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Assemblage Site Report

**Site Location Information:**

The first part of the assemblage is the Gendron Collection AA site number 2 from the state of Ohio in Licking county of Bowling Green Township from the Adena cultures and Stone Industries. Then the second part of the assemblage is the Teaching Collection which did not have any site information.

**Ceramics:**

**Methods of Analysis:**

For the method of analysis, the pottery sherds in the teaching collection were identified by using examples of pottery that are Cordmarked (z twist), Cordmarked (s twist), Punctates, Cord-impressed, and surface treatment. The next part of the analysis included examining Temper type, size, and density, this was done by examining the overall size of the sherds and the thickness of the sherds. Once this information was identified it was put into a database and each of the sherds were placed individually in a bag that was labeled with bag number and the site. As well a vessel rim sheet was done for the second rim since the first rim was too small to be determinate. The vessel rim sheet including weight, decoration, vessel type, use wear, a description of the interior, and a drawing of the interior.

**Results of Analysis:**

*Body Sherds:*

In the Teaching Collection part of the assemblage, most of the collection included body sherds which was a total count of 19 sherds with a total weight of 59.94 grams. Most of the sherds temper type was sand and grit with their surface treatment being mostly smoothed or eroded, while some of the surface treatment that was seen with the sherds was Cordmarked or smoother over Cordmarked. Temper size ranged from fine, medium, to course with most of the temper density being around 5%. Use wear on the body sherds was primarily chipping with three of the 18 total sherds being sooting instead. The decoration for the body sherds varied between cord impression, cordwap stick impression, and Dentate Stamp, while other sherds appeared to possibly have holes in them.

**Table 1: Body Sherds Temper and Decoration**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Provenience | Temper size | Temper type | Temper Density | Decoration |
| Bag 1 | Medium | Sand | 20% | Cord Impression |
| Bag 2 | Fine | Sand | 10% | Punctate? |
| Bag 3 | Fine | Sand | 5% | Punctate? |
| Bag 5 | Coarse | Grit | 10% | Cord Impression |
| Bag 6 | Fine | Sand | 5% |  |
| Bag 7 | Fine | Limestone | 5% |  |
| Bag 8 | Coarse | Grit | 10% | Cordwrapped Stick Impression |
| Bag 9 | Coarse | Grit | 5% | Cordwrapped Stick Impression |
| Bag10 | Coarse | Limestone | 5% | Cordwrapped Stick Impression |
| Bag 11 | Coarse | Grit | 10% | Cordwrapped Stick Impression |
| Bag 12 | Medium | Grit | 10% | Dentate Stamp |
| Bag 13 | Fine | Grit | 5% | Cordwrapped Stick Impression |
| Bag 14 | Medium | Limestone | 10% |  |
| Bag 15 | Fine | Sand | 5% | Cordwrapped stick Impression |
| Bag 16 | Medium | Limestone | 5% |  |
| Bag 17 | Medium | Grit | 5% | Dentate Stamp |
| Bag 18 | Medium | Sand | 5% |  |

**Table 2: Body Sherds Surface Treatment, Use wear, Cord Twist, and Weight**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Provenience | Surface Treatment | Use wear | Cord Twist | Weight |
| Bag 1 | Cordmarked | Chipping | Z-twist | 12.26 |
| Bag 2 | Eroded | Chipping | Z- Twist | 5.59 |
| Bag 3 | Eroded | Chipping | S-Twist | 3.63 |
| Bag 5 | Smoothed over C.M. | Chipping | S-twist | 5.66 |
| Bag 6 | Eroded | Sooting | Indeterminate | 3.19 |
| Bag 7 | Eroded | Chipping | Indeterminate | 2.51 |
| Bag 8 | Smoothed | Chipping | Indeterminate | 2.9 |
| Bag 9 | Smoothed | Sooting | Indeterminate | 1.8 |
| Bag 10 | Smoothed | Chipping | Indeterminate | 2.4 |
| Bag 11 | Eroded | sooting | Indeterminate | 3.3 |
| Bag 12 | Eroded | Chipping | Indeterminate | 2.8 |
| Bag 13 | Cordmarked | Sooting | S-twist | 1.2 |
| Bag 14 | Smoothed | Chipping | Indeterminate | 2.8 |
| Bag 15 | Smoothed | Sooting | Indeterminate | 3.5 |
| Bag 16 | Smoothed | Chipping | Indeterminate | 2.4 |
| Bag 17 | Smoothed | Chipping | Indeterminate | 2.3 |
| Bag 18 | Smoothed | Chipping | Indeterminate | 1.7 |
|  |  |  |  | Total: 59.94 |

*Rim Sherds:*

For the Teaching Collection of the assemblage, in the total amount of ceramics, there were two rims that had a weight of 2.09 grams. The first rim weighted 0.7 grams, but I was unable to identify what type of vessel it was due to how small the rim was. Then the second rim weighted 1.39gams and is of a pipe which had clay temper and its temper density and size being fine and between 5 and 10%. The decoration on the rim was a punctuate with a couple of lines on one side of the rim sherd. The sherd was brown and grey and was wider in the middle with being smaller on the ends while being rounded.

