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I: Introduction and Background

The Adair Site (3GA1) is a Caddo site located in the Upper Ouachita River Valley, 25 miles north of Hot Springs, Arkansas and three miles northwest of the now inundated town of Buckville, Arkansas. The site, located on a terrace overlooking the North Fork of the Ouachita River, was composed of one three-meter-high mound and at least two other low mounds, as well as two borrow pits, structure floors, middens, and cemeteries (Early 1982). The largest mound was approximately 26 by 33 meters at its base. The two other mounds were recorded as low mounds (1-1.5 meters high), but were still relatively large, up to 30 meters across (Dellinger and Dickinson 1939).

The goal of this project is to better understand the Adair Site by placing the whole vessel collection from the site into archaeological context. This research will show that collections with little, no, or problematic provenience can still be utilized and can yield information when analysis is framed correctly. This project will also explore the greater settlement systems, and hierarchical social order of Caddo in the Upper Ouachita River Valley. Whole vessels and whole vessel data from the Adair Site and surrounding sites are used to identify patterns in pottery type and distribution among sites, as well as possible evidence of social stratification.

Previous research in the area

This site has been the subject of two previous excavations, both done by the University of Arkansas Museum and its curator, Samuel C. Dellinger. The University of
Arkansas Museum conducted the first excavation at the Adair Site during several seasons from 1929 to 1931. To gain funding for this project, Dellinger convinced prominent Arkansas businessman Harvey Couch (fig. 1-1), the president of Arkansas Power and Light, to donate money to excavate sites along the Ouachita River (Mainfort 2008). The Adair Site excavation was part of this larger project that was designed to salvage some of the sites in the Ouachita River Valley from intense looting of Native American graves. Although there was a little funding designated for each site, the Museum was able to excavate a large cemetery on the south side of the Adair Site (Dellinger and Dickinson 1939).

Notes and descriptions of this excavation and the project as a whole are sparse, thus little is known about the procedures of this excavation and what was excavated. During the 1939 excavations, Phillip Philips surveyed the Adair Site and the surrounding areas as part of his dissertation work from Harvard University. In his personal journals he wrote about
the Adair Site and what was found there (Philips 1939). According to Philips, Dellinger said they excavated 117 burials in this cemetery during the first excavations in 1929 to 1932 (Phillips 1939).

The site was dug a second time as part of a Works Projects Administration (WPA) funded expedition in the late 1930s, when it was certain that the site was to be inundated by the construction of Blakley Dam across the Ouachita River, resulting in the formation of Lake Ouachita. Although the United States Congress had approved the construction of the dam in 1870, the first steps toward the construction were started in 1939. Because of this, Dellinger obtained WPA funds to salvage what they could from not only the Adair site, but surrounding sites as well, notably the Poole Site (Wood and Early 1981).

At Adair, Dellinger, his associate, Samuel D. Dickinson, and a small crew, excavated four areas, or plots, divided into ten-foot squares, dug in six-inch layers. A ten-foot wide trench was excavated through the largest mound (fig. 1-2). Because the site had been looted many times, Dellinger and Dickinson thought that individual plots and units would yield the least amount of disturbed information. The excavators were able to identify two distinct layers distinguished by hard, compact occupation floors, which suggested two phases of occupation. No burials were found in the mound, but nine burned house floors and housing features were discovered (fig. 1-3). They opened the area excavated previously, but recovered only a few whole and restorable vessels and twelve burials that were missed by the previous excavation were recovered.

The WPA excavations ended in 1939. The construction of the Blakely Dam was started in 1952 with the relocation of the town of Buckville, local cemeteries, and other
items that required attention. The dam was finished in 1952, the power plant was completed in 1955, and flooding began on July 4, 1956.

![Image of trenching through the mound](University of Arkansas Museum 1939)

![Image of house structures on mound](University of Arkansas Museum 1939)

**Environmental Setting**

The Adair Site and the Ouachita Mountains are part of the Interior Highlands, which extend from the central United States to the mountainous west. This area has two major subdivisions in Arkansas, the Ozark Mountains and the Ouachita Mountains (Foti 1974). The Ouachita Mountains are composed of compressed, folded, and faulted sedimentary rock. The mountains are divided into four distinct regions, the Arkansas Valley, the Fourche Mountains, the Novaculite Uplift, and the Athens Piedmont Plateau. The Adair Site is located on the border between the Fourche Mountains and the Novaculite Uplift.
Natural rock and mineral resources are abundant in the Ouachita Mountains; most notable is novaculite. Ancient novaculite quarries are common in the Ouachita Mountains and point to a resource that was not only heavily utilized, but also one that was highly important to Native Americans. Other natural resources in the area are Big Fork chert, sandstone, quartz crystals, turquoise, and copper (Early, Burnett, and Wolfman 1988). Further downstream in the Middle Ouachita Region, the Ouachita River flows out of the Ouachita Mountains. Here natural salt can be found in saline bayous. All these natural resources would have been highly attractive to ancient and historic peoples in the entire Ouachita River Valley area. (Early, Burnett, and Wolfman 1988)

The forests in the Upper Ouachita River basin are in the temperate deciduous forest biome (Early 1982). The forest surrounding the Adair Site includes a mixture of oak-hickory and oak-pine forests. The mixture of the oak-hickory forests, more common to the north, and the oak-pine forests, common to the south, intermingle in the Ouachita Mountains. There are also mosaic areas of prairieland on south-facing slopes and cedar and cypress patches in the alluvial areas, creating a unique biome.

The Ouachita River was a valuable resource for both ancient and historic peoples in the area. The rivers and streams form mostly from runoff of natural springs in the upper elevations (Early, Burnett, and Wolfman 1988). The rivers provided excellent topography for farming land, abundant sources of fish, a natural draw for wildlife, and major transportation routes. The low elevation riverbeds would have also supported the greatest range of plant species. Some of the springs that were in the Ouachita Mountains were hot
springs. Most notable are those at modern day Hot Springs National Park, located only 25 miles away from the Adair site.

**Caddo history in Arkansas and the Southeast**

The Caddo are a mostly sedentary culture that was found in the Southeast starting around the turn of the first millennium. Many people identify the Fourche Maline culture as the antecedent culture to the Caddo in this area. This culture, present mostly in western Arkansas and eastern Oklahoma, is a Woodland tradition that is named for sites along Fourche Maline Creek in eastern Oklahoma (Wood and Early 1981). Although this culture is thought to precede the Caddo culture, it is not found everywhere that the Caddo eventually occupied. Other cultures that are similar to Fourche Maline, but not identical, include the Mossy Grove culture in northeastern Texas and the Bellevue culture in Louisiana (Early 2004). These Woodland cultures are differentiated by their distinct pottery and material assemblages. Artifacts that are diagnostic of the Woodland include Gary points, Williams Plain pottery, chipped stone hoes and axes, boatstones, and platform pipes (Wood and Early 1981). Many sites that were later occupied by Caddo also have evidence of Fourche Maline culture, such as the Poole Site (3GA3) and Standridge (3MN53) (Early 2004; Wood and Early 1981; Early, Burnett, and Wolfman 1988).

Archeological evidence of the Caddo can be seen beginning around A.D. 900. In some places the pottery being used later begins to change from grog (or clay) tempered plain ware vessels to highly decorated shell-tempered pottery in new shapes. Flat-topped mounds that were used for rituals and civic events start to become common. Social hierarchy develops and can be seen in the form of stratified mortuary practices, also
observed in this time is a change in subsistence patterns. The number of caries per person, as well as shifts in stable isotope patterns, suggests that corn becomes the predominant food source around A.D. 1000-1200 (Early 2004).

The Caddo are generally considered Mississippian people. The Mississippian culture as a whole can be seen in the eastern United States from A.D. 800 until the time of European contact (around A.D. 1550), with the height of culture peaking around A.D. 1200-1400 in most areas. The Caddo tradition is generally thought of as one of, if not the most, western of the Mississippian cultures (Rogers and Sabo 2004). Like other Mississippian cultures, intensive agriculture was the driving economic factor in society. People living in the eastern and southeastern United States exploited corn, beans, squash, melons, and sunflowers. This system of intensive agriculture led to long-term, permanent settlements, which allowed the cultures to form highly complex social systems and hierarchical cultures, which are generally characteristic of Caddo and other Mississippian cultures (Rogers and Sabo 2004).

