever he goes he carries the site cards with him and has a folder full of maps under his arm, picking up sites. He writes:

"The response of the members to the appeal for aid sent out by the Survey Committee is very gratifying. We have at this time (December 10) a total of 459 sites recorded on the Society's maps. The vast majority of these sites are in Massachusetts but some are in Rhode Island, just across the state line. We wish to thank the Narragansett Archaeological Society of Rhode Island for their cooperation.

"In spite of the splendid cooperation of the membership of our Society there are many quadrangles where we have no sites at all. This is particularly true of the western and north central parts of our state. We would greatly appreciate it if members knowing of sites in those sections would report them as soon as possible."

Don't forget that no one is going to steal a pet site. Usually everyone knows all the sites anyway, but it would be hard for anybody to steal a site from the information you turn in as it is locked up in the Society's records where no one can get at it to look for good places.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

We've made a darn good start anyway. Look at the number of members we have, and the sites recorded, and the various committees that are out trying to dig up dope and make things hum. The machinery still creaks a bit, but maybe if we have a few more members the springs will be weighted down a bit more and the car will ride more easily.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

The Editor thought he was going to sit back and take it easy but he found he has to work after all. Being Editor sounds as if it ought to be something - wing-collar, glasses with a ribbon on them, and all that. Well, it certainly is something, but what you need more than wing collars is tough skin on the fingers to hammer this stuff out. And, by
the way remember that while hot gases may be good for some dry cereals they soon raise cain with even a mimeographed publication, so turn in a few papers, or at any rate write in a few letters that we can put in the next release. This is your Society, and your Bulletin, so come on and hunt for some good strong food for it. I guess we can probably get it in print even if we have to put our arms in slings.
October Meeting

The fall meeting of the Society was held at 330 Maple St., Holyoke, on Saturday October 14th, 1939. The morning was devoted to a Trustees meeting and an exhibition of pottery, found in the Connecticut River Valley by Messrs. William J. Howes of Holyoke and Walter S. Rodiman of Granville.

After an informal lunch the meeting was opened by Pres. Robbins. He introduced Mr. William J. Howes who welcomed the members to Holyoke.

There followed reports by the Secretary-Treasurer; Mr. Benjamin L. Smith, Chairman of the Project Committee; Mr. Ripley P. Bullen of the Site Survey Committee and Mr. Donald F. Brown of the Bibliography Committee.

Mr. Brooks read a brief report, which was illustrated with lantern slides, on the Society's field work during the summer season on Nantucket Island. Mr. Bullen then showed his colored slides taken while the work was in progress.

Mr. Frederick Johnson gave an interesting account of his work on the "Fish Weir," which was found under Boylston St., in Boston during the excavation for the foundation of the New England Mutual Life Insurance Company's new building.

It was voted that the April 1940 meeting of the Society be held in Attleboro and Worcester for the October meeting.

It was announced by Pres. Robbins that Mr. William J. Howes would represent the Society at the meeting of the Eastern States Archaeological Federation in New York on October 20 and 21 and while there he would present a paper on the pottery of the Connecticut River region.

Mr. Vincent J. Schaefer, President of the Van Epps-Hartley Chapter of the NYSAA in Schenectady, the guest of the Society, was then presented to the members. The meeting adjourned at 5:30 for dinner. In the evening Mr. Schaefer gave an illustrated talk on work done in the Schenmerhorn Site outside of Schenectady and on Frontenac Island. He later showed some of the material taken from these sites. After a rising vote
of thanks to Mr. Howes for his painstaking work in arranging the meeting, the meeting adjourned at 10:15 P.M.

Edward Brooks, Secretary
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The Meeting of
THE EASTERN STATES ARCHAEOLOGICAL FEDERATION.

The Eastern States Archaeological Federation held its annual meeting in New York on October 20 and 21 in the American Museum of Natural History. It was a great opportunity to get together with members of our sister societies and find out what was going on. Representing the Massachusetts Archaeological Society were Rip Bullen, Mr. Howes, Fred Johnson and Doug Byers. One of the outstanding talks that was given was John Brown's paper on the work of the Narragansett crowd at Jones Pond. Mr. Howes brought his excellent drawings of pottery with him, and gave a most interesting discussion of the pottery of Massachusetts. It was most gratifying to note that the slides shown by John Brown, and by Wendell S. Hadlock of the Abbe Museum at Bar Harbor, were the best slides thrown on the screen.

At the annual dinner of the Federation, Dr. George C. Vaillant gave a most interesting talk on resemblances between the culture of North America and that of Middle America. It was a somewhat far cry from punctate decorated or cordmarked pottery, but presented a side of archaeology that is too often forgotten by the person with his fingers in the dirt and his mind on problems of classifying his finds.

