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To the Editor:-

As Mr. Harry Wright has called into question the accuracy of Mr. Benjamin Smith's placing of the Nipmuck bounds, and as I furnished Mr. Smith the information concerning them, I offer these remarks on the subject.

A number of years ago, in a paper delivered before the Worcester Historical Society, I stated:

"My own theory concerning the Connecticut Valley tribes (in Massachusetts) is that they were a Nipmuck overflow to lands vacated by the Pequot-Mohecan group, and they were a rather mixed combination, containing Nipmuck, Mohecan and possibly Pennacook elements."

That still is my theory. As a matter of fact, I am uncertain about the western bounds of the Nipmucks. I am also uncertain about the other bounds. There was undoubtedly much shifting from time to time, and the subject condition of the Nipmucks makes it difficult to determine just what sachems held the land.

I refer Mr. Wright to the "Handbook of American Indians" for the tribal affiliations of the Hadley Indians. (See "Nipmuc.".) I would like to have him prove definitely that the Agawams and Quabaus were not so closely associated that many of our earlier chroniclers considered them as one and the same. Why is Mottawampe's name on a deed (1674) to "parts of Springfield, Hampden, Longmeadow and Wilbraham"? And why did John Magus, (Awossamaug) sell land in Brimfield, Monson, Palmer and Warren? Mottawampe was a Quabagu, Magus a Nashua, both Nipmucks. An examination of the map places Nitchewauq, (Petersham), Pottapauq, (Dana), and South Athol west and north of Brookfield. All three were Nipmuck villages. As to the Athol-Gardner lands mentioned, they were sold in 1735 by Skatecock Indians. "Most definitely" they could have been Nipmucks. There were two Skatecoocks, one peopled by remnants of Pequot and river Indians, the other by Wampanoags, Nipmucks, Pocumtucks and other refugees who fled Massachusetts after King Philip's war. 1735 is a pretty late date to go by, however.

As to judging just which languages were used by the various little tribes mentioned, in the absence of any definite statement from a white contemporary as to a difference in tongue or dialect, I am perfectly willing to take off my hat to the man who can do it, and I have a beautifully long list of names I want classified according to tribe. For instance:- Assawaug, Nassawog, Nashawaug, Assamaug, Nashaw-com, Washasun, Nashaway-Nashua and Lashaway. There are a dozen or so more. They were all written down in Nipmuck territory, and I'd like the Nipmuck, Pennacock, and Mohecan forms sorted out.

While still on the subject, I'd like to remind Mr. Wright, "for the benefit of posterity," that in the present state of our knowledge, which will probably not be very much improved unless new records are found, we cannot be too ready to take too steadfast a stand in regard to the Nipmuck bounds. I have found that even Eliot and Gookin were not infallible.

In conclusion, may I call attention to the fact that there was a great amount of overlapping and intermixture on the boundaries, and the only line of which I'm absolutely sure is that of the Charles river from Sherborn to the Medways, where the stream separated the Massachusetts and Nipmucks.

Lawrence K. Gahan
REPORT OF THE SITE SURVEY TO FEBRUARY, 1941

By Ripley P. Bullen

At the organization meeting of The Massachusetts Archaeological Society in April 1939 it was voted to make a survey of the Indian sites in Massachusetts. Instructions and cards for this survey went to the members with Vol. 1, No. 1 of the BULLETIN in October 1939. By April 1940 five hundred and fifty sites had been reported. At the October 1940 meeting a total of seven hundred and sixty-six were reported and now the total stands at one thousand thirteen.

Judging from the results so far it seems that there are, or were, something like 4,000 to 5,000 sites in the state. This is based upon an average of 80 to 100 sites per topographical map sheet and 52 sheets for the state. The Concord sheet, for example, has 135 sites to date. Judging from the above, our job is about one fourth completed. It seems, however, that a preliminary study of the results of our survey is in order, not only to present the information gained but also to point the way forward and to give other committees any clues that can be gleaned. The interpretation of the material is to be considered as extremely preliminary, and in the nature of clues only, not as hypotheses; but the suggestions for future work are, it is believed, worthy of careful consideration.

DISTRIBUTION OF SITES

The accompanying map of Massachusetts gives the relative distribution and concentration of sites as reported. The number of dots and their location bears no relationship to the actual sites themselves. The map indicates areas surveyed and the approximate relative densities in those areas.