Much of what is known about specific settlement systems of the Caddo culture can be found in ethnohistorical sources that were written by the Spanish and French explorers. These accounts describe the Caddo living, not in walled or centralized settlements, but in small two to three family hamlets or single-family farmsteads. These hamlets and farmsteads were located near arable farmland, secure water sources, and were generally grouped around a central area or village where the political and religious leaders lived. These areas were often spread out over many kilometers, encompassing many people. In addition to farming, the Caddo made use of the resources around them and were intensive hunters and gatherers. (Rogers and Sabo 2004; Sabo 2001)
Familial descent for the Caddo was matrilineal, but political offices and religious titles were passed through the male line. Recent ethnographic research within historic and modern Caddo populations has shown the existence of clans. These had names of animals such as Raccoon, Beaver, Bear, or Wolf, mostly named for mythical or religious reasons. Clan membership was passed matrilineally, but if the father’s clan were deemed “stronger” than the mother’s, the sons would belong to the father’s clan and the daughters to the mother’s. This patterns suggests a kinship structure similar to the Wichita, which looks at relative “strength” of groups in the larger social unit, rather than strictly matrilineal decent. (Rogers and Sabo 2004; Sabo 2001)

The government of the Caddo was hierarchical, much like the society. The highest official in the Caddo governmental system was the kahdi. This office was passed from elite male to elite male within a family. The kahdi had eight offices under him called the canahas, which were political aides. In addition to the kahdi and canahas, there was a high priest, or religious leader, known as the xinesi. This man, although not the highest office in society, had a great deal of power. Like the caddi, the xinesi had offices he was in control of as well. These offices were numerous lesser shamans and priests called the connas. All of these people and their families would have lived in the central religious and political place with many hamlets around. (Rogers and Sabo 2004; Sabo 2001)

Adair, surrounding sites, and settlement systems in the Ouachita River Valley

Caddo settlement systems can be seen as a physical representation of a hierarchical society. The smallest components found within Caddo settlement systems include the single household or farmstead and the collection of households or hamlets, both of which
relied heavily on kin systems and familial structures (Early 1982). The larger components of the system were composed of many households and hamlets to form communities or villages. These communities could range from very large sites, such as ones apparent in east Texas where they covered almost 64 kilometers, to small ones with only a few dozen houses (Early 1982).

The social and political center of the Caddo social system was where the highest-ranking members of society interacted. These people often lived at or near the areas where religious or ritual activity took place. In other Mississippian societies, possibly among the Caddo as well, religious and political leaders would have special rights within the society. These rights would include being able to conscript work, such as mound building or planting, or have access to certain objects or resources (Early 1982).

Subsistence activities and natural resources determined the location of and the dispersal and settlement systems of the Caddo. Natural resources such as salt, wood, and water were all things that were important for the selection of a site. Suitable farmland and access to hunting and collecting sites were vital as well. Many of the sites in the Caddo culture area are found along rivers and other waterways.

The Adair Site has long been considered important in the upper Ouachita River valley, and it is the only site in which a pyramidal mound is present in the Upper Ouachita area. The area was not properly surveyed until the early to mid-twentieth century, and it was done so very quickly because of the threat of looters as well as the construction of Blakely Dam and Carpenter Dam (Wood and Early 1981; Mainfort 2008). But, it should be
noted that if another mound center were in the Upper Ouachitas, it would have been noticed and thus written about.

Dr. Ann Early first suggested that the Adair Site was home to the Caddo elite in a paper which discusses Caddoan settlement systems (Early 1982). Early defined five types of Caddoan settlements in the Ouachita Mountains: diffuse activity centers, focal activity centers, low mound clusters, cemeteries, and mound centers (Early 1982). These distinct, hierarchical levels of society can be seen and mapped in the Upper Ouachita River Basin. Although the Upper Ouachita River Valley covers a large expanse, the number of known sites within the area is low. The quantity of study sites that Early looked at in her mapping of settlement types is only 57 (fig. 1-4), and the insufficient excavations which have occurred in the area do not allow the sites to be temporally divided at this time.

Focal activity centers are sites that are most likely temporary settlements. These areas have little to no midden accumulation, as evinced by anthropomorphic soils, a small number of diagnostic artifacts, and a small range of artifacts. Diffuse activity centers have midden deposits, some structures, and a range of artifact types. There is evidence of sustained use of the site where many activities took place.

Cemeteries are areas where human remains were found with no evidence of sustained residential use. Low mound clusters are areas where one or more low mounds are present. Other features present may include middens, house foundations, burned structures, and any other features that are evidence of sustained use. Mound centers have at least one pyramidal mound as well as one or more low mounds, cemetery areas, middens, and many other features. (Early 1982)
Fig. 1-4: Map of the Upper Ouachita with settlement types, Adair circled (Early 1982)
By using those definitions, and looking at the sample of sites across the area, Early determined that the Adair Site is the only site that falls into the category of mound center. Using this system, sites in the Upper Ouachita area follow a “ranking” system, with the mound center being the highest “rank”. Because of this, one could assume that Adair was the apex of the Caddo occupation during the time.

From the distribution of mound clusters in the Middle Ouachita River area and the location of Adair, it is clear that Adair was not connected with the other mound centers downstream in the Middle Ouachita. In the Middle Ouachita, mound centers are surrounded by many other, smaller lower “ranking” sites. As can be seen on the map in fig 1-4, this does not seem to be the case in the Upper Ouachita. Because of the number of sites in the area and the lack of social works (such as mounds) in the immediate area around Adair, one can hypothesize that the people at this site were superior to those at the other sites around it, however the amount of control was probably not that immense (Early 1982).

Given this background information, the study outlined in this paper will look at the role of the Adair Site in the larger Caddo settlement system. By looking at the pottery and how it is similar to or different from other sites in type, size, and distribution we can start to see how people at this site may have been in contact with people at others.
II: Research and Methods

Research questions:

This study will look at the unprovenienced whole vessel collection from the Adair Site, with the main goal of setting these collections into an archaeological context that has been lost. The vessels are currently part of the University of Arkansas Museum Collections located in Fayetteville, Arkansas. The majority of the whole vessel collection was accessioned into Museum Collections in 1931 and 1932, with the bulk of the non-whole vessel collections being accessioned in the early 1940s. It should be noted that this study is looking at the whole vessels only, with only a brief discussion of other artifacts. The artifacts accessioned in the 1940s are numerous and include mostly sherds and chipped lithics. These later collections were mostly excavated from non-grave areas and represent possibly the domestic areas of the site and will not be included in this study.

By knowing the history of the site, the history of the past research on the site, and the research that has been done in other areas around Adair, some assumptions can be made.

1. We can assume that this was the paramount cultural center in the immediate area because of the pyramidal mound, two low mounds, structures, a large cemetery, and middens. In this research, “elite”, as in the text, as in reference to the “ranking” of Caddo sites outlined in the first chapter, means elite status is conferred to a site that exhibits the components of a mound center. This would have been a place where religious and political leaders would have lived and
people from surrounding areas would have visited to participate in religious and social events.

2. Although there was most likely interaction between the residents of Adair and neighboring sites, which ones and how far the interaction extended is still unknown. This interaction would have been in the form of economic, political, religious, or social contact. Although it is known that these interactions would have taken place, specifics about these exchanges are outside of the scope of this project.

These assumptions can lead to three research questions

1. Can the archaeological context for the whole vessel collection from Adair be confirmed?

Because of the lack of reports about the vessels found at Adair, we have to make assumptions about where they came from. According to Dellinger, the first excavations (1929-1932) at Adair were done at “a large cemetery” south of the large mound on the site (Dellinger and Dickinson 1939). Because most of the ceramic material was accessioned into the Museum collections one to two years after that, it could be presumed that much of this material came from that excavation. But, the exact archaeological context in which these artifacts were found is unknown. In order to test this theory, collections found at Adair are compared with those found at the Poole Site (3GA3), where it is known the collections are from a cemetery. To test whether the Adair vessels are also from a cemetery, analysis of the overlap of types, relative sizes of the vessels, and the distribution of the types found at both sites is conducted to see if they are similar enough to indicate
similar contexts. Statistical differences between the two collections can be tested with a Student’s t-test on the top three types at both sites. This should show whether there is a statistical difference between the two collections.

2. What was the relative degree of interaction between the people at Adair and people in the surrounding sites?

The Adair Site is the only mound complex in the Upper Ouachita River Valley, and is thought to be an elite site. But, which sites would have had interaction with Adair? It is known that Caddo communities would have had social, political, religious, and economic interactions, but specifications about these is beyond the scope of this project. What can be tested is the overlap of pottery types in the collection as a measure of proxy interaction. Looking at contemporary sites, Poole, Standridge, and Hardman, situated at successive distances from Adair, possible overlap is seen. The Poole Site (3GA3) is approximately 3 kilometers from Adair, (Wood and Early 1981), the Standridge Site is approximately 33 kilometers, and Hardman is 63 kilometers from Adair (Fig. 2-1). By studying the ceramic collections, we can evaluate whether there was any trade or exchange of ideas happening between these sites? If they were culturally linked, there will most likely be evidence in the ceramic collections, as seen by an overlap index, which can be a proxy for measuring interaction. By comparing the whole vessel collections with respect to type, size, decoration, and distribution, hypothesizes about the possible relationships between sites can be generated.
3. Can the assumption of elite status of the Adair site be seen in the ceramic collections?

Adair is thought to be an elite site. We know that the Poole Site was a low mound center, which was, within the social hierarchy outlined at the beginning of this paper, socially beneath the mound complex at Adair (Early 1982). Similarly, Hardman and Standridge were diffuse activity and a domestic center/low mound cluster, respectively. Given the hypothesized social hierarchy, we can ask the question, do the different sites...
show differences in the type, kinds, and distributions of pottery? This can be studied by comparing the vessel collections with particular interest in the variety of types from each site, the quality of the vessel, and, when available, the provenience of the artifact. By understanding how and why each artifact is located in the site as well as in the greater settlement system, interpretation of the greater social hierarchy can be garnered.

