

is toward a period of sifting—a “house cleaning” from which there will survive few exhibits bearing the old familiar label, “Presented by ——.” I take it that our collecting should be considered a custodianship rather than an ownership, and our records, more than the material, will show “Who’s Who and Why.”

When you have a three-in-one collection, as I have, the problem is more complicated. One part, a reference collection of projectile points, a series of representative types which has now served its purpose, could be sold. The other two interlock; i.e., material personally collected from a stretch of the Grand River Valley extending twenty miles upstream from Lake Erie, and of greater value, research records for this area, including salvaged records from a number of collections, which in a sense I have made my own, as a custodian. Sell these? No! I think there’s something human about them, both Indian and of myself.

In winding up our collecting “business,” we may rest assured, and nothing can efface the fact, that: “The good will live, the bad will die, and tomorrow will tell us which is which.”

P. M. PRINGLE
Toronto, Ontario
Canada

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE ON CORNER-TANG ARTIFACTS

In last October’s issue of *AMERICAN ANTIQUITY* (Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 152–154) I published a brief note on corner-tang artifacts. The material contained therein had been collected and submitted during the summer of 1937. It is only fair to state that since that time Dr. Patterson has published in the *University of Texas Bulletin*, no. 3734, *Anthropological Papers*, Vol. 1, No. 5: *Supplementary Notes on the Corner-Tang Artifact*.

In the article he embodies, with three noteworthy exceptions, most of the occurrences of the corner-tang artifacts covered by my brief note. In addition to the list of states given by me, Dr. Patterson reports these artifacts from Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska, and South Dakota. The number of counties in Texas where these artifacts have been found increased from seventy to eighty-three, and the total number of corner-tang artifacts known to Dr. Patterson grew to 725.

Dr. Patterson gives as present boundaries of the corner-tang artifacts fourteen states, located between the Mississippi and the Rocky Mountains, extending from Texas (the presumable place of origin) to Montana. The map in Dr. Patterson’s report showing the central states indicates the four states of Louisiana, Minnesota, North Dakota, and Wisconsin without any reported occurrence of corner-tang-artifacts. Of the three exceptions, by which my tabulation exceeds Dr. Patterson’s list, two fit in neatly with his distribution, showing occurrence of corner-tang artifacts in the two states of Louisiana and

Wisconsin, contiguous with his area of distribution. The third exception represents a thus far isolated occurrence in Pennsylvania.

On November 10, Dr. Patterson informed me that since his last publication, he has received a large number of additional records, including some from Minnesota, North Dakota, Wisconsin, and Canada. This leaves as a new contribution on my part only the occurrences in Louisiana and Pennsylvania.

HANS E. FISCHER
Department of Anthropology
Berkeley, California

FOLSOM AND YUMA POINTS FROM SASKATCHEWAN

Several years ago, after intensive studies of the Folsom "problem," it seemed to be apparent that the more finely chipped Folsom and Yuma points were coming from the Great Plains province. This, in general, has been shown by evidence produced principally from New Mexico, Colorado, and Nebraska.

It was logical therefore to expect similar evidence to be forthcoming from the Great Plains region of Canada. Two men in Saskatchewan: Kenneth H. Jones of Mortlach and Burt S. Gunn of Pense, have been finding beautifully flaked points of the above types for the past several years in the southern part of the province, near Regina, under conditions that are almost identical to those prevailing where similar points are found within the United States. D. J. McKillop of Regina also had a number of Yuma points in a collection that he showed to me.

Having been in correspondence with Mr. Jones for several years, I had promised myself at the end of each summer's field work to make a trip to Saskatchewan and see these localities for myself. It was not till the end of August and the early part of September of last year that I was able to carry out this intention. I spent several days in and around Mortlach and the country between there and Regina, which offered an opportunity for investigation of the areas from which both Folsom and Yuma points had been reported, and to study the collections made by Mr. Jones, Mr. Gunn, and others.

The same pattern is discernible here as in other Folsom and Yuma sites. The points are not only similar, but they are coming from areas that show the same unmistakable signs of a changing environment. All are from places that have been eroded by the wind. These places are described by those who have found them as "blow-outs," "wind-blown bottoms of small dry lakes," and "shallow wind-blown ravines."

The sites from which the collections of Folsom and Yuma points were made roughly comprise a fan-shaped area northwest, west, and southwest of Regina, with a radius stretching west about one hundred miles and northwest to the South Saskatchewan River. Some, however, were said to have come from southeast of Regina, in the sand hills near Estevan. The area which I investigated was mostly that in proximity to Mortlach, about seventy-three miles