At this meeting a steering committee was set up in an attempt to coordinate the work of the societies that constitute the Federation. Fred Johnson and Doug Byers were accorded seats on the Committee. So far the Federation has made gratifying progress toward accomplishing something as a body. There is a whopping big preliminary bibliography of northeastern archaeology that has been gotten together by Dr. Irving Rouse of New Haven, Connecticut, and put out in mimeographed form as a Bulletin of the Archaeological Society of Connecticut. Dr. Rouse would probably be glad to send them while they last on receipt of your dollar if you write him at the Peabody Museum, New Haven.

We felt that the chance of again meeting our neighbors from the Van-Epps Hartley Chapter, and talking over their problems and our problems was worth
the trip. After Vincent Schaeffer's great talk at Holyoke the Society had a real opportunity to judge their work and just what it was worth. After all, they are going to need our help and we are going to need theirs, so the more opportunities to meet, the better.

We haven't heard yet where the next meeting of the Federation will be. It moves up and down the seaboard, probably to Philadelphia this year.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

In order to draw the members of the Society into more group activities during the course of the year a new committee, designated as the Districts Contact Committee, was formed in November by President Robbins.

The State was divided into seven districts, each having a district chairman. To date, four of the seven districts have been organized, and plans are in progress in the other three districts.

At this season of the year district meetings are of a social nature, but with the advent of spring, field work is contemplated.

It is hoped that such periodic meetings will furnish an excellent means of interesting the right kind of prospective members in joining the Society.

Following is a list of the organized districts with their chairmen:

- Central District #3 C.C. Ferguson Millbury
- Southern District #4 L.F. Hallett Mansfield
- Northern District #6 Forbes Rockwell N. Andover
- Plymouth District #7 Jesse Brewer Plymouth
REPORT OF THE SOUTHERN GROUP OF THE MASSACHUSETTS ARCHAEODOLOGICAL SOCIETY

At the request of Lee Hallett, Chairman, I am writing this brief summary of the activities of the Southern Group, which we believe is the first group to be organized under the recent plan of the Society to encourage such local groups. The enthusiasm and the cooperative spirit of this group reminds me of one of the many stories told about Abraham Lincoln. It seems that at the height of the success of the Union Armies under General U.S. Grant, a group of malcontents called on Lincoln to urge the removal of the famous general on grounds of personal immorality. They complained among other things, that Grant was a heavy whiskey drinker. Lincoln's reply was to ask what brand Grant drank saying, "If you can find out I'll send a barrel to each of my other Generals". I wish I could find out the exact reason for the enthusiasm and spirit of this group and communicate some of the same stuff to the other groups of the Society.

An organization meeting of this group was called soon after our recent meeting at Holyoke with several objectives in view. We wished to build up a group to sponsor the April meeting of the Society in Attleboro, we had in mind a "dig" of some sort to "dedicate" ourselves into the mysteries of archaeological digging, and we wanted to find a solution to the problem of placating the family when Saturday rolled around and the great out of doors tempted us to leave the many things about the house wait a rainy day. Present at this original meeting were Lee Hallett, Roger Wilson, Walter Franke, Elmer Tufts and two guests Sheldon Smith and Walter Bryant.

After looking over various sites listed from the area in the site survey we settled upon M-39-64 for a number of reasons. The site had been prospected several years ago by Roger Wilson and myself, a number of interesting artifacts had been found and a habitation site investigated and carefully plotted. Work at that time had been interrupted by a local relic hunter who, discovering our digging, had done some of his own with the help of a small power plow, a shovel and a screen; he had destroyed our habitation site before we got pictures of it, and raised havoc generally. The recent hurricane, however, had
done us a good turn by completely blocking two cartpaths which led through the site, preventing horseback riders from passing through, and we hoped our relic hunter friend had forgotten about the site after a lapse of two years. This site is located directly on an ancient path known as the "North Purchase Road" which in Colonial times led from the village of Cohannet to the scattered homes of the frontier; probably before that it was an Indian trail from the Taunton River villages into the interior. As the crow flies it is but a scant half mile to Winnecunnett Lake and a bit more to the Great Swamp; by canoe one might travel from this lake or swamp down the Taunton River System to the sea. It seemed to us that much might be learned from a village thus located "at the crossroads" so to speak of ancient Indian life.

In addition to digging this site we decided to try out a supper meeting to which the ladies might be invited and set a date for November 18th for that affair.