Treatment of the Collections

The focus of this study is on roughly 200 whole vessels from the Adair site. Each vessel was cleaned when it was accessioned into the University Collections between 1929-1947. No further washing or cleaning has been done to the pottery since its original processing roughly 75 years ago. During this study, each vessel was examined thoroughly and measured. The measurements were taken using the Ceramic Vessel Documentation Form, which is standard for the Arkansas Archaeological Survey (AAS). On this sheet, measurements for each vessel were recorded depending on the shape and type of the vessel. Standard names for the vessel, rim, and lip shape, and other specific measurements were recorded as per the direction and assistance of Dr. Ann Early.

Once all measurements were taken for a certain vessel, a Caddo pottery type was assigned, if applicable. These types descriptions were either taken from the Handbook of Texas Archaeology (1954) by Dee Ann Suhm, Alex Krieger, and Edward Jelks, published reports of nearby and/or contemporary sites, or marked as “untyped” because of the unique aspects of the vessel. Once a type was assigned, the vessels were then assessed using the Descriptive Classification System that was developed by Frank Schambach.
Problems arise when trying to classify decorated Caddo utilitarian wares. The basis of the typology comes from the Handbook of Texas Archaeology by Suhm, Krieger, and Jelks, which was first written in 1954. Since then there have been many revisions, updates, and other changes to the way that Caddo pottery is generally classified today. Although the Suhm and Jelks book is the foundation for the standardization of decorated Caddo wares, the type descriptions that were put forth by the authors have been shown to be somewhat incomplete. Many other authors, using the published types, have altered or added to the type descriptions in their respective publications. Although Caddo pottery is fairly uniform across the Caddo cultures, regional differences often cause types or varieties to overlap and conflict with each other.

To solve this problem, Frank Schambach devised a way to document pottery by looking at the method of decoration, and the combinations of techniques and designs used on a particular vessel. This is a system that goes beyond naming types and varieties and tries to understand how decorative patterns were used and which ones often are found together. This system was first described in the site report for the Shallow Lake Site (3UN9/52) (Rolingson and Frank F. Schambach 1981). It looks at the techniques and designs found on the vessel and assigns a name for the pattern (Schambach 1984). In addition to the pattern names, motifs within a certain pattern are designated with a number to identify its various aspects. For example, the Afton design is composed of diagonal or vertical lines in a nested triangle pattern design. The Afton 1 pattern is simple nested triangles, while Afton 2 is simple nested triangles with lip notches.

The advantage of this method, as opposed to using only types and varieties, is that although it was designed by using whole vessels, it can also be used on sherd collections. By
naming each decoration pattern, the information can be analyzed separately and as a whole. This method allows one to see trends between types and varieties, as well as sherds and whole collections.

Each classification of pottery decoration is first divided into groups depending on the technique used. The classes are:

**Class A:** Incised line patterns (tool-made lines on wet paste) using straight lines to create vertical or rectilinear designs. Vertical lines, diagonal lines, diagonally opposed lines, and straight lines are used to make designs such as triangles, chevrons, or herringbone designs.

**Class B:** Incised lines used to make horizontal or curvilinear designs. Punctates can occur, but only as secondary design techniques. Horizontal lines, meanders, or cross-hatching are some designs that can occur.

**Class C:** Punctated, tool-punctated, pinched, and ridge-pinched designs are all included in this class. Incised lines can occur, but only if they are secondary to punctated designs.

**Class D:** Brushed pottery which is classified by Schambach as multiple incised lines that are extremely close together, almost touching. If the area between the lines is wider than the lines themselves, then it is not considered brushing.

**Class E:** This includes engraved pottery, meaning horizontal, vertical, curvilinear, or rectangular lines etched on hard pre-fired or fired paste.

**Class F:** Stamped pottery

**Class G:** Painted or slipped pottery

**Class H:** Appliqué or noded pottery
Theoretical issues with the collections

Although Caddo pottery can be classified better than other cultures, there are still issues when trying to discern cultural ideals from pottery collections. Many of the vessels looked at in this study can be classified into groups or types, but still human innovation should be considered. Prehistoric potters often selected designs that were standard in their culture. But other times, human innovation and deviation from the cultural standard causes modern day researchers to question the prehistoric systems that are used. Many times the designs that the Caddo use on their pottery are based on clear rules, meaning certain rim decorations only go with certain body decorations, or designs only show up on one shape and style of vessel. Sometimes these rules are hard and fast, other times the rules are blurred. Knowing which vessels designs are commonly used and which ones are not is an important part of this research.

In addition to understanding the limitations relating to cultural standards, another issue is that the data used for this study (whole vessels) has little to no context within the site. Although Dellinger did a great service by excavating the Adair site and saving valuable information from looters and the eventual inundation of the site, the context in which the artifacts were found, is not well documented. Because of this, the information that can be gleaned from the material is not complete. Even if this site was the apex of society like it is believed, there is no way that researchers can ever definitely answer the questions that are asked of the site.
Although we can assume that the majority of the vessels came from a cemetery at the Adair site, we cannot know how many burials or what each burial composition was. It is known that elite status can be hypothesized from the goods in a person’s burial, but since we do not know the exact composition of each burial, it is difficult to make specific assumptions about the people who were buried there.

In addition, it is important to know that culture as a whole can never be fully understood by looking at just one aspect. This study is about the ceramic assemblage of this site. Moreover, it is about the whole vessel assemblage, which limits the assumptions even more. The data set for the Upper Ouachita River Valley is one that is incomplete, even more so than the other areas of observed Caddo culture. Because of these reasons, one has to understand that the conclusions that are made cannot be proved or even tested without much more research being done on this and other Caddo sites.
III: Data and Type Descriptions

The Adair collection consists of 201 whole vessels. In the collection there are twenty-six known vessel types and nine untyped forms. Within the typed collection, there are six examples of vessels that exhibit more than one known type. There are also five vessels that are either partial or do not conform to any known vessel type and are anomalies within the collection. The data collection for the vessels follows the standards outlined by the Arkansas Archaeological Survey (AAS). For pictures of all vessels analyzed, refer to appendix A. For the pottery patterns discussed in the type descriptions, refer to the latter half of this chapter.

Fig. 3-1: Diagram of vessel
Types:

**Adair Engraved:**

**Sample Size:** 4 whole vessels

Dee Ann Suhm, Alex Krieger, and Edward Jelks first described this form as a type of Friendship Engraved in the Handbook of Texas Archaeology Type Descriptions in 1954. This was changed in 1971 by Weber and Loring in their paper exploring the Friendship Engraved vessels in the Henderson State University Museum.

**Paste:**

*Texture:* The paste on these vessels is extraordinarily smooth because of the polished or burnished finish. Very hard and compact texture, with little of the temper or inclusions on the surface.

*Temper:* Small, finely ground clay particles. No sign of shell used as temper

*Color:* Exterior colors are almost always a dark gray or dark gray-brown. Cores usually cannot be seen. In the one example that can be seen the core color is similar to body color.

*Surface Finish:* Exteriors were always highly burnished or polished. The interiors that were visible were usually burnished.

*Thickness:* Most necks were too narrow to get a body thickness, but the neck and rim thickness ranged from 0.4-0.5cm.

*Vessel Dimensions:* Height ranges from 15.4-18.9cm, width ranges from 11.3-14.3cm with the low-waist being the widest part, neck 5.8-7.8cm

*Vessel Shape:* Exclusively bottles, body shape is low-waisted, necks are always vertical with no rim and a flat lip, undistinguished bases.
Decoration: No neck or rim design. Body design is a combination of engraving and appliquéd. The decoration is usually divided into two registers, the upper and lower. The upper body design consists of the Elgin decorative motif, which is formed of multiple horizontal lines, sometimes ticked. There is one example of horizontal lines interrupted by vertical appliquéd nodes. The bottom body design usually has a crosshatch filled circle or semi-circle central design sometimes with vertical nodes in the center. The central design is flanked on each side with vertical crosshatch filled bars or solid lines. The design usually repeats two times, one on each half of the vessel. The Eric pattern is apparent on two of the four vessels in this collection.

Reference:

Suhm and Jelks 1962, Plate 23; Weber and Loring 1971

Avery Engraved:

Sample Size: 1 whole vessel.

Suhm, Krieger, and Jelks first described this type in 1954. Although this vessel does not look like the examples shown in the reference, the written description would include this bottle.

Paste:

Texture: Hard, compact, and smooth. The temper is visible to the eye because of the highly polish

Temper: Medium to finely ground clay particles
**Color:** Light to medium gray, some clouds of dark brown to black, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.

**Surface Finish:** Burnished exterior and interior surfaces.

**Thickness:** Lip thickness of 0.4cm, with a neck thickness of 0.5cm. The neck is too narrow to get a body thickness, but it is most likely similar to the lip and neck thickness.

**Vessel Dimensions:** Height 20.6cm, diameter 15.2cm at shoulder, neck 9cm, base diameter 8.6cm

**Vessel Shape:** High rimmed bowls are the most common vessel shape, bottles and compound bowls also common. The vessel in this collection is a bottle with a sub-globular body, with a vertical neck, no rim, and flat lip.