The northeastern part of the state north and west of Cape Cod, the Concord and Sudbury River Valleys, the middle part of the Connecticut River Valley, the south central part of the state, the area between Taunton and Rhode Island, part of the south shore, the end of Cape Cod, Martha's Vineyard, and Nantucket have been covered fairly well. Buzzard's Bay, the central part of the Cape, and the north central and western areas have barely been scratched. We know that there were Indians there but that is all. Obviously the location of these sites reflects the geographical distribution of our membership.

The chief rivers of Massachusetts are shown on the map. It will be noticed immediately that the sites cluster along the shore of the ocean and up the river valleys, with some around lakes. Only one or two possible sites have been reported which were not directly associated with water. The most favored spots seem to be on the inside of the bend of a river, or where a small stream enters a larger one, or near the headwaters of a small stream. Along the ocean the sites are found on the inland side of islands or sand bars and on the inland side of salt marshes. On the shore of lakes the sites seem always to be between the lake shore and a hill (provided there is level land between the hill and the lake) without regard to cardinal points or prevailing winds. Apparently the Indians planned to get protection from at least one direction realizing that the winds were variable. It is interesting that the south or southeast slope does not seem to have been particularly favored. Of course, we have no idea as to what direction their lodges may have faced.

Very few sites were found between river drainages, except in the Brookfields.
On the larger streams and along the ocean shore, where an intensive survey has been made, a site is to be found about every mile. This might be an indication of the migratory habits of the Indians, or it might indicate that the tribes were broken up into groups of families or clans and scattered over the land, giving each group a front of about a mile for hunting and fishing. This scattering might be logically expected in a food-gathering or semi-agricultural economy. Of course, we have no right to assume that these sites were contemporaneous in time.

One of the old theories in connection with the Indians of New England is that they had summer and winter homes. Around Plymouth the distribution of sites seems to substantiate this thought. As indicated on the map, there is a line of sites along the shore and another line about two to four miles inland where there is a chain of good sized ponds. In between there are hills and other ponds but no sites reported. This may be the fault of the surveyor or it may indicate a seasonal population shift. Further inland there are more lakes, but unfortunately that region has not yet been surveyed. It is also unfortunate that no artifacts were reported on from these sites. An analogous situation is not evident elsewhere, but river valleys to the north of Cape Ann may have served the same function.

An opportunity to see if archaeology can substantiate this theory seems to present itself here. If a few shore and lake sites around Plymouth were carefully excavated, the hypothesis might either be proved or disproved. One would expect the cultural remains to be the same but that the percentages of artifacts used in winter hunting and fishing through the ice compared with those more suitable for summer shore life might show significant differences.

The sites in Massachusetts might be roughly divided into three groups; those on the ocean shore, those along the rivers, and those in the south central part of the state. This last area, situated between the headwaters of the Chicopee, Nashua, Quinnebaug and Blackstone Rivers, seems to represent the cross roads of Massachusetts. It is an area of small rivers and lakes with presumably good hunting and corn lands. It has many sites, and should receive more consideration than has been the case in the past.

Any attempt to interpret the archaeology of Massachusetts must take into consideration the geography of the whole of New England and eastern New York at the least. With the river valleys as the probable routes for Indian migrations and the spread of cultures, a very complex picture results. Influences from the north can come down the Connecticut and the Merrimac Rivers. In the latter case they could fan out into central Massachusetts via the Nashua and Concord River Valleys. Influences from New York could come up the Hoosic, down the Connecticut or Deerfield or, from southern New York, up the Housatonic. As approaches from the south we have the Housatonic, Connecticut and Thames Rivers, the latter with its tributaries, the Quinnebaug and French Rivers, while the Blackstone, Ten Mile and Taunton Rivers lead into the interior from Narragansett Bay. Thus Massachusetts is at the cross-roads of New England; and by virtue of the Chicopee, Nashua, Concord, Blackstone and Quinnebaug Rivers, the area to the south of Worcester and the Brookfields is the cross-roads of Massachusetts. Its aboriginal importance is further evidenced by the fact that the Bay Path from east to west is supposed to have passed through this region.

The importance of the western part of the state is very great, but we have less than a dozen sites to guide us. If the effect of the Iroquois is as great in Massachusetts and particularly in the Connecticut Valley as it is supposed to be, it would seem that their culture must have passed up the Hoosic and down the Deerfield.
Rivers. This area must be surveyed, and at the risk of becoming a false prophet, we would like to prophesy that here, at least, the stratified site that we dream about will be found. It should be possible to trace this Iroquoian influence up and down the river valleys and perhaps into central Massachusetts.

