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As the Winter 2010 issue of the Ohio Archaeologist contained two interesting articles about Ashtabula points, I thought that this would be a good time to publish a map showing their distribution in Ohio (Fig. 1). The data for the map include published specimens, Ashtabula points listed in the Ohio Archaeological Inventory, and personal observations over the last 40 years. For excellent illustrations of Ashtabula points, which were manufactured during the 2nd millennium B.C., please refer to those articles (Eberle 2010; Sedler 2010). Converse’s (1994) Ohio Flint Types also contains good images of Ashtabula points, as well as an informative overview of that type.

The vast majority of the Ohio Ashtabula points found west of a line running from Cleveland, through Akron and Canton, to St. Clairsville, are made from Upper Mercer or Flint Ridge materials, of which large, accessible outcrops occur in Coshocton and Licking counties. Four specimens from Brown, Fayette, and Scioto counties are made from Carter Cave flint, nodules of which occur south of Portsmouth, in Kentucky. These are highlighted in Fig. 1. I am personally unfamiliar with the raw materials of Ashtabula points from the northeastern corner of Ohio.

Figure 1 shows that most Ashtabula points have been recorded northeast of a line running from Defiance, through Kenton, Delaware, Newark, and New Lexington, to Marietta. This seems to reflect their actual distribution, not sampling error. However, I am not as confident about the data for the area east of the Cleveland to St. Clairsville line. A minor, separate concentration of Ashtabula points runs along the glaciated/unglaciated boundary from Newark, through Chillicothe, to the Ohio River in Adams County. This also seems to reflect the actual situation rather than sampling error.

I am painfully aware that distinct sub-types of Ashtabula points exist. Regrettfully, all too often in the past I have recorded specimens as “one Upper Mercer Ashtabula point from the Doe farm,” etc. This retards research, to say the least. An important next step will be to study the distributions of sub-types, using provenanced specimens for which images, or the specimens themselves, are available.
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