

ANALYSIS OF THE FOLSOM POINT FROM THE  
LINDENMEIR SITE, COLORADO

U.N.M. No. B 22/8

Study of a reproduction of this point  
given to me by Dr. Marie Wormington

Following is my interpretation of the work on the above named artifact  
and is the conclusion of a flint knapper and not that of an Archaeologist

Upon inspection, I find that on one side of this artifact there are a  
*total 152*  
~~84~~ secondary retouch flakes removed on the edges. On the other side,  
*interval is 21 flakes per inch*  
~~39~~ secondary retouch flakes have been removed from one edge and ~~40~~  
from the other edge. The technique used in fabricating this point was  
*and not the Base - the*  
then the point turned  
to remove a flake from one side/and one from the other, resulting in a  
piecrust type of serration. This method also left no crushed edges,  
meaning that when the pressure tool was applied to the edge there was  
downward as well as outward pressure. This method is shown by the  
rezer edge left when the bulb of pressure came off with the flake.  
Straight pressure results in a crushed edge and a shell like flake with  
compression rings. The tool used must have been very minute. The  
length of these tiny flakes are about 4 to 5 times width of the flake.  
The terminal ends of the flake scars were removed by the fluting flake,  
so the total average length shall remain unknown. On one side there is  
a sign of primary pressure retouching. It appears that when fluting was  
to be done, it was a very regular surface, one side showing only a little  
flexing as the flake was removed, the other showing almost no undulation.  
The undulations can be caused by surface irregularity or too great a  
compression without sufficient outward force.

The platform for the first flake removed was almost even with the top of  
the base ~~XX~~ or I should say in a straight line with the basal barbs. The  
sides of the bulb of pressure were removed by two well controlled flakes  
then a new platform was made farther in the base in order to get enough  
a tone to support the pressure tool for the removal of the second flake.

Co. 30.12.7.1



It was polished to give it more strength. Upon close inspection with a magnifying glass, one fine that a little of the polished surface remains. Then two flakes were detached to remove the high areas on either side of the second bulb of pressure. The control of the fluting flakes is remarkable. The angle is next to perfect, as neither flake removed the point. The area of stone detached by the fluting is many times the cross section of the artifact.

Q-30.12.7.2