**Figure 1: Picture of second rim sherd**
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*Discussion:*

The patterns in the ceramic artifacts from the teaching collection suggest that the time periods for the sherds are from the Early Woodland period which dates from 600 B.C to 1 A.D. The suggested technological style is that is used are sand and grit with a medium-size temper that had density around 5%. As well that was used soothed over Cordmarked for decoration mostly while other decorations were used occasionally. Possible activities include a use for utility and lifestyle purposes with the second rim activities and storage uses.

**Lithics:**

**Methods of Analysis:**

The method of analysis for the Gendron AA -1 site 2 was done by first sorting the debitage and chipped stone tools by their different sizes which were sizes from 1/8 of an inch to 1in. Once the debitage and chipped stone tools were sorted by size they were then analyzed by lithic coding to determine their stage of lithic reduction and their raw material type. Determining the raw material was done by looking at different photos of artifacts from different areas such as Pipe Creek and Delaware from a chert book. Once either the debitage and the chipped stone tools were identified they were put into a bag and labeled according to what they were. As well of the chipped stone tools analysis forms were done which stated that tool type the stone tool it was such either ground stone or chipped if it was heat-treated of not and the stone tools weight. In the analysis form sheets, a drawing of each of the chipped stone tools was also done.

**Results of Analysis:**

*Chipped stone debitage:*

In the Gendron AA-1 site 2, there was a total of 61 chipped stone debitage with a total weight of approximately 21.2 grams. The stages of lithic reduction were linear flakes, biface thinning, block shatter, reduction flake, retouch, broke flake, and utilized flake. Linear flakes were the most form of lithic reduction in Gendron AA-1 site 2 while there was 12 biface thinning, 4 block shatter, 7 reduction flakes, 1 retouch, 6 broken flakes, and 13 utilized flakes. Most of the chipped stone debitage were 1 inch in size with only two flakes being ¾ of an inch and ¼ of an inch. The raw material types that were found were from Bloomville, Bruch Creek, Cedarville, Delaware, and Flint Ridge. Bloomville is typically found in Seneca County in Ohio, then Bruch Creek is typically found by a small town in Morgan County in southeastern Ohio. Cedarville is typically found by Logan county Ohio; Delaware is found in northwestern Ohio and northeastern Indiana. Then Flint Ridge is typically found in Licking County Ohio near Brownsville.

*Chipped stone tools:*

In the Gendron AA-1 Site 2, there was a total of 2 formal chipped stone tools that were both triangular projects. The formal chipped tools weighed a total of 39.9g with the first formal chipped tool weighing 10.3g and the second formal chipped tool weighing 29.5g. Both chipped stone tools in this part of this assemblage appear to be from the Middle Woodland which is from 1000 B.C to 500 A.D and possible associated activities are that chipped stone tools were the main flint-working activities and were possibly used for a verity of cutting and scraping purposes.