**Decoration:** Decoration includes engraved, concentric circles made of plain lines with crosshatched background, with diamonds separating the circles. The center circle motif is divided into rounded thirds and filled with vertical curved lines, similar to the Earl pattern.

**Reference:** Suhm, Krieger, and Jelks 1962, plate 1

**Belcher Engraved var. Manchester**

**Sample Size:** 3 whole vessels

This variety was first described in the report on the Hardman site (3CL418) in 1993. It differs from the others by having concentric circles made of ticked lines, rather than plain.

**Paste:**
Texture: Hard, compact, smooth, very little temper can be seen.

Temper: Finely pulverized grog or shell.

Color: Dark brown to gray, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.

Surface Finish: Smoothed exterior and interior surfaces

Thickness: 0.2-0.4cm for lip thickness, 0.4-0.6cm for neck thickness, necks are too narrow to measure body thickness

Vessel Dimensions: Height 16-21.8cm, diameter 10.1-15.4cm at shoulder, rim 0.4-0.9cm, neck 8.5-9.6cm, base diameter 5.8-5.9cm

Vessel Shape: This type consists of shallow bowls with flaring rims or globular bottles with flaring lips. Vessels in this collection are all bottles with a sub-globular or low-waisted body shape; necks are vertical or slightly in sloping, short out flaring rim, rounded lip, and flat, circular bases.

Decoration: The examples from this and the Hardman site all have the Edith body design, concentric circles made of ticked lines or ladders on the body, either with a central feature or not. All vessels have undecorated rims and necks.

Reference: Suhm and Jelks 1962:9, plate 5; Early 1993:86, fig 53c.

Blakely Engraved var. Blakely

Sample Size: 2 whole vessels

This variety of Blakely Engraved was first described by Early in the Hardman site report in 1993. It is distinguished by its design including parallel lines with or without an embellished scroll pattern.
**Paste:**

*Texture:* Hard, compact, smooth, because of the surface finish, the temper can rarely be seen.

*Temper:* Finely ground clay or shell particles, sometimes a combination of both

*Color:* Dark grey to dark brown, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.

*Surface Finish:* Smoothed or burnished exterior surfaces, interior surfaces cannot be seen.

**Thickness:** Lip thickness of 0.3cm, rim thickness of 0.4-0.6cm, neck thickness of 0.5-0.6cm, body thickness cannot be measured because necks are too narrow

**Vessel Dimensions:** Height 16.3-28.1cm, diameter 13.7-16.3cm, neck height 6.3-7.6cm, rim height 0.5-0.7cm

**Vessel Shape:** This type utilizes exclusively bottles. This collection contains one tripod bottle, with sub-globular or low-waisted body shape; necks are insloping, rims are straight and out slanted, lips are flat or rounded, bases are either footed or undistinguished.

**Decoration:** Upper body has horizontal lines under the neck, with ladders, ticked or plain lines. Lower body has multiple parallel lines diagonal across body with embellished scroll in the center, in the Esop pattern

**Reference:** Suhm and Jelks 1962:plate 7; Early 1993
**Blakely Engraved var. Witherspoon**

*Sample Size:* 5 whole vessels

This type, like *var. Blakely* and *var. Manchester*, was first described by Early in 1993. This pattern is distinguished from the others by embellished vertical lines. Embellishments can include hook or diamond elements on the lines.

*Paste:*

*Texture:* Hard, compact, smooth. Because of the surface finish, there is rarely any temper seen

*Temper:* Finley ground clay particles or a mixture of finely ground clay and shell particles, much of the shell has leached out

*Color:* Dark grey to dark brown, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.

*Surface Finish:* Smoothed or burnished interior and exterior surfaces.

*Thickness:* Lip thickness 0.3-0.4cm, rim thickness 0.4-0.6cm, neck thickness 0.4-0.4cm, body thickness 0.3-0.4cm

*Vessel Dimensions:* Height 18-21cm, diameter 12-14.9cm, rim height 0.5cm, neck height 6.7-8.3cm, base diameter 5.6-7.7cm

*Vessel Shape:* This type is composed exclusively of bottles. The examples from this collection consists of one with a low-waisted body and one with a globular body,
both have vertical necks, straight out-slanted rims, flat or rolled lips, and circular, flat bases.

Decoration: The decoration consists of multiple lines starting under neck and continuing on diagonally to the base. The Emil pattern is common on this type, which uses plain lines, volutes, and embellished diamonds.

Reference: Suhm and Jelks 1962:plate 7; Early 1993

DeRoche Incised var. Central

Sample Size: 2 whole vessels

First described by Early in the Hardman site report in 1993, this type is found at this and other upper Ouachita River Valley sites. Although the Hardman site had no whole vessels of this type, the sherd collections showed that there were rim and body designs that were congruent. This type is similar to Military Road Incised and has been questioned on whether it is just another variety. For now, these two vessels are being typed as DeRoche Incised, but as more information is gathered, additional types or varieties will most likely be added.

Paste:

Texture: Hard, compact, and smooth, fine texture with little to no temper visible

Temper: Finely ground clay particles

Color: Dark grey to dark brown; because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.

Surface Finish: Smoothed interior and exterior surfaces
Thickness: Lip thickness 0.3cm, rim thickness 0.4cm, body thickness 0.3-0.5cm

Vessel Dimensions: Height 8.7-9.8cm with a diameter of 8.9-10.4cm with the widest part being mid-body, rim height of 2.2cm, a rim diameter of 9.3cm, and a base diameter of 4.7-5.8cm

Vessel Shape: This type is generally composed of short jars with short rims. The examples in this collection have globular bodies with a short flaring rim, a rounded lip, and flat, circular base.

Decoration: One example from this collection has an undecorated rim, the other has a Military Road Incised-type rim with a Beloit 1 pattern, which includes three horizontal lines with vertical punctates above and below. Body designs are generally in the Antioch pattern, which are rectilinear lines forming triangles, squares, or diamonds covering the entire body.

Reference: Early 1993: fig 43b, 45d,e, 48c

East Incised

Sample Size: 1 whole vessel

Paste:

Texture: Hard, compact, and smooth. The outside surface finish is fine, no temper can be seen.

Temper: Finely ground clay particles

Color: Gray to dark gray, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.

Surface Finish: Interior surface are finely smoothed with the outside surfaces
burnished

Thickness: Rim thickness 0.4cm, body thickness 0.4cm.

Vessel Dimensions: Height 10.4cm, diameter 15.6cm with the widest part at the rim and mid-body

Vessel Shape: The common shapes for this type are usually simple bowls with convex or vertical sides. This vessel type may have castellations or peaks at the rim, flat lip, and circular and flat base.

Decoration: This type is usually slipped with multiple horizontal incised lines under the rim in the Barrington pattern.

Reference: Suhm and Jelks 1962: plate 21

Foster Trailed Incised

Sample Size: 12 whole vessels

Paste:

Texture: Hard, compact, smooth

Temper: Finely ground shell or grog, sometimes a mixture of both.

Color: Dark grey to dark brown, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.

Surface Finish: Either smoothed or burnished, on interior and exterior.

Thickness: Lip thickness 0.2-0.5 cm, Rim thickness 0.3-0.5 cm, body thickness 0.3-0.6 cm.

Vessel Dimensions: Height 8.8-18.1 cm, width 8.8-17.3 cm, with the widest part being at rim, shoulder, or mid-body. When the widest part is at the rim, the height and width dimensions are similar. With a short square vessel, when the widest part is at
shoulder or mid-body, the vessel is taller than it is wide. Rim height 1.8-6.1 cm, rim diameter 7.5-15.5 cm.

Vessel Shape: Mostly jars with one example of a bowl. Body shape is globular, sub-globular, high-waisted, or low-waisted. Rims are generally tall with straight rims that are either vertical or outflaring. One example of a convex rim and one example of a concave rim, both are outflaring. Lips are generally everted or slightly everted and are flat or rounded. Bases are generally circular and flat.

Decoration: Jars with tall rims that are decorated in designs made up of incised lines. The incised lines form rows of vertical lines, chevrons, nested triangle patterns, or diagonal lines separated by spaces or solid lines. Designs that are common include the Caldwell, Chattanooga, or the Agnes patterns. Body designs include incised concentric arches or circles with or without central nodes and interlocking scrolls made of multiple lines. Designs that are common include the Baker, Buffalo, or Bellamine patterns.

Reference: Suhm and Jelks 1962:Plate 22

Friendship Engraved var. Freeman

Sample Size: 11 whole vessels

This variety was first identified by Early in 1993 in the Hardman site report. The distinguishing difference between this and other Friendship Engraved variety is the presence of cross-hatching in the background of the design.
Paste:

*Texture:* Hard, compact, smooth

*Temper:* Finely ground clay particles

*Color:* Light brown to dark brown, with some instances of light to dark grey. Some examples have fire clouds in dark grey or black. Because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.

*Surface Finish:* Smoothed interior with a burnished exterior.

*Thickness:* Lip thickness 0.3-0.4cm, rim thickness 0.3-0.6cm, body thickness 0.4-0.7cm.