The following Sunday the weather man disappointed us by providing rain, nevertheless, four of us met at the site and had a look around; needless to say no work could be attempted. The next Saturday, however, was pleasant and quite warm for the lateness of the season. The site was a scene of great activity almost as soon as the sun peeped over the horizon. Our genial secretary of Nantucket fame, Ned Brooks, came down from Brookline, Lee Hallett from the adjoining town of Mansfield, Walter Franke from North Attleboro, Maurice Lavallee and Walter Bryant from Rhode Island and Roger Wilson, Sheldon Smith and the writer from Attleboro. After a general check up on the site to acquaint those who had never been there before with the location, we selected an area in which to begin operations just west of the spring. Using an invention of Rip Bullen's, the screw eye board, we laid out a base line and staked out several squares two meters on the side. While the rest of the boys were digging Ned and I extended our base line, becoming increasingly more disgusted with our ability to lay out a straight line. Noon came quickly and over coffee and sandwiches we held a conference with the result that enough cash was forthcoming to order a transit of sorts from Sears Roebuck to be purchased by Ned for use the following week-end.
The night before Armistice Day we all prayed for clear weather and a high thermometer, our prayers must have been heard for Saturday morning proved all that could be asked for our purposes. Ned arrived early with our transit, and by nine o'clock the gang was assembled and ready to go. We found our original base line to resemble a corkscrew and were obliged to start again, using our laid out section as a starting point we ran a new base line 300 meters long, I think we should nickname Ned after 'The Father of his Country' as they both were wilderness surveyors, we cut more brush and briers to get our lines through the site than George cut to survey Ohio I firmly believe. The archaeologists of the crowd swear I could be heard shrieking "a little to the left" and "hold it there" all the way around the site and wonder that we did not bring an investigating posse of police to check up on possible murder. Altogether we had a most successful day, quitting only when the sun retired for the night.

Saturday, the eighth dawned cold and clear, so cold that only the most hardened of the crowd ventured to dig. Sheldon Smith and our friend Bryant from R.I. spent the morning at the site and were well repaid for their time. Early in the afternoon the clan began to get together for our first supper meeting, bringing their better halves with them, and after an hour or so of violent discussion about our finds and our theories concerning the site we adjourned to the Brown Farm in Seekonk for supper. This Brown Farm turned out to be ideal for a gathering such as ours. The house itself is an old historical one, having been built shortly after King Phillip's War by John Brown of Swansea. This Brown who, by the way, is an ancestor of Mrs. Fairbanks who now owns the farm, was a friend of the great Phillip and was warned by him shortly before the outbreak of the war in 1675 to abandon the farm and retire to Plymouth or Taunton, Phillip sending word that he could not hold his warriors in check many days more.

There were eighteen in our party, including Ben Smith from Concord who arrived just in time to eat. We all missed our surveyor Ned Brooks who was kept at home by a severe cold. After a most enjoyable supper we adjourned to the living room where before a cheerful fireplace we settled down for an evening or relaxation. Lee Hallett entertained us
with a description of the Nantucket dig for the benefit of those of the group who had not heard the report at Holyoke, and Sheldon Smith gave a short talk on an exploration trip on Prudence Island made by he and Walter Bryant last summer. Specimens of Colonial pottery, shell tempered plaster and Dutch brick from a house on the Island built by Roger Williams about 1630 and discovered by Bryant and Smith were exhibited. The evening closed with an examination of the plans of the M-39-64 site and the specimens so far recovered.

It was most evident that everyone present enjoyed the meeting and the unanimous vote to continue the custom monthly was not needed to prove the venture most successful.

Maurice Robbins
THE APPROACH TO AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL PROBLEM

Maurice Robbins has prepared an excellent paper covering the archaeological material in New York state that has been classified in terms of cultural relationship by Mr. William A. Ritchie of the Rochester Municipal Museum. Since some of us may not be entirely familiar with the terminology in the classificatory scheme, the following short introduction has been prepared.

What we are all trying to do as archaeologists is to work out the story of the past. How we are going to do it is another thing. We go out and dig up pottery and chipped artifacts and maybe some polished stone, if we are lucky. If we have read Willoughby, or in fact any of the older works applicable to the Northeast, there are three choices open to us: we call our finds Red Paint (or maybe, Pre-Algonkian), Algonkian, or Iroquois. The term Red Paint is a designation applied to what was formerly believed to be a cultural entity, quite distinct from anything else, but now, apparently linked to a number of very similar cultural expressions scattered over the region east of the Great Lakes and still only imperfectly understood. The other terms are linguistic, and at once lead us into deep water. Not that we have any difficulty in New York or in Ontario, for there are many historic sites there from which characteristic material is obtained. As a result, one may point out the differences between the cultures of documented sites occupied by peoples of the two different linguistic groups. (Wintemberg's paper entitled "The Distinguishing Characteristics of Algonkian and Iroquoian Cultures", Canada, National Museum, Bulletin No.67, Ottawa, 1931, covers this well). But once we get away from documented sites which were actually visited by people who heard the people living there speak one tongue or the other, the ground begins to get somewhat less firm. If the entire complex is similar to that at known Iroquoian or Algonkian sites we are probably on safe ground. If we have only a pot, or if we are out of the known range of the particular linguistic group the difficulty is more obvious. But even in the vicinity of Taunton we are not on safe ground in saying that we have at a site articles made by the Wampanoags unless somebody actually saw them there and recorded the fact that
Wampanoags inhabited a village at such and such a place that we are able to identify. The site may be a village inhabited by some other group before the Wampanoags lived in that district. Because of this difficulty it is wiser not to attempt to connect a site with any linguistic group unless there is documentary evidence to prove it. When such supporting data are at hand they provide a wonderful opportunity to find out just what the handiwork of an identified people may have been. This is the "direct historical approach" or the working from the known toward the unknown.