Very little work has been done on Indian trails as far as the survey goes. It is recommended that an attempt should be made to trace trade routes and that techniques should be developed for testing trade pieces. If we do not have stratigraphy, we must fall more heavily on typology and trade to tie those sites together and see if we have more than one cultural horizon. Cross dating by trade material may hold the answer.

As brought out in the next part of this report, the cultural aspects of Massachusetts are very complex. It seems that geography holds the key to why this is so. With influences from the north, west and south, it is probably logical to find such a confusion of traits. This makes our task harder, and calls for more care, but also makes it more interesting.

RESULTS OF THE ARTIFACT CANVASS

On the back of the survey cards was an artifact list, including points, knives, scrapers, perforators, grooved axes, chipped axes, celts, adzes, plummets, sinkers, probomatics, postles, mortars, ground slates, pipes, pottery, soapstone, worked bone and shell, copper, contact material and skeletal material. The points were called spear points if over three inches in length. The smaller points were divided into five generalized classes as triangular, notched, stemmed, leaf, and small quartz.

It must be stated at once that this is a very poor and incomplete list. Obviously it would have taken an extremely long time to get terms that would be understood by everyone and give the proper distinctions. The question of artifact classification seems outside the province of the Survey Committee. Consequently it was felt best to go ahead with the above list, realizing that we were depending upon a very weak tool, but a tool which, if used, would at least point the way and indicate where the material was and, in general, what was available.

Possibly the greatest contribution from the survey in this connection is to point out the necessity for a good classificatory system, not only for points but also for the larger artifacts. Until that is done, no one without illustrations can get a true mental picture of what is meant when another is talking about hoes or choppers or chipped axes, for example. We think we know what is meant by a celt or an adze or an axe, but do we? And what is the difference between a celt, a grooved-axe, a tomahawk or a hatchet? These terms, quite properly, may mean the same or different things to different people. For a classic example of what we mean, refer to C.C. Willoughby's "Antiquities of the New England Indians," pages 32 to 35, where over the caption of "Adze Blades" are illustrated not only what we would normally call adzes but also a multiplicity of what most of us call gouges. There is a crying need, not only in the Massachusetts Archaeological Society, but also throughout the country, for a list of sound, logical and clear terms and definitions.

Together with the above there should be a uniform system for easily describing sub-types. It seems somewhat unreasonable to believe that all the different types of gouges which we have were made by the same culture group.

This report has probably gone into too great a length on the question of classification, but it was forcibly brought to our attention in going over the artifacts reported.
With this introduction it may seem like rank foolishness to endeavor to make any interpretation at this time of the information sent in. It seems, however, that certain generalities may be investigated, and that the members who worked so hard on this list have a right to expect from the committee at least suggestions of present indications. It must also be borne in mind that even from sites where a large amount of material is reported, we have at best only a sample and by no means a complete inventory. Feeling that the members will treat the analyses as possible suggestions and not as hypotheses, the committee has attempted to investigate possibilities to see if the results cannot at least give rise to thought and indicate possible lines for future research.

Before proceeding with the analysis it seems desirable to bring to the attention of our members certain interesting sites which have come to the attention of the committee as a result of the survey.

Apparently the earliest careful archaeology was the excavation by John Robinson in 1882 of a shell heap on the shore of the Ipswich River. The heap covered an area 100 by 60 feet, and was as deep as three feet. It was gone through from end to end and the collection kept together. The inventory reported to the Essex Institute in Salem consisted of 50 stone chips, burnt stones (20 saved), 11 round stones, 1 longstone, 6 arrowheads, 5 broken points, 3 sinkers, 26 sherds from two pots, 5 bone implements, 2 quarts of human bones comprising 1 adult and 1 child, deer, moose (?), bear, wolf, turkey, and other birds' bones, turtle shell, porpoise bones, three quarts of fish bones, several pierced shells and charcoal.

This list sounds somewhat small to us, but it was stated that more stone was found than from all other nearby heaps before that date.

Site M-20-4 was a rock shelter west of Worcester, measuring only about 30 by 12 feet, and completely excavated a few years ago. In it were found 40 clay sherds, 1 antler tine awl, many freshwater union shells, turtle shells, 1000 broken bones—mostly deer with some bear and turkey leg bones—a wolf's tooth, jaw bones of rabbits and raccoons, and fire cracked rock, but the only worked stone consisted of 4 tiny chips and 1 basal portion of a point. The pottery was both plain and decorated with chevron and zigzag designs and parallel lines.