*Vessel Dimensions:* Vessel height 4.6-9.9cm, vessel diameter 10.4-21.6cm with the widest part being at the carination, rim height 2.1-4.7cm, rim diameter 10.5-21.8cm

*Vessel Shape:* This type is composed exclusively of carinated bowls with tall, vertical, carinated rims, shallow convex bodies, rounded or flat lips, and undistinguished bases

*Decoration:* This type has engraved rims, plain bodies. Rim decoration is made of 2 or 3 registers that include stacked panels of ticked or straight engraved lines, ovals that are plain or filled with cross-hatching, and ladders. All designs have a crosshatched background. This variety exclusively uses the Elaine pattern.

*Reference:* Suhm and Jelks 1962:Plate 23, Early 1993

**Friendship Engraved var. Antoine**

*Sample Size:* 2 whole vessels

This variety was also identified in 1993 by Early. Unlike the other variety, this one is distinguished by cogged rims, diagonal scrolls, and central circular patterns.
Paste:

Texture: Hard, compact, smooth
Temper: Finely ground clay particles
Color: Light brown to dark brown, with some instances of light to dark grey.
Surface Finish: Burnished surfaces, both on the interior and the exterior.

Thickness: Lip thickness 0.4cm for the plain lip and 1.2cm for the cogged lip, rim thickness 0.4-0.7cm, body thickness 0.6-0.7cm

Vessel Dimensions: Height 7.0-7.4cm, diameter 18.4-20.8cm at carination, rim height 2.3-4.1cm, rim diameter 18.0-20.7cm

Vessel Shape: This variety exclusively had carinated bowls, with tall, vertical, carinated rims, shallow convex bodies, rounded or cogged lips, and undistinguished bases

Decoration: This variety has engraved rims and plain bodies. Vessels have registers with diagonal scrolls, central circles, ladders, or ovals with crosshatched backgrounds.
Rims have the Edward decoration.

Reference: Suhm and Jelks 1962:Plate 23, Early 1993

Friendship Engraved var. Trigg

Sample Size: 1 whole vessel

This variety was also identified in 1993 by Early. Unlike the other varieties, this one is distinguished by diagonal scrolls, cross-hatched background, and additional elements that separate the scrolls.
**Paste:**

*Texture:* Hard, compact, smooth

*Temper:* finely ground clay particles

*Color:* Light brown to dark brown, with some instances of light to dark grey, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.

*Surface Finish:* Burnished on both inside and outside surfaces

**Thickness:** Lip thickness 0.4cm, rim thickness 0.4cm, body thickness 0.7cm

*Vessel Dimensions:* Height 7.4cm, diameter 18.4cm with the widest part being at the carination, rim height 4.1cm, rim diameter 18.0cm

*Vessel Shape:* This variety is exclusively carinated bowls, with tall, vertical, carinated rims, shallow convex bodies, rounded lips, and undistinguished bases

*Decoration:* This type has engraved rims and plain bodies. Rims have diagonal scrolls, central circular elements, ladders, segments, and ovals, and crosshatched background. Rim is in the Edward design.

*Reference:* Suhm and Jelks 1962:Plate 23, Early 1993

---

**Garland Engraved**

*Sample Size:* 2 whole vessels

**Paste:**

*Texture:* Hard, compact, smooth

*Temper:* finely ground clay particles

*Color:* Dark grey to dark brown, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could
not be seen.

Surface Finish: Burnished on both inside and outside surfaces

Thickness: Lip thickness 0.2-0.4cm, rim thickness 0.3-0.5cm, body thickness 0.5cm

Vessel Dimensions: Height 4.6-6.6cm, diameter 11.5-16.5cm with the widest part being
    either at rim, shoulder, or mid-body, rim height 0.4-2.9cm, rim diameter 11.5-
    15.0cm

Vessel Shape: This type is composed of carinated bowls with straight and vertical carinated
    rims; shallow convex body shapes; flat or rolled, everted or slightly everted lips; and
    undistinguished bases.

Decoration: Engraved rims and undecorated bodies are common on this type. Rims are
    decorated with arches, either plain or filled with segments or cross-hatching, and
    have crosshatched backgrounds. A set of solid single or multiple lines is often found
    on either top or bottom of arch design. Rims in the Elmira design.


Hardman Engraved var. Joan

Sample Size: 1 Whole vessel

This type of decoration and vessel was first described by Early in 1993 in the
Hardman site report. There are two varieties, Joan and Hardman. Variety Hardman is
distinguished by having horizontal lines with triangles hanging from the horizontal band,
Joan has no triangles.
Paste:

Texture: Hard, compact, smooth

Temper: Medium ground shell particles, mostly leached out

Color: Light to medium grey with instances of dark grey to black fire clouds, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.

Surface Finish: Smoothed on the interior of the vessel, burnished on the exterior.

Thickness: Lip thickness 0.4cm, body thickness 0.5cm

Vessel Dimensions: Height 9.4cm, diameter 15.3 with the widest part being at the lip,

Vessel Shape: The vessel in this collections is a flaring conical bowl with flat lip and circular base. The rim has short castellations on it.

Decoration: The rim decoration is in the Erie pattern composed of three solid engraved lines that follow the castellations under the lip.

Reference: Early 1993, fig 55d

Hempstead Engraved

Sample Size: 5 Whole vessels

Paste:

Texture: Hard, compact, smooth

Temper: Finely ground clay particles, sometimes grit or sand, or a combination of both.

Color: Light to dark brown and dark grey, some instances of dark grey to black fire clouds, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.

Surface Finish: Smoothed on the inside, when it can be seen. Outside surfaces are
either smoothed or lightly burnished.

**Thickness:** Lip thickness 0.3-0.4cm, rim thickness 0.4-0.5cm, neck thickness 0.5, body thickness 0.4-0.7cm

**Vessel Dimensions:** Height 7.0-22.7cm, diameter 11.5-31.0cm with the widest part being at the rim, shoulder, carination, or mid-body, rim height 0.6-5.0cm, rim diameter 4.5-13.5cm

**Vessel Shape:** Bowls are either simple or carinated, and bottles are either simple or footed. Rims are straight and either carinated or out-slanted. Body shapes for bowls are convex, when the bowl is carinated or globular or sub-globular when it is a simple bowl. Body shapes for bottles are sub-globular or low-waisted. Lips are flat or rounded and can be everted or slightly everted. Bases can be footed, circular and flat, or undistinguished.

**Decoration:** Decoration is engraved and depending on the vessels shape, can have decoration on the body or rim. The Elmira and Erie patters are common on this type. Typical designs that are found on both rims and bodies include crosshatched filled triangles or hourglass shapes and single or multiple solid horizontal lines.

**Reference:** Suhm and Jelks 1962:Plate 35

Hodges Engraved

**Sample Size:** 4 whole vessels

**Paste:**

**Texture:** Hard and compact, smooth when the surface is burnished or polished, otherwise the surface is a bit rough because the shell tempering can be
coarsely ground

Temper: Shell or grog, shell tempering can be finely ground, but large, coarse ground particles are also in this collection.

Color: Medium to dark grey and light to medium brown, with many instances of dark grey to black fire clouds, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.

Surface Finish: Inside surfaces are smoothed. Outside surfaces are smoothed, burnished, or highly polished.

Thickness: Lip thickness 0.2-0.5cm, rim thickness 0.2-0.4cm, neck thickness 0.3cm body thickness 0.3-0.4cm

Vessel Dimensions: Height 1.9-26.2cm, diameter 10.3-17.5cm with the widest part being either the rim or the shoulder, rim height 1.9-2.4cm, rim diameter 7.6-11.3cm, neck height 12.0cm, neck diameter 6.3cm

Vessel Shape: Both bowls and bottles common. Bowls are usually short and wide with short, straight, outflaring rims, flat lips, convex or sub-globular body shapes, and circular and flat or undistinguished bases. Bottles are tall with bulbous necks, sub-globular bodies, rounded, everted lips, and circular bases. The bottle in this collection is a compound bottle.

Decoration: Decoration is made of exclusively engraved rims and bodies, usually in complex meandering or interlocking patterns. Scrolls, arches, ovals, orbs, circles, and spirals are also common. Ticked and plain lines usually make up the pattern on the vessel, with crosshatched backgrounds. Diagonal incised lines on the lip in the Cornell 10 pattern are also common.
Reference: Suhm and Jelks 1962:Plate 37,38

**Hudson Engraved**

**Sample Size:** 4 whole vessels

**Paste:**

*Texture:* Hard, compact, smooth

*Temper:* combination of finely ground shell and clay particles

*Color:* Medium to dark grey, with some mottling and clouding of light grey to light brown, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.

*Surface Finish:* Inside surfaces either smoothed or burnished, outside surfaces are smoothed, burnished, or polished.