More often than not there isn't any opportunity to work from a documented site - it's a site like the Norton site, very promising, but still not connected with any known group. So many sites are like this that the pitfalls encountered in attempting to tie a site to any linguistic group are legion. Accordingly we have to work from the unknown to the known - something like working your way in the dark when the lights go off, out of the spare room, where you don't know exactly the way the furniture sets, into the hall where that board near the corner gives its reassuring creak like the groan of a whistling buoy. You have to be careful or you'll get hurt, especially if you try to rush things until you know where you are. So with our archaeological material we have to feel around and find out where we are by classifying stuff first, and then find out what seems to fit onto what. This is known as the "taxonomic approach" because taxonomy means classification; it has nothing to do with calling a cab. Mr. W.C. McKern, of the Milwaukee Public Museum, has set down on paper ("The Midwestern Taxonomic Method as an Aid to Archaeological Culture Study," American Antiquity, Volume IV, pp.301-313.) the scheme that has been worked out for handling archaeological material of this sort. This is the scheme that bears his name - The McKern Classification. Ritchie, in his various writings, has elaborated it for the New York area.

It conceives of archaeological material as susceptible to treatment as systematic as that given the zoological world, but it does not conceive of the various subdivisions as related in any but the more general sense - certainly not in the sense of parent form and descendent form. The most generalized division has been termed the Base, it is composed of
Patterns that have several points in common; The Horticulture-Pottery Base, or the Nomadic Hunting Base might be composed of a group of patterns that had in common a dependence on agriculture and pottery making, or on a wandering hunting existence. No good Base has yet been suggested, perhaps because there aren't any such generalized terms that can be applied to archaeological material with really satisfactory results. What are we going to do with people that live in settled villages and make pottery but live by hunting? But it's a lot easier to start from the other end and work toward the general terms.

Your site is the smallest element in the scheme. It is a unit in itself, although sometimes two units may be there when a site has been occupied by two successive groups. The site is also known as a Component. Several sites or Components that show similarities are grouped together to form a Focus. For instance a site at Perryville, Rhode Island, shows certain similarities to two sites at Norton. If more detailed study of these sites shows that they are really similar, Perryville, M-39-64, and the other site will each be Components of what might in time be called the Narragansett Bay Focus. If our hypothetical Narragansett Bay Focus shows enough points in common with Foci already known from Ritchie's work, which Mr. Robbins discusses in the next paper, it should be lumped with them in a known Aspect, perhaps the Coastal. If however, it doesn't seem to fit in, then we have a new Aspect, and we have succeeded in saying definitely that the culture of the people that were responsible for the Narragansett Bay Focus was different from that of the people who were responsible for the Early, Late, or Orient Foci, but we haven't committed ourselves on who they were or what language they spoke.

Now let us suppose for the sake of argument that we have set up a new Aspect that we will call the Massachusetts Bay Aspect for the fun of it. If it seems to be similar to what we know from New York we can lump the new Massachusetts Bay Aspect into the Northeastern Phase along with Owasco, Vine Valley, and the rest. This admits a general similarity between all of them, based on the style and decoration of pottery vessels, and fairly close resemblances in forms of polished stone. If we feel we have a striking difference in this respect we may be justified
in setting up a new Phase — perhaps a New England Phase if we feel we have a basis for it. There are a number of Phases of the Woodland Pattern, for the Pattern is a still more generalized category, based on similarity in vessel form, in shape of chipped artifacts, and the like. In the Mississippi Pattern there are at least three Phases, the Upper, Middle and Lower, and the Iroquois is only one Aspect of the Upper Mississippi.

It's rather simple when you get used to the idea of using the terms, and you don't commit yourself about languages at all. But that doesn't help you determine what group of people inhabited a site. Ritchie's Bainbridge Component of the Castle Creek Focus of the Owasco Aspect of the Northeastern Phase of the Woodland Pattern is so full of "Iroquoian" elements that you have a hard time saying just where it belongs, while some of the sites in Ontario and northern Ohio or Michigan are representative of such a mixture that it is hard to tell just where they belong without considerable study.

