

KENT STATE  
UNIVERSITY

KENT, OHIO 44240

SOCIOLOGY AND  
ANTHROPOLOGY  
(216) 672-2562

August 10, 1970

Mr. Donald Crabtree  
Route 1  
Kimberly, Idaho  
83341

Dear Mr. Crabtree:

I have been laboring on a dissertation that is an analysis of Ohio Hopewell lithic material. I am hesitant to intrude into your busy schedule, but I wonder if I can ask your advised on the following matters:

1) As much as I can tell (for I do not experiment with flint knapping), Hopewellians used percussion to accomplish their flint work. I am, none-the-less, caught in the argument between Bordes and Semenov on the use of pressure vs. percussion for blade (I have been using Witthoft's designation bladelet) manufacture. To extricate myself from this, I wonder if turning to lithic technological in Ohio and eastern North America may provide the clue. The lamellar flaking obtained by pressure so characteristic on Paleo points shifted in the Archaic to employment on retouch. Woodland technology employed percussion, some of it very fine. Pressure was virtually absent, except as an anachronism. (I think, however, certain specific local groups in Ohio employed pressure, but I'll have to let this question go.) What, in your opinion, was employed to obtain the triangles that persisted from Late Woodland to Historic times? In Ohio, these triangles are called Mississippian, Erie, Iroquois, or Late Woodland. In short, was there a continent-wide, or at least Eastern No. Am., technological evolution occurring in which Hopewell was merely one of many participants? The early ethnographic accounts describing Eastern U.S. Indians ought to be of some help, but, so far, my efforts to obtain any insight from these sources, has been to no avail.

2) If Bordes is to be believed, and bladelets could be drawn from Hopewell subconical cores by elongated hammers, were the cores held in some manner of vise?

CE.S. 1.15.1



3) I find many hammerstones of various sizes, typically of limestone, but I have found nothing I can call a presser or retoucher. There are, however, many tipped items of bone and antler. Is this enough evidence to suppose the use of antler as a soft hammer? Perhaps of some interest are the scores of perforators made from bladelets or modified bifacial trim flakes. Most are too fragile, but some are strong enough for stone work.)

4) As is quite obvious--I'm muddling through all this, with lots of churning yet to go through--but, premature as it is, I think I have the evidence to claim some technical evolution within Hopewell itself. The Ater Mound, dug by Ray Baby in 1948 and so far undescribed, reveals six long (7.62 to 8.23 cm) bladelets that I think could only have been obtained by crutch pressure. Three of them carry apex distally which looks ground. So far, this is a singular occurrence. Ater is late.

I have not included drawings or pictures for I felt that would be presumptuous, but will do so should you prefer to examine them. I also am reluctant to be such a nuisance for I understand your wife is ill, and I have great feeling for the intense preoccupation such a situation demands. From my own experience, I know how sometimes business-as-usual in its matter-of-factness is strangely comforting. It is my hope this request will be so construed.

Most respectfully,

*Barbara Harkness*

(Mrs.) Barbara Harkness