*Thickness:* Lip thickness 0.3cm, rim thickness 0.3cm, neck too narrow to get thickness measurement, body thickness 0.3cm

*Vessel Dimensions:* Height 7.0cm, diameter 10.2-16.2cm with widest part at rim or mid-body, rim height 1.1cm, rim diameter 4.3cm, neck height 4.0cm, neck diameter 4.3cm

*Vessel Shape:* Bottles and bowls are found in this collection. Bottles have straight outflaring rims, bulbous necks, low-waisted bodies, and circular bases. Bowls are generally short with no rim, conical or sub-globular body shape, and circular bases

*Decoration:* Engraved designs are found on rims and bodies. Straight, plain, horizontal lines are common elements. Body designs have engraved designs in the Evelyn, Elgin, or Eureka patterns, arches, meanders, and ovals made of plain lines. No orbs or crosshatched background are found on this type. Lips can have diagonal incised or
punctated marks in the Cornell 10 pattern.

Reference: Suhm and Jelks 1962:Plate 41

Keno Trailed

Sample Size: 4 whole vessels

Paste:

Texture: Hard, compact, smooth

Temper: Finely ground shell, or finely ground clay particles

Color: Uniformly dark grey to dark brown, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen

Surface Finish: Smoothed on inside surfaces, smoothed or burnished on outside surfaces

Thickness: Lip thickness 0.2-0.4cm, rim thickness 0.4cm, body thickness 0.4cm

Vessel Dimensions: Height 8.1-8.8cm, diameter 9.0-18.2cm with the widest part being at the rim or shoulder, rim height 0.9-2.8cm, rim diameter 9.4-16.3cm

Vessel Shape: Jars and bowls are found in this collection. Jar is sub-globular in body shape, short rim, with rounded, everted lip, and undistinguished base. Bowls are convex in body shape, tall, straight, outflaring rims, flat lips, and flat, circular bases.

Decoration: Rim and body designs are incised. Rims have punctates in rows, solid incised lines, or lines interrupted with triangles. Body designs have either the Buffalo or Baker patterns, concentric circles, interlocking scrolls, or spirals made of wide incised, medium spaced lines. Lips can have the Caldwell 10 design of diagonal punctates along the top of lip.
Reference: Suhm and Jelks 1962:Plate 44

**Keno Trailed** var. *Curtis*

**Sample Size:** 1 whole vessel

This variety of Keno Trailed was first described by Early in 1988. This differs from traditional Keno Trailed in the vessel shape including only straight-necked bottles, with a design that is an incised version of Bailey Engraved.

**Paste:**

*Texture:* Hard, compact, smooth

*Temper:* Finely ground clay particles

*Color:* Uniformly dark grey to dark brown, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.

*Surface Finish:* Inside surfaces cannot be seen clearly, outside surfaces burnished

*Thickness:* Lip thickness 0.3cm, neck is too narrow to get thickness on neck or body

*Vessel Dimensions:* Height 6.1cm, diameter 12.2cm with the widest part at mid-body, neck height 7.7cm, neck diameter 3.7cm

*Vessel Shape:* This variety is exclusively bottles, usually sub-globular body shape, straight to slightly in-sloping body, circular base, rounded and everted lip.

*Decoration:* Body is decorated with incised lines and has a plain neck. The variety exhibits a pulled square motif around neck. Concentric arches under pulled square with concentric half-circular arches under arches in the Bellhaven 5 pattern are also found.
Reference: Suhm and Jelks 1962:Plate 44, Early 1988, fig 39

Keno Trailed var. Red hill

Sample Size: 1 whole vessel

This variety was first described by Early in 1993 in the Hardman site report. Unlike the other variations of Keno Trailed, this is a local variety that is found in the Upper Ouachita River Valley area. The pattern is of horizontal lines under the neck with a series of nested hook patterns on the lower body.

Paste:

Texture: Hard, compact, smooth

Temper: Finely ground clay particles

Color: Uniformly dark grey to dark brown, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.

Surface Finish: Interior surfaces cannot be seen, exterior surfaces are burnished

Thickness: Lip thickness 0.3cm, rim thickness 0.3cm, neck thickness 0.3cm, body thickness 0.4cm

Vessel Dimensions: Height 15.2cm, diameter 12.2cm with the widest part being mid-body, rim height 1.5cm, rim diameter 6.3cm, neck height 3.9cm, neck diameter 5.3cm

Vessel Shape: This variety consists of exclusively bottles with sub-globular body shape, straight outflaring rims, wide bulbous neck, flat everted lip.

Decoration: Decoration consists of a plain neck and rim and incised body. Design is Bellhaven 5, a pulled square made of multiple medium incised lines, with nested
hooks under.

Reference: Early 1993, fig 51a, Suhm and Jelks 1962:Plate 44

Killough Ridge Pinched

Sample Size: 1 whole vessel

Paste:

Texture: Hard, compact, smooth; cannot be see temper

Temper: Finley ground clay particles

Color: Uniformly light brown, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.

Surface Finish: Roughly smoothed on both interior and exterior surfaces

Thickness: Lip thickness 0.5cm, rim thickness 0.5cm, body thickness 0.5cm

Vessel Dimensions: Height 8.9cm, diameter 9.5cm with the widest part being at the rim and mid-body, rim height 3.6cm, rim diameter 9.0cm

Vessel Shape: Squat jar with tall rim, conical body shape, with straight vertical rim, rounded lip shape, and circular base.

Decoration: Both rim and body are commonly decorated. Rim is fine-lines incised in an Afton-type pattern with nested, slightly overlapping, sloppy triangles. Body design is the Curry pattern made of a pinched design of concentric circles that have the bottom cut off and a central node.

Reference: Suhm and Jelks 1962:Plate 42
Maxey Noded Redware

Sample Size: 2 whole vessels

Paste:

Texture: Hard, compact, smooth

Temper: Finely ground clay particles

Color: Light brown to light grey, red slipped, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.

Surface Finish: Interior surfaces cannot be seen clearly, exterior surfaces smoothed.

Thickness: Lip thickness 0.4cm, neck thickness 0.3-0.4cm, body thickness cannot be measured because neck is too narrow

Vessel Dimensions: Height 17.1-19.4cm, diameter 12.4-13.2cm with widest part being at the shoulder/mid-body, neck height 6.7-6.9cm, neck diameter 4.2-4.6cm

Vessel Shape: Type utilizes exclusively bottles, globular or low-waisted in body shape. Neck shape is tall and vertical, flat lip shape, no rim, circular base.

Decoration: Decoration consists of diagonal appliqué nodes on the side of body, usually one or two. Red slip can be seen over entire body and neck.

Reference: Suhm and Jelks 1962:Plate 51

Maydelle Incised

Sample Size: 9 whole vessels

Paste:

Texture: Hard, compact, smooth

Temper: Finely ground clay particles, some instances of clay and shell particles
mixed together, but less common

*Color:* Buff to dark brown or dark gray, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.

*Surface Finish:* Interior surfaces smoothed or burnished, exterior smoothed or burnished

*Thickness:* Lip thickness 0.3-0.5cm, rim thickness 0.3-0.8cm, body thickness 0.3-0.8cm

*Vessel Dimensions:* Height 7.2-16.5cm, diameter 8.0-17.1cm with widest part being at rim or shoulder, rim height 1.9-4.8cm, rim diameter 7.2-14.9cm.

*Vessel Shape:* Type consists exclusively of jars with tall rims and high-waisted, globular, sub-globular, or conical bodies. Tall and straight, concave and outflaring, or vertical rims are common with flat or rounded lips everted or slightly everted, and circular, flat bases.

*Decoration:* Decoration is usually incised rims and occasionally incised bodies, Rims generally have designs made of rectilinear lines in the Afton or Andes pattern and/or punctates. Bodies are either plain, have a continuation of the rim pattern, and/or have punctates partially down the body. Lips can have tabs.

*Reference:* Suhm and Jelks 1962:Plate 52

*Means Engraved*

*Sample Size:* 5 whole vessels

*Paste:*

*Texture:* Hard, compact, smooth

*Temper:* Finely ground clay particles, occasionally finely ground shell
**Color:** Shades of gray to dark brown, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.

**Surface Finish:** Interior surfaces that can be seen are smoothed, exterior surfaces are smoothed or burnished.

**Thickness:** Lip thickness 0.3-0.5cm, rim thickness 0.5cm, neck thickness 0.2-0.4cm, body thickness 0.3-0.6cm

**Vessel Dimensions:** Height 6.0-19.4cm, diameter 12.4-19.4cm with widest parts being at rim, carination, shoulder, or effigy appendages, rim height 2.3cm, rim diameter 14.0cm, neck height 6.9-9.5cm, neck diameter 4.2-4.9cm

**Vessel Shape:** Common shapes include bottles, bowls, carinated and effigy bowls. Bottles are low-waisted or globular, with in-sloping or vertical necks, no rim, flat lips, and circular bases. Bowls are convex or sub-globular, with straight, vertical, and/or carinated rims, flat or rounded lips, and circular or undistinguished bases.

**Decoration:** Decoration is made almost exclusively of engraved horizontal ticked lines. Eddy, Elgin, and Edith designs are all used. Effigies are apparent in two of the five bowls, one bear and one bird. Other designs are made of concentric circles and diagonal scrolls made of ticked lines.