McKern's article in American Antiquity has a much lengthier discussion of the system. This simply sketches out the general outlines of the McKern classification — a term we often use with bated breath as if it was the end and answer we were all seeking. It isn't, but it is a handy tool to help us think out our relationships. And, after all, if we finally succeed in identifying the Narragansett Bay Focus with the people historically known as Narragansetts there's nothing difficult about remembering that the Focus and the ethnic group are identical.

Use of the Taxonomic Approach — that by way of the classified material does not necessarily imply that the Historic Approach is invalid, nor does it mean that both are not equally good. What the use of this approach does mean is that there was not enough historic material to permit the use of the Historic Approach. One method supplements the other; together they form an excellent set of tools for dealing with our problems.
Trays, boxes and shelves; a hopeless jumble of artifacts; projectile points of all shapes and sizes; pestles and grinding tools, scrapers and notched weights, plummets and semi-lunar knives, gouges and adzes, grooved axes and celts, rough crude forms and beautifully flaked and ground forms; what do they tell me of those who made them? True I know what some of them were intended for or at least I tell, with a deeply intelligent look, what I think their uses were. Still I must admit, in honesty to myself, that I catch only a word or two of the story they are trying to tell me. They talk a language I do not know, a tongue as strange as that of the people who made them. Cataloged? Yes, I can tell you what sites they all came from and in some instances some of the various forms with which they were associated and I can quote from my notebook other information about some of them but that isn't the story; it's only the first sentence.

Sooner or later, unless we degenerate into simple relic hunters, we all face this feeling of futility and seek a solution to the problem of culture association and sequence. It is just this feeling that results in the formation of organizations like our Massachusetts Archaeological Society. In an assiduous attempt to solve the problem lies the only justification of such a Society.

I believe we are all in agreement as to the nature of the problem but are growing for methods and avenues of approach to the solution of it. I am aware that I will be told that we have not yet enough information to even state clearly the problem of the prehistory of Massachusetts. As an amateur I can afford to dare more, to "stick my neck out" as the saying goes, and so I'm going to offer the suggestion that if we are going to shoot at all we should have a target, and if we don't hit the target at first we can get a bigger one and so on until we do score.

A few years ago "The Antiquities of the New England Indians" was published. It was a summary of the life work of Mr. Charles C. Willoughby, the dean of New England archaeology. In it Mr. Willoughby
assumed certain associations and postulated certain stages in the culture of the area. Since that time new information has come to light that has disproved some of his conclusions and I believe that Mr. Willoughby himself probably expected and would be the first to welcome these corrections in his classifications. The fact remains, however, that he set up a target, and that the ability to disprove some of his postulations is in itself proof of the advancing knowledge on the subject of archaeology in New England. There is no Bureau of Standards on which we can depend for culture units; trial and error must be our method.

Mr. William A. Ritchie, of the Rochester Museum of Arts and Sciences has also offered us a target in his "Classification of the Aboriginal Cultures in the State of New York". I know that Mr. Ritchie would be the first to acknowledge that future work may demonstrate errors in his postulations and that he will welcome any information which may lead to the correction of such errors or which may expand the classification. A glance at his photographs will demonstrate the similarities of the archaeological material which he discusses to that in your own cases and a study of his classification will awaken many memories of similar association of artifacts in our own experience. The very geographic relation of the territory with which he is concerned to our own is suggestive of the similarities which we may well expect to find. His classification seems to me an indication of the coming dawn in our night of archaeological blackness and I suggest that we might test his classification for use as a yardstick, at least for the present. I have the permission of Mr. Ritchie to reproduce for you in simplified form the classification as published in his paper "A Perspective of Northeastern Archaeology" (American Antiquity, Vol.4, No.2, 1938).

In addition to providing us with a comparative list of traits of the various Aspects and Foci it also offers suggestions on how we must obtain information. It calls to mind that materials from surface hunting alone can not be depended upon as a sole basis for diagnosing a culture. The material which one recovers may contain only a few of the variety of artifacts which were originally present on the site, or the associations may be mixed by cultivation. We may well have only the gleanings from a site which
has been hunted for years, and from which the major elements of a culture have been long ago removed.

We must know something about the mortuary customs of a people, something about their habitations and their general economy before we can, with any degree of certainty fit them into a culture classification. We must keep constantly in mind that as one digs one destroys the page from which he is reading and that if we accept the responsibility of destroying we must also accept the responsibility of reconstructing that which we destroy. We must also school our minds to separating the factual from the imaginative, recording the facts, and, if we must imagine, confining it to the evening talk fest in the company of friends who will not quote our fancies as facts.