**Table 3: Chipped Stone debitage**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Provenience | Lithic Reduction | Size | Raw Materials | Heat Treatment |
| Bag 1 | Block Shatter | ¾ in | Pipe Creek | Torched/Burnt |
| Bag 2 | Retouch | ¼ in | Delaware | no |
| Bag 3 | Broke Flake | 1 in | Delaware | no |
| Bag 4 | Broke Flake | 1in | Cedarville | no |
| Bag 5 | Broke Flake | 1in | Delaware | No |
| Bag 6 | Broke Flake | 1 in | Flint Ridge | Maybe |
| Bag 7 | Block Shatter | 1 in | Flint Ridge | Maybe |
| Bag 8 | Block Shatter | 1 in | Cedarville | No |
| Bag 9 | Block Shatter | 1in | Cedarville | Yes |
| Bag 10 | Broke Flake | 1in | Brush Creek | Yes |
| Bag 11 | Broke Flake | 1 in | Brush Creek | Yes |
| Bag 12 | Biface Thinning | 1 in | Delaware | No |
| Bag 13 | Biface Thinning | 1in | Delaware | Maybe |
| Bag 13 | Biface Thinning | 1in | Delaware | No |
| Bag 14 | Biface Thinning | 1in | Bloomville | no |
| Bag 15 | Biface Thinning | 1in | Bloomville | No |
| Bag 16 | Biface Thinning | 1in | Delaware | No |
| Bag 17 | Biface Thinning | 1in | Cedarville | Yes |
| Bag 18 | Biface Thinning | 1 in | Brush Creek | Maybe |
| Bag 19 | Biface Thinning | 1in | Bloomville | No |
| Bag 20 | Biface Thinning | 1in | Cedarville | Maybe |
| Bag 21 | Biface Thinning | 1in | Bloomville | Maybe |
| Bag 22 | Biface Thinning | 1in | Bloomville | No |
| Bag 23 | Biface Thinning | 1in | Delaware | Yes |
| Bag 24 | Reduction Flake | 1 in | Delaware | No |
| Bag 25 | Reduction Flake | 1in | Flint Ridge | No |
| Bag 26 | Reduction Flake | 1 in | Cedarville | No |
| Bag 27 | Reduction Flake | 1in | Flint Ridge | Yes |
| Bag 28 | Reduction Flake | 1 in | Flint Ridge | no |
| Bag 29 | Reduction Flake | 1 in | Delaware | No |
| Bag 30 | Reduction Flake | 1 in | Flint Ridge | No |
| Bag 31 | Linear Flake | 1 in | Bloomville | No |
| Bag 32 | Linear Flake | 1in | Bloomville | No |
| Bag 33 | Linear Flake | 1 in | Bloomville | No |
| Bag 34 | Linear Flake | 1in | Flint Ridge | No |
| Bag 35 | Linear Flake | 1in | Delaware | yes |
| Bag 36 | Linear Flake | 1 in | Delaware | No |
| Bag 37 | Linear Flake | 1 in | Flint Ridge | No |
| Bag 38 | Linear Flake | 1in | Delaware | No |
| Bag 39 | Linear Flake | 1 in | Delaware | No |
| Bag 40 | Linear Flake | 1in | Brush Creek | No |
| Bag 41 | Linear Flake | 1in | Brush Creek | Yes |
| Bag 42 | Linear Flake | 1in | Delware | Maybe |
| Bag 43 | Linear Flake | 1in | Bloomville | No |
| Bag 44 | Linear Flake | 1in | Bloomville | Maybe |
| Bag 45 | Linear Flake | 1in | Cedarville | No |
| Bag 46 | Linear Flake | 1in | Cedarville | No |
| Bag 47 | Linear Flake | 1in | Cedarville | No |
| Bag 48 | Linear Flake | 1in | Cedarville | No |
| Bag 49 | Utilized Flake | 1in | Delaware | Yes |
| Bag 50 | Utilized Flake | 1in | Brush Creek | No |
| Bag 51 | Utilized Flake | 1in | Bloomville | yes |
| Bag 52 | Utilized Flake | 1in | Cedarville | No |
| Bag 53 | Utilized Flake | 1in | Cedarville | No |
| Bag 54 | Utilized Flake | 1in | Bloomville | Yes |
| Bag 55 | Utilized Flake | 1in | Cedarville | No |
| Bag 56 | Utilized Flake | 1in | Flint Ridge | Maybe |
| Bag 57 | Utilized Flake | 1in | Bloomville | Maybe |
| Bag 58 | Utilized Flake | 1in | Cedarville | No |
| Bag 59 | Utilized Flake | 1in | Bloomville | Maybe |
| Bag 60 | Utilized Flake | 1in | Brush Creek | Yes |
| Bag 61 | Utilized Flake | 1in | Cedarville | Yes |
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*Discussion:*

What my interpretations about the patterns in the lithic artifacts in the Gendron AA-1 site 2 part of my Assemblage shows that the technological style that used mostly made linear flakes, as well as biface thinning, block shatter, reduction, and utilized flakes for the debitage. Then the technological style from the completed chipped stone tools is triangular projection with raw materials from Bloomville and Delaware. The used raw materials from the debitage are from Bloomville, Brush Creek, Cedarville, Delaware, and Flint Rindge. The time period of the lithic artifacts with the debitage and the completed chipped stones are from the middle woodland period. The activities suggest that with the completed chipped stone tools that they were the main flint-working activities at the site and were possibly used for a verity of cutting and scraping purposes and for the debitage were making blades and bladelets and possibly other types of chipped stone tools at the site as well.

**Conclusion:**

The assemblage suggests from the patterns in the ceramic sherds with temper size, type, density, decoration, and surface treatment while for lithic’s patterns in the raw materials, size, reduction and where the raw materials are from. For the site time period, it is from the early to middle woodland period. This is due to the ceramic sherds being from the early woodland period and the lithic’s being from the middle woodland period. Activates at the site centered around the production of chipped stone tools with flint-working activities and with making blades and bladelets and were possibly used for a variety of cutting and scraping purposes. Then with pottery and pipes as seen with the second rim sherd which were most likely used for utility and lifestyle purposes. Access to resources at the site based on the assemblage would suggest that trade was a major activity at the site but some of the resources were used from the site as well.
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