**Reference:** Suhm and Jelks 1962:Plate 53

---

**Military Road Incised**

**Sample Size:** 2 whole vessels

**Paste:**

**Texture:** Hard, compact, smooth
**Temper:** Finely ground clay particles

**Color:** Shades of brown to gray-brown, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.

**Surface Finish:** Interior surfaces smoothed or burnished, exterior surfaces smoothed

**Thickness:** Lip thickness 0.4cm, rim thickness 0.5cm, body thickness 0.6cm

**Vessel Dimensions:** Height 13-14.2cm, diameter 12.5-12.7cm with widest part at rim, rim height 1.7-5.0cm, rim diameter 11.5cm

**Vessel Shape:** Vessel shapes are exclusively jars, globular or conical bodies, straight, convex, or concave, outflaring rims, rounded lips, circular bases. One example from this collection has a compound body shape with a conical top and a low-waisted bottom.

**Decoration:** Rim patterns have the either a meander pattern, with punctates and/or solid lines in the background in the Bethel pattern, or nested triangles in the Afton pattern. Body designs are usually nested triangles or other rectilinear patterns in the Antioch pattern or other straight-line decorative motif.

**Reference:** Suhm and Jelks 1962:Plate 54

---

**Moore Noded**

**Sample Size:** 5 whole vessels

**Paste:**

**Texture:** Hard, compact, smooth

**Temper:** Finely ground clay particles, one instance of clay and shell mixed

**Color:** Medium gray dark brown, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.
Surface Finish: Smoothed inside and outside surfaces.

Thickness: Lip thickness 0.3-0.5cm, body thickness 0.4-0.8cm, rim thickness 0.5cm

Vessel Dimensions: Height 3.3-8.6cm, diameter 9.1-14.3cm, rim height 4.0cm, rim diameter 4.3cm

Vessel Shape: The vessel shape is almost always bowls, in this collection there are four small flaring bowls and one carinated bowl. Flaring bowls have globular or sub-globular body shape, rounded, beveled, or flat lips, and circular bases. Carinated bowls have convex body shape, straight, carinated rims, and undistinguished bases.

Decoration: Decoration is always appliqué nodes all over body, sometimes in lines or rows, sometimes randomly spaced. Nodes are either circular or conical.

Reference: Bonhannon 1973

Poole Plain

Sample Size: 59 whole vessels

Paste:

Texture: Hard, compact, smooth

Temper: Predominantly finely ground clay particles, in some instances there are examples of shell and grog mixed together, although the shell has been leached away.

Color: All shades of grey from light to dark, many instances of fire clouds in a dark grey to black color. Some examples have orange to red colors apparent in fire clouds or on portions of the body. Because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.
**Surface Finish**: In most examples the finish is roughly to finely smoothed, some vessels have a light burnish to them.

**Thickness**: Lip thickness 0.3-0.8cm, rim thickness 0.4-0.6cm, body thickness 0.4-0.7cm, neck thickness 0.3-0.7cm

**Vessel Dimensions**: Height 4.0-20.9cm, diameter 7.6-20.4cm, rim height 0.4-1.2cm, rim diameter 3.4-10.4cm

**Vessel Shape**:

- **Bottles** (13 examples) generally have a globular, sub-globular, or low-waisted body shape, straight or slightly insloping necks, short outslanted or no rim, flat or rounded lips, and circular flat bases.

- **Jars** (3 examples) generally have convex, conical, or high-waisted body shape, short, outslanted rims, flat or rolled rims, and flat, circular bases.

- **Effigy bowls** (2 examples) generally have conical body shapes, flat lips, and flat, circular bases

- **Bowls** (42 examples) have either a conical or convex body shape, rounded or flat lip and flat, circular bases. There is one instance of a carinated bowl with a convex body shape, straight, carinated rim, rounded lip, and undistinguished base. This vessel shape has not been defined in the Poole Plain type before, but is now being added in this report. (Fig. 3-2)
Decoration: The decoration on these vessels is very minimal or non-existent. Usually the only decoration is on the lip. Diagonal incised lines or punctates (the Cornell 10 pattern) are common, and wide or shallow scalloped edges, or tabs, either single or double, are spaced around the lip. Effigy bowls generally have appendages added to the lip. One decorative motif that is being added to the type is nodes. One example in this collection has widely spaced, low, sperical nodes over the body (fig. 3-3)

Reference: Wood 1981: fig. 16b-k
Poteau Plain

Sample Size: 1 whole vessel

Paste:

Texture: Hard, compact, smooth

Temper: finely ground shell particles

Color: Uniformly medium brown, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.

Surface Finish: Highly polished exterior surface, finely burnished interior surface.

Thickness: Lip thickness 0.5cm, body thickness 0.6cm

Vessel Dimensions: Height 7.4cm, diameter 16.6cm with widest part at lip.

Vessel Shape: Many vessels shapes are common, but this collection includes a small flaring bowl with convex body shape, rounded, slightly everted rim, and undistinguished base.

Decoration: Little to no decoration is usually found on this type. On some examples diagonal incisions are found around lip in the Cornell 7 pattern.

Reference: Brown 1971

Sandford Punctated

Sample Size: 4 whole vessels

Paste:

Texture: Hard, compact, smooth

Temper: Finely ground clay particles, with one instance of clay and shell mixed together.
**Color:** light to dark grey surfaces.

**Surface Finish:** Finely smoothed to lightly burnished

**Thickness:** Lip thickness 0.3-0.4cm, rim thickness 0.4-0.6cm, body thickness 0.4-0.5cm

**Vessel Dimensions:** Height 3.9-7.9cm, diameter 8.3-16.1cm with widest part at rim or carination, rim height 2.4-3.7cm, rim diameter 8.3-16.1cm

**Vessel Shape:** This type uses exclusively carinated bowls, with convex body shapes, flat lips, straight carinated rims, and undistinguished bases.

**Decoration:** Decoration is on the rim only, rows or random circular punctates in the Caldwell pattern. No body design.

**Reference:** Wood 1981: fig. 13e, o and fig. 15e, Verly 1964

---

**Seed Jar**

**Sample Size:** 11 whole vessels

**Paste:**

**Texture:** Hard, compact, smooth

**Temper:** Mostly finely ground clay particles, one example of clay and shell mixed

**Color:** Light to dark brown, light to dark grey, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.

**Surface Finish:** Interior surfaces cannot be seen, exterior surfaces finely smoothed.

**Thickness:** Lip thickness 0.3-0.9cm, body thickness 0.3-0.6cm

**Vessel Dimensions:** Height 8.8-23.1cm, diameter 8.5-13.5cm with widest part generally at mid-body

**Vessel Shape:** Seed jars are distinguished by their generally long shape and small opening.
This collection has elongated, cylindrical, high or low-waisted, or globular body shape, rounded rims, circular and flat bases.

*Decoration:* Usually no decoration but, some examples have small pierced lugs on either side of the orifice.

*Reference:* Wood 1981: fig. 12a

**Sinner Linear Punctated**

*Sample Size:* 1 whole vessel

*Paste:*

  *Texture:* Hard, compact, smooth
  *Temper:* Finely ground clay particles
  *Color:* Uniformly dark grey, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.

  *Surface Finish:* Smoothed interior and exterior surfaces

*Thickness:* Lip thickness 0.4cm, rim thickness 0.5cm, body thickness 0.5cm

*Vessel Dimensions:* Height 7.6cm, diameter 9.4cm, rim height 1.7cm, rim diameter 9.1cm

*Vessel Shape:* This type has jars with high-waisted body shape, straight out-slanted rims, rounded lips, and circular and flat bases.

*Decoration:* Rim design is in the Cambridge 21 design, which is composed of one row of medium spaced vertical linear punctates along upper rim with randomly spaced circular punctates under. Body decoration is the Catawba 4 design with multiple lines of small closely spaced punctates around body.

*Reference:* Suhm and Jelks 1962:Plate 71
Taylor Engraved

Sample Size: 5 whole vessels

Paste:

Texture: Hard, compact, smooth

Temper: Finley ground clay particles, some instances of shell and clay mixed together.

Color: Medium to dark brown, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.

Surface Finish: Finely smoothed or lightly burnished on exterior and interior surfaces

Thickness: Lip thickness 0.3-0.4cm, rim thickness 0.3-0.5cm, body thickness 0.6cm, neck thickness 0.5cm

Vessel Dimensions: Height 9.0-20.3cm, diameter 13.4-14.4cm with widest part at rim/shoulder, rim height 0.5cm, rim diameter 4.0cm, neck height 7.7-9.0cm, neck diameter 4.0-5.1cm

Vessel Shape: This collection has one sub-globular bowl with a straight, outflaring rim, flat lip, and circular and concave base. There are also examples of sub-globular bottles with in-sloping or vertical necks, flat rims, and circular and flat bases.

Decoration: The bowl has two sets of tightly wound spirals in the Bellhaven pattern, with appliqué “handles” on each side. The bottles have medium spaced wide lines in large spirals in the Buffalo 14 pattern or interlocking scrolls made of finely engraved multiple lines with a central circular motif in the Evergreen pattern.
Woodward Plain

Sample Size: 3 whole vessels

Paste:

Texture: Hard, compact, smooth

Temper: Medium to finely ground shell particles

Color: Very light brown to medium grey with apparent of black fire clouds. Because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.

Surface Finish: Smoothed interior and exterior surfaces.