Our Society has in our Survey Committee the vehicle to assemble and coordinate the information; the following classification offers us a framework on which to build; we have in our professional friends a balance wheel to keep us on the course and to make use of any information we may obtain.

A PERSPECTIVE OF NORTHEASTERN ARCHAEOLOGY SUMMARY

THE OWASCO ASPECT

DISTRIBUTION

The whole central portion of New York State from the Genesee River eastward to the Hudson, with one recognized site in the north central part (Jefferson County), and smaller stations on both sides of the Champlain Valley of New York and Vermont. The Delaware Valley in southeastern New York, Pennsylvania and upper New Jersey, and the Susquehanna Valley, at least as far south as the West Branch in Pennsylvania, contain numerous camp and village sites.

FOCI

Canandaigua - Castle Creek
Differentiated mainly on the basis of pottery traits.

Canandaigua Pottery
Conoidal base, slightly everted collarless rim, coarse texture and more rudely decorated.
Castle Creek Pottery. Rounded bottom, incipient or well defined rim or collar often bearing nodes or bosses and surmounted by rim points or castellations.

GENERAL TRAITS

Relatively numerous population of an agricultural economy.

Villages sometimes on hilltops a mile or so away from lakes or large streams. One station was stockaded.

Floor outlines of small, pole-supported lodges with central fireplaces.

Refuse filled cache pits are sometimes abundant and on some sites rare.

Burials, flexed in varying degrees, only rarely accompanied by grave goods, chiefly pipes.

DIAGNOSTIC TRAITS

Large and more or less equilateral triangular arrowpoints, usually with concave bases and prominent barb-like corners.

Obtuse angle elbow pipes.

Elongate bodied, grit tempered pots, with decorations utilizing frequently the herring bone design, varying degrees of neck constriction, pointed or rounded bottoms and punctate decorations.

NEGATIVE TRAITS

Burial mound, cremation, copper artifacts (rare), shell objects (rare), the gouge, grooved axe, plummet, and slate problematical forms.

ETHNIC IDENTITY

There remains to be considered the probable ethnic identity of the Owasco Aspect and its wider affinities. While the archaeo-
logical proof is still lacking there is actually little reason to doubt it's Algonkian origin and while all stations thus far discovered pertain to the pre-historic horizon, future excavations may disclose a protohistoric site enabling correlation with some historic tribe or tribes of this people.

THE VINE VALLEY ASPECT

MIDDLESEX FOCUS

DISTRIBUTION

Middlesex components have been reported from Maine, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Vermont, and eastern and central New York. Scattered surface traces are of a wider distribution, including particularly the upper St. Lawrence Valley.

BURIALS

Simple flexed interments often accompanied by mortuary offerings. Occasionally a mass of powdered hematite occurs in the grave.

MATERIAL CULTURE

The most deterministic culture trait is the Adena-like tube of stone or clay, with one end fully open and the opposing extremity somewhat flaring and centrally perforated with a small opening. It is thought to have been a pipe for smoking.

Boat stone, bar amulet, gorget, birdstone, side- and corner- notched projectile points; double pointed and triangular forms of blades of stone.

The copper celt, awl and beads of two kinds.

A variety of bone work such as awls, conoidal antler points, a single pendant and gague and perforated elk canine teeth.

Fishing devices have not been recovered.
POIN T PENNINSULA FOCUS

DISTRIBUTION

Burial sites of this culture have been found in lower Ontario, northern, western and central New York.

BURIALS

Flexed interments, sometimes in a seated position, predominate, but bundle burials and cremations are known.

MATERIAL CULTURE

Stone and pottery tubular pipes of nearly uniform diameter, rare curved base and frequent straight-base monitor pipes, the latter often having a characteristic ridged stem.

Side-notched, corner-notched, triangular, and pentagonal shaped arrowpoints.

Large antler flaking tools, harpoons, daggers, conical antler points, perforated sharks teeth. Apparently diagnostic are beaver incisors hafted in antler tines and large antler combs usually engraved.

Copper beads made by rolling a sheet of the metal.

Another distinguishing feature is the presence in most graves of pieces of unworked or partly worked bone and antler, the raw material for implement manufacture. Commonly the skeleton and accompanying offerings are liberally covered with red paint.

TRAITS SHARED BY BOTH FOCI OF THIS ASPECT

Gorget, pendant, birdstone, so called "bola stones", various types of marine shell beads, rude fabric or cord marked conoidal based pottery vessels, and obtuse angle elbow pipes of clay.
THE COASTAL ASPECT

EARLY FOCUS

DISTRIBUTION

This focus is represented by the lower levels in rock shelters, shell heaps, and village sites in New York and Pennsylvania.