The two sites give an interesting idea of the food eaten.

On the Cape is the Micar Ralph Site, M-47-5, where an Indian lived on into post-Pilgrim times. This is a very important site, but as we expect that Mr. Howard Torrey, who excavated it, will write a report, we will not try to describe the material here.

By far the best site reported is M-23-89, where 1000 points of all kinds, 9 spear points, 102 knives, 103 scrapers, 60 perforators, 4 grooved axes, 1 chipped axe, 2 celts, 1 adze, 51 gouges, 20 plummets, 2 sinkers, 19 bannerstones, 1 pestle, 16 ulus, 20 sherds of pottery, 15 pieces of soapstone vessels, 40 hammerstones, 15 hoes, 5 slate earrings (?), 4 gorgets, 1 chisel, 1 pitted stone, 6 crude picks, 6 balls, 9 pieces of graphite (like pencils), and whetstones were found. The variety of forms was considerable, as there were several types of bannerstones and plummets. One gun flint was found on the surface, and two articles presumed to be fire flints in the ground.
There seems to have been some specialization in local industries, as well as a peculiar concentration of points reported from some sites. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Other artifacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-18-75</td>
<td>190 small quartz</td>
<td>8 quartz scrapers, 1 celt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-21-27</td>
<td>30 stemmed quartz</td>
<td>6 quartz scrapers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2-9</td>
<td>140 triangular quartz</td>
<td>3 spears</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>162 stemmed</td>
<td>47 knives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>315 small quartz</td>
<td>10 perforators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110 hammerstones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-39-61</td>
<td>119 stemmed slate</td>
<td>1 spear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 leaf</td>
<td>111 knives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 small quartz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And then we have several sites with very heavy concentrations of sinkers. M-39-52 leads with 197 sinkers, 310 small quartz points and 201 points divided among the other four types. R-2-58, M-39-1 and M-39-57 also show more than 100 sinkers each. One is on a lake and the other three are near tidal rivers.

Near the north shore at site M-13-27, four Red Paint type adzes were reported. They are like "k" in Figure 18 of the "Antiquities of the New England Indians" by Willoughby.

Out of the total of 1013 sites, 192, with 10 or more artifacts reported, were considered carefully. Looking at these from various angles, we were unable to discern any type of site that seemed to be repeating. There are sites to be found giving any combination of artifacts desired. It is hoped that with a satisfactory classificatory system this difficulty can be overcome.

From the 192 sites, forgetting points, etc., the totals of the larger artifacts were 158 grooved axes, 447 chipped axes, 186 celts, 125 adzes, 277 gouges, 181 plummetts, 867 sinkers, 50 ulus, 87 hammerstones, 100 problematics not classified, 223 pestles, 17 mortars, 23 pipes, 79 hoes, and 25 choppers. These totals have no particular significance, but the ratio of grooved to chipped axes, the abundance of sinkers, the scarcity of mortars and the comparative abundance of ulus is interesting.

A check of the distribution of plummetts, sinkers, pipes and hoes gave the following results. Plummets are found on shore, river, brook, lake and pond sites. They showed no tendency to concentrate near salt water. Five hundred and fifty-one of the sinkers came from four sites located near Taunton and Narragansett Bay. The remainder, 316, were slightly more apt to be found on shore sites than river sites. They were only reported from 6 ponds.

Pipes, with one exception near Ipswich, were thinly scattered over the area east of the Connecticut River and south of Worcester and Boston. In general this is the area surveyed, but we wish to point out that they were not reported from the Merrimac Valley. It is interesting that the distribution of hoes covers the same area, except that the northern boundary is moved about ten miles further north. Lest anyone feel that this might indicate the extent of agriculture let us make haste to add that the early explorers give many references to corn fields on the north shore, in New Hampshire and in Maine.

Among the points, the triangular and stemmed seem to predominate, with the leaf form the scarcest. In several cases the triangular or stemmed point is more numerous than the total of all others, but at M-37-4 there are more leaf forms than any other.
reported. It is surprising how often all five forms are found on the same site, or any one form may be omitted. Site R-2-1 reports the greatest number of points with 460 triangular, 510 notched, 360 stemmed, 152 leaf, and 640 small quartz.