MATERIAL CULTURE

Typical of this horizon are the grooved axe; celt; adze; grooved, notched, and perforated bannerstone; gorget; a simple form of sinew stone; grooved club; "bola stone"; shallow mortar; cylindrical pestle; projectile points and knives of several forms, lozenge shaped, stemmed, side notched, corner notched, and triangular in order of frequency (the lozenge shaped and semi-lozenge shaped and narrow stemmed and side notched forms seem to be the oldest); drills and scrapers of several kinds, chiefly the simple oval end scraper. Stone pipes of the tubular and obtuse angle elbow forms.

Crudely fashioned pottery vessels with straight sides and pointed bottoms usually grit tempered, and with fabric and cord marked body and punctate or rarely rough incision for decoration.

Bone work weakly developed; the splinter awl, flat bone needle, and the wedge and chisel, all consistently crude.

BURIALS

Flexed position with few or no grave goods.

LATE FOCUS

DISTRIBUTION

The distribution of the late focus of this aspect is at present known only from sites on Long Island, Staten Island and the
adjacent mainland. Skinner regards this as simply a development of the early focus.

BURIALS

Similar to those of the early focus.

MATERIAL CULTURE

This focus produces grooved axes; bannerstones and gorgets in much smaller numbers than the "Early Focus" and some sites produce none at all; a preponderance of broad triangular arrowpoints, although many of the older forms survive; the stone pipes are missing.

A fair quality of bone and antler work, including the harpoon and fishhook. Tubular and obtuse angle elbow pipes of finer workmanship than the "Early Focus". Pottery vessels with globular body, constricted neck and everted rim, composed of grit or shell tempered paste, well devigated, modeled, and fired, and more carefully decorated by means of punctate and incised techniques. (The latter type of decoration is more frequent.) Pointed bottom pots, however, continued in use, probably until the historic period.

ORIENT FOCUS

DISTRIBUTION

Eastern Long Island and probably lower Connecticut.

BURIALS

Orient material occurs as grave goods in large caches or deposits at the bottoms of deep grave pits in which cremated human bones and one bundle burial was discovered. Large quantities of powdered hematite were present in some instances.
MATERIAL CULTURE

No bone shell, or metal artifacts or pipes have come to light and but very little pottery.

Steatite vessels of several forms and sizes, all deliberately killed, were common.

Lithic components comprised rude rectangular celts; plano convex adzes, some grooved; a single short gouge and a grooved axe; ellipsoidal two-holed gorget; a short stone tube; hematite and graphite paint stones; iron pyrites strike-a-lights; spear points, and knives with narrow blades, side notches and flaring concave bases — the so called "fish tail" types.

GENERAL REMARKS

The Coastal Aspect in general seems to be traceable in northern New Jersey, tidewater New York and lower Connecticut at least. Want of adequate data renders the distribution uncertain and precludes the clean cut definition of the culture complex.

In the case of the Orient Focus both material and form indicate derivation from the lower Connecticut across the sound, but there, for want of search, the trail is lost.

The problems presented by the Coastal Aspect are sundry and diverse. Most of the region involved is heavily populated and relatively few aboriginal sites remain undisturbed. These must be intensively studied to fill the gaps in the existing knowledge of time relationship and culture transition. Greatly to be desired are protohistoric and historic link traits to replace the present indefinite tribal identification of sites. The possibility is lessened by the fact that virtually everywhere throughout the tidewater region acculturation following the white invasion was accomplished in a very short period.
THE LAURENTIAN ASPECT

GENERAL DISTRIBUTION

The distribution of the Laurentian Aspect, based on surface material as interpreted by recent excavations, appears to include lower Quebec and Ontario, upper New England and New York. It seems to be a typically Woodland culture which present knowledge suggests radiated into the area from somewhere in the middle or lower St. Lawrence Valley. Information is needed respecting its source, possible Eskimoan connections, congeries and delimitations, and its relative antiquity in the sundry precincts of the northeastern area.

GENERAL TRAITS OF THE ASPECT

Bannerstones of several forms - oval, trapezoidal, rectangular, bipenate; the so called "chopper" identical with the Archaic form; a wide variety of projectile points, prevailingly broad bladed, side or corner notched, stemmed, semi lozenge shaped, and triangular. Many types of scrapers - end and side, notched and unnotched; drills and aberrant forms. There are rare celts, plano-convex adzes, pitted and unpitted hammerstones, mullers, shallow mortars, cylindrical pestles, gouges, plummets, and copper forms including the gouge, awl, gorse and celt. Bone and antler implements comprise awls of many sorts harpoons, fishhooks, gorges, flat mat needles, beaver incisor cutting tools, flakers, conical arrowpoints and other types.

VOSBURG FOCUS

The Vosburg Focus is based upon some eight surface sites in eastern New York investigated largely by members of the Van-Epps Hartley Chapter of the New York State Archaeological Association.

In addition to certain of the general traits present on these sites the semilunar knife or ulu is generally found. No burials have been discovered.
VERGENNES FOCUS

This focus is predicated upon excavations by Bailey for the Champlain Valley Archaeological Society on a settlement site in Vermont during 1937. Ulus and ground slate points have been found in unassailable connection with deterministic forms. Pottery is met with at all depths on this site. Burials have not been discovered.

BREWERTON FOCUS

Based on the extensive excavations of the Rochester Museum of Arts and Sciences at two large village sites at Brewerton in central New York during the seasons of 1937 and 1938.

Pottery only in the upper half of the refuse.

Burials were numerous, flexed, cremated, extended and bundle skeletons but with few or no grave goods.

Gouges and plummets are diagnostic for this horizon. No ulus in situ.

POTTERY IN GENERAL

Where it occurs the pottery of the aspect is fairly consistent in texture form and ornamentation, being relatively thick, grit tempered, moderately well fired, conoidal based, and punctate decorated, or rarely incised or comb marked. One peculiarity is the channelling produced by the scraping of the interior.

ARCHAIC ASPECT

LAMOKA FOCUS

Chiefly on typological considerations the Lamoka focus appears to be the oldest known culture of the Northeast, and without a doubt may be arrayed with the Laurentian, which it may overlap, as one of the specific and significant of the older complexes of the area.
DISTRIBUTION

The aspect seems to center in western and central New York reaching there through the Ontario peninsula.

The aspect is based on the excavations at three village sites excavated by the Rochester Museum of Arts and Sciences and supported by surface finds from probable camp sites in western, central and southern New York.

BURIALS

Few found have been simple flexed burials without grave goods.

GENERAL TRAITS

Non-agricultural economy. No pottery or steatite vessels have been found.

Arrow, javelin and spear points appear in order of frequency, all, with negligible exceptions, conforming to a single pattern; blade relatively long and narrow and the tang or stem straight or slightly side notched. The few exceptions may be knives rather than projectile points for the broad blades are often convexly edged.

The known fishing devices comprise the hook, gorge and net, the latter inferred from the abundant notched sinkers.

Diagnostic for the horizon is the beveled adze, often excellently made from a compact crystalline rock, and in marked contrast to the crude lithic component which embraces the chipped drill, rectangular and trianguloid celt, a thin celt-like blade, a plano-convex adze, chopper, muller, mortar, flat grinding stone or metate, large stationary whetstone, pitted hammerstone, and anvil stone and a few other types.

The purpose of the grinding stones was shown at the Lamoka Lake station by the large quantity of carbonized acorns and other wild vegetal foods.
The bone industry was well developed, comprising in addition to the hook and gorge, a host of awl types, whistles, tubular beads, worked teeth of beaver, bear, and dog; antler punches, and some traits characteristic of, if not definitely confined to the Lamoka Focus. Notable among these are the deer astragali spindle socket, deer scapula scraper, several types of probable weaving tools, split antler tine pendants, and allied forms, sometimes painted, and various problematical forms.

NEGATIVE TRAITS

In addition to the lack of pottery significant absent elements include the pipe, bone harpoon, copper and shell artifacts, the grooved axe, gouge, plummet, ground slates, and the so called problematical forms of slate.
CLASSIFICATION OF THE ABORIGINAL CULTURES IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK

MISSISSIPPI PATTERN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>ASPECT</th>
<th>FOCUS</th>
<th>COMPONENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>Iroquois</td>
<td>Huron</td>
<td>Various sites in New York, Ontario, Pennsylvania.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Erie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seneca</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cayuga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Onondaga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oneida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mohawk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tuscarora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Andaste</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UNKNOWN PATTERN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hopewellian</th>
<th>New York</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Genesee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Souawkie Hill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WOODLAND PATTERN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northeastern</th>
<th>Owasco</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Castle Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canandaigua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pt. Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vine Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middlesex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# WOODLAND PATTERN (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>ASPECT</th>
<th>FOCUS</th>
<th>COMPONENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern</td>
<td>Coastal</td>
<td>&quot;Late&quot;</td>
<td>Various sites in N.Y. &amp; N.J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Early&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orient</td>
<td></td>
<td>Southampton Orient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vosburg</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vosburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laurentian</td>
<td>Vergennes</td>
<td>Vergennes Vt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brewerton</td>
<td></td>
<td>Smoky Hollow Oberlander Robinson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ARCHAEO PATTERN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lamoka</th>
<th>Woodchuck Hill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lamoka Lake</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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