The state was divided into crude geographical units in an endeavor to see if different artifacts seem to predominate. No definite ideas were discovered, but the following rough generalities were noted:

Connecticut Valley - strong on pottery and soapstone.
South Central Massachusetts - strong on pottery, soapstone and hoes.
Merrimac Valley - leaf type points very rare, strong on pottery.
North Shore - weak on small quartz points.
Concord Valley - slightly stronger on gougues and plummets, more soapstone than clay pottery.
South Shore - more variation in relative numbers of different types of points; stronger on leaf type points, hoes, sinkers, soapstone; very weak on pottery.
Northeast of Providence - very strong on chipped axes, celts and sinkers.
Taunton River - weak on leaf and notched points, very strong on chipped axes and sinkers.
Buzzard's Bay - poorly represented in survey, but seems to be weak in triangular points, strong on chipped axes and sinkers.
Far Cape Cod - weak in notched, strong on triangular and stemmed points, pottery and worked bone; some hoes, but comparatively weak in heavy artifacts.

For comparative purposes the chart below lists the artifacts from the five heaviest sites reported. Unfortunately there is not the geographical distribution desired, as the last four are in the same area. The apparent differences present a problem.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grooved Axes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipped Axes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adzes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gouges</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plummets</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinkers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pestles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulus</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay Pottery</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soapstone Vessels</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(14 choppers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bannerstones</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, the sites, omitting burials, were approached from the point of view of contact with the white man to see if there were any evident differences between contact sites and others. Only six sites were taken as being admittedly contact. They produced all five types of points, spear points, knives, scrapers, perforators, grooved axes, celts, gougues, plummets, pestles, clay pottery, soapstone pipes, worked bone, hoes and pendants. Fourteen possible contact sites gave exactly the same list plus adzes, sinkers, soapstone vessels, tubos, bannerstones and ulus. It is to be noted that chipped axes are about the only thing not found.
The sites were examined again to see if there were any clues as to which came first, clay pottery or soapstone vessels. It was found that non-ceramic non-soapstone sites had otherwise the full inventory, including sometimes contact material. The chart below gives an attempt to correlate soapstone and clay pottery with possible indications of agriculture as a temporal base.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites reporting</th>
<th>No. of sites</th>
<th>Percent of sites reporting</th>
<th>Hoes</th>
<th>Pipes</th>
<th>Possibly contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soapstone vessels only</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay pottery only</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both soapstone and clay</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agriculture has been considered to be comparatively late in New England. There seems to be no evidence here that the use of soapstone preceded that of clay pottery.

An attempt was made to compare sites with the Pre-Algonkian, Old and Middle Algonkian sequence of Willoughby, but without success. Certainly there are far too many bannertones and ulus found to support that hypothesis. It would be necessary to rearrange Willoughby's allocation of artifacts to fit our survey results into the scheme.

It was also impossible to make comparisons that check with the arrangement used in New York State. With a classificatory system, closer agreement might be found than at present. Sites can be found similar to Owasco, Lamoka and Laurentian, but there are certain significant difficulties.

It must be borne in mind that we are working in this report with only a small part of the story in Massachusetts and that careful excavation would give us an entirely different viewpoint.

CONCLUSIONS

The picture as we have presented it is a very complicated one, with a confusing array of all types of artifacts found, in general, on all sites. It looks as though there were many different groups of Indians in Massachusetts. A non-ceramic group may have lived next to a pottery using group; some people may have hunted and gathered nuts, while others were farmers or fishermen. Some of these different groups may even have lived contemporaneously, but eventually we should be able to say that certain sites are older or younger than certain other sites. At present we cannot.

It is believed that the geographical position outlined in the earlier part of this report gives the reason for this confusion. Different influences came in from all directions, but the personal equation was most important; some people took up certain of the new ways, others used the old, together with various combinations and local adaptations.

Our problem is thus crudely outlined. How shall we proceed? First, the adoption of a uniform classificatory system is recommended so that we will all speak the same language. Next, there are exactly forty sites which are crying for careful examination and comparison. This does not essentially necessitate excavation, but a firm basis must be laid. Thirdly, the western part of the state must be surveyed.
The above is a possible start. In such a maze of confusion we must do a few sites very meticulously and then build on to our knowledge by small increments until we have gained sufficient information to make working hypotheses. Without following this procedure we will remain in a maze of confusion, and the archaeology of Massachusetts will never be written.

In conclusion we wish to thank the many members who have helped to bring this survey to its present stage. Their cooperation has been very stimulating and gratifying. It would be nice to say that you would not receive any more requests for sites, but unfortunately such cannot be the case yet. A splendid start has been made, and we look forward to the future with the hope that the next eighteen months will produce at least half as many sites as the last eighteen.

FURTHER ERRATA

The name of Aaron Moore Bagg, 44 Liberty Street, Holyoke, Mass., was inadvertently omitted from the membership list in the January BULLETIN, the secretary reports.
A STANDARIZED SYSTEM FOR THE CLASSIFICATION AND DESCRIPTION
OF STONE IMPLEMENTS FROM NEW ENGLAND.

A - PROJECTILE POINTS

By FREDERICK P. ORCHARD
Chairman, Artifact Classification Committee

Having reviewed many archaeological reports dealing with stone implements and their classification, I am convinced that the system suggested by Byers and Johnson in their recent paper, "Two Sites on Martha's Vineyard," covers chipped stone artifacts very well and simply. As chairman of the Artifact Classification Committee, may I suggest that this system be given a fair trial by the members of the Massachusetts Archaeological Society.

The accompanying plate of illustrations shows five general types of projectile points. The cross-hatched figures are the idealized forms. To the right of each are actual specimens of a similar form. The latter were first photographed, then the prints drawn over with pen and ink, outlining their form and chipping; finally, the photograph was eliminated by bleaching, thus leaving an accurate drawing of the point.

These five types are:

- Ovate: egg-shaped, having a base broader than the apex.
- Trianguloid: triangular—three sided and three cornered.
- Lanceolate: similar to ovate, but longer and tapering to a point.
- Rhombic: like a rhombus—an equilateral four-sided figure having oblique angles.
- Elongate: similar to lanceolate, but narrower and drawn out.

There is a marked similarity in all of the above forms in so far as points are concerned. Obviously the illustrations only show the types in a general way. Variations—such as stemmed, notched, straight base, concave base, rounded corners, bi-excurvate, etc.—may be added to the above general types by the individual using this system of classification.

At a later date an attempt will be made to standardize the classification of other stone implements.
To the Editor:-

In a letter to the Editor, published in Volume II, #2, of the Bulletin of the Massachusetts Archaeological Society, Mr. Harry A. Wright makes the statement that "carelessness displayed in the Bulletin, Vol. II, #1, leaves one with a decided lack of confidence" and hopes that, "for the sake of posterity, these errors will not remain uncorrected."

As the excerpts to which he objects were both published over my signature, it may reasonably assumed that the fault is mine. However, in fairness to myself, I feel justified in calling attention to certain circumstances which bear on the situation.

The statement on p. 33 is obviously an error, as Mr. Wright points out. There are in my possession letters from four people, three of whom have visited the ring in question, and they give its location as follows.

1. "The Indian Council Ring, on the shore of Pontoosuc Lake, in the Tappan Forest, at Lenox, Mass."  
(Miss Mabel Choate, letter to Miss Mary Lee, 11/2/39.)

2. The Council Ring -- at "Pittsfield --"  
(Letter to B.L.S. from Maurice Robbins, 11/12/39.)

3. The Council Ring is "located on the grounds of 'Tanglewood' --in a grove on the south bank of Lake Mahkeenac, just within the northern limits of the town of Stockbridge."  
(Letter to B.L.S. from Clay Perry, 11/16/39.)

4. The council ring is on north shore in the Tanglewood property.  
(Letter to B.L.S. from Clay Perry, 12/10/39.)

5. "The Council Ring on the east shore of Lake Mahkeenac," (formerly) "known as the Stockbridge Bowl, Lenox, Mass."  
(Report of William Fowler, 6/30/40.)

6. "I visited the council ring at Lenox."  
(Letter from William Fowler, 6/4/40.)

The writer confesses to a slight confusion as to the present location of this skittish ring, and joins Mr. Wright in hoping the matter may be definitely cleared up. However, it seems certain that the name of the lake is Mahkeenac, not Pontoosuc. The statement on p. 34 was a quotation from the report of Mr. Fowler, whose primary object was to determine the function of the ring, rather than to inquire into the history of the lime industry. Mr. Wright's information regarding the amount of lime produced in 1853 is an interesting and valuable historical addition to the function of the ring, established by archaeology, as a colonial lime mill.

The statement on p. 3 was again a quotation, as stated in the text, but an outline of Indian territorial bounds is such a controversial matter, that it can probably never be made exact. It is hoped that others may follow Mr. Wright's example in complying with the request for corrections and further information.

Benjamin L. Smith
DISTRIBUTION OF 1013 INDIAN SITES
SITE SURVEY COMMITTEE REPORT TO FEB. 1, 1941
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