Thickness: Lip thickness 0.3-0.5cm, rim thickness 0.5cm, body thickness 0.3-0.6cm

Vessel Dimensions: Height 2.8-11.3cm, diameter 9.7-14.3cm with widest part at rim or mid-body, rim height 2.1cm, rim diameter 12.8cm

Vessel Shape: Bowls and jars are present. Bowls are convex in body shape, with rounded lips, no rim, and circular or undistinguished base shapes. Jars have conical body shapes, straight, outflaring rims, rounded lips, and circular, flat bases.

Decoration: Usually no decoration is found. There is one instance of diagonal punctates in the lip in the Cornell 7 pattern.

Reference: Brown 1971

Reference: Suhm and Jelks 1962:Plate 75, 76
Untyped pottery:

There were five whole vessels that exhibited a combination of two or more designs and could not be placed in only one type.

Untyped Combination 1

Sample Size: 1 whole vessel

Fig. 3-4 Untyped combination 1 (University of Arkansas Museum 1992)

This vessel is untyped because it incorporates design styles of both Cowhide Stamped (rim design) and Foster Trailed Incised (body design).

Paste:

Texture: Hard, compact, smooth

Temper: Medium ground shell particles

Color: Light to medium shades of grey with dark brown and black fire clouds apparent, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.

Surface Finish: Smoothed inside and outside surfaces
Thickness: Lip was reconstructed, so no accurate measurements could be taken, body thickness 0.5cm, rim thickness, 0.5cm

Vessel Dimensions: Height cannot be accurately determined because part of the rim and lip were reconstructed, diameter 11.5cm with the widest part being at the shoulder, rim diameter 10.2cm

Vessel Shape: This vessel is a tall necked jar, with a high-waisted body shape, straight vertical rim, unknown lip shape, and flat circular base.

Decoration: Rim design is similar to that of Cowhide stamped in the way that it combines punctates with an incised, plain pattern. A zigzag triangle pattern made of plain incised lines covers the rim with the background filled with punctates in the Cisco pattern. Body decoration is a design that is found on Foster Trailed Incised, sets of vertical interlocking hooks made of multiple lines going around the entire body in the Babson 5 pattern.

Reference: Suhm and Jelks 1962

Untyped Combination 2

Fig. 3-5 Untyped combination 2 (University of Arkansas Museum 1992)
This vessel is untyped because it shows the combination of Hatchel Engraved, in the circular design, vertical elements, and vessel shape and Avery Engraved by the cross-hatching fill and semi-circular design.

*Paste:*

*Texture:* Hard, compact, smooth

*Temper:* Finely ground clay particles

*Color:* Light brown with abundant black fire clouds, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.

*Surface Finish:* Smoothed exterior surfaces, interior surface difficult to see.

*Thickness:* Lip thickness 0.3cm, neck thickness 0.3, body thickness cannot be measured because of the narrowness of the neck.

*Vessel Dimensions:* Height 17.9cm, diameter 13.1cm with the widest part at mid-body, neck height 6.5cm, neck diameter 4.7cm

*Vessel Shape:* This vessel is a globular bottle shape with a vertical neck, flat lip, and circular, flat base.

*Decoration:* Decoration is made of engraved, vertical, cross-hatched filled bars with solid lines on either side, flanked by half circles made of cross-hatch and plain lines. Horizontal lines are found on top and bottom of main design.

*Reference:* Suhm and Jelks 1962
Untyped Combination 3

![Untyped combination 3](image.png)

*Fig. 3-6 Untyped combination 3 (University of Arkansas Museum 1992)*

This vessel is untyped because it combines two distinct vessels into one. The top part of the bottle is that of the Hudson Engraved with the meander pattern and ball shapes, and the bottom is that of Friendship Engraved with the carinated faux rim and the design made of cross-hatched ovals.

*Sample Size:* 1 whole vessel

*Paste:*

*Texture:* Hard, compact, smooth

*Temper:* Combination of finely ground shell and clay particles.

*Color:* Dark brown to black, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.

*Surface Finish:* Finely smoothed on both interior and exterior surfaces

*Thickness:* Lip thickness 0.2 cm, rim thickness 0.4 cm, neck thickness 0.4 cm body thickness
0.4cm

*Vessel Dimensions:* Height 12.5cm, diameter 11.8cm with the widest part being at the bottom carination, rim height 1.1cm, rim diameter 5.5cm, neck height 1.0cm, neck diameter 3.7cm

*Vessel Shape:* This vessel has a compound body shape with a globular bottle on the top and a carinated bowl on the bottom, straight vertical neck, straight, outflaring rim, flat lip and undistinguished base.

*Decoration:* The top design is Hodges Engraved with its cross-hatched filled meander pattern with central ball designs. The bottom is Friendship Engraved design in the Elwyn pattern of crosshatched filled ovals with ticked lines.

*Reference:* Suhm and Jelks 1962

Untyped Combination 4

*Fig. 3-7 Untyped combination 4 (University of Arkansas Museum 1992)*
This bottle is untyped because it has a Means Engraved pattern on the top, raised part of the vessel and a Hudson Engraved pattern on the bottom.

Paste:

Texture: Hard, compact, smooth
Temper: Ground clay particles
Color: Uniformly dark grey, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.
Surface Finish: Burnished exterior surfaces, interior surfaces cannot be seen.
Thickness: Lip thickness 0.4cm, rim thickness 0.4cm, neck thickness 0.4cm, body thickness cannot be measured because of the narrowness of the neck
Vessel Dimensions: Height 21.6cm, diameter 16.5cm with widest part at mid-body, rim height 1.5cm, rim diameter 5.4cm, neck height 5.5cm, neck diameter 4.7cm
Vessel Shape: This vessel is a bottle with low-waisted body shape, straight, outflaring rim, vertical neck, flat lips, and undistinguished base.
Decoration: Top design is the Means Engraved type in the Efram design pattern and is placed on a raised area above the main body pattern and under the neck. Design made of engraved ticked arches interrupted by appliqué bars. Bottom design is Hudson Engraved in the Elmira pattern, multiple, engraved, cross-hatched, interlocking scrolls cover the entire body.
Reference: Suhm and Jelks 1962
Untyped Combination 5

Fig. 3-8 Untyped combination 5 (University of Arkansas Museum 1992)

This vessel is untyped because of its combination of Keno Trailed pattern on the top half of the vessel and an untyped pattern on the bottom. The bottom part of this vessel may be Untyped group number 2 which is described in chapter 4 of this report.

Paste:

Texture: Hard, compact, smooth

Temper: Finely ground clay particles

Color: Dark brown to dark grey, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.

Surface Finish: Finely smoothed on exterior surfaces, interior surfaces cannot be seen

Thickness: Lip thickness 0.3cm, rim thickness 0.3cm, neck thickness 0.5cm, body thickness
0.5cm

Vessel Dimensions: Height 15.9cm, diameter 14.6cm with widest part at the carination/mid-body, rim height 1.3cm, rim diameter 4.8cm, neck height 4.6cm, neck diameter 5.7cm

Vessel Shape: This vessel exhibits a compound bottle shape with a globular bottle shape on the top and a carinated bowl shape on the bottom, with an in-sloping neck, straight out-slanted rim, flat lip, and circular, flat base.

Decoration: Top design is Keno Trailed with a Bellamine 1 pattern, made of concentric arches made of multiple, medium-spaced, incised lines. Bottom design is untyped but has the Bishop 2 pattern, made of ovals.

Reference: Suhm and Jelks 1962

Untyped 1

Fig. 3-9: Untyped vessel group 1
(University of Arkansas Museum 1992) Fig. 3-10: Untipped vessel group 1
(University of Arkansas Museum 1992)
This group of vessels is similar to some vessels that were found at the Standridge Site.

Early describes “Untyped Vessels, Group 4” in the report as tall, necked jars, but instead of multiple rows of punctates, as illustrated above, there are only three widely spaces rows.

The vessels from Adair also differ in the treatment of the exterior surfaces. Both vessels are highly burnished and exhibit a great deal of craftsmanship, as opposed to the Standridge vessels that have coarse paste and roughly smoothed surfaces.

**Paste:**

*Texture:* Hard, compact, smooth

*Temper:* Finely ground clay particles, one vessel has clay and grog mixed together.

*Color:* Uniformly dark grey to dark brown, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.

*Surface Finish:* Finely smoothed interior surfaces, burnished exterior surfaces.

**Thickness:** Lip thickness 0.3-0.4cm, rim thickness 0.4-0.5cm, body thickness 0.4cm

**Vessel Dimensions:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>30-1-47</th>
<th>31-2-45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Height</strong></td>
<td>14.5cm</td>
<td>16.0cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diameter</strong></td>
<td>12.9cm</td>
<td>17.9cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rim Height</strong></td>
<td>4.7cm</td>
<td>4.4cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rim Diameter</strong></td>
<td>11.5cm</td>
<td>14.0cm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3-1*

**Vessel Shape:** Vessel shapes are high waisted jars, with tall vertical necks, rounded lips and circular, flat bases.

**Decoration:** Decoration is only found on the rim in the form of multiple rows of vertical punctates around the rim in the Chattanooga or Cambridge pattern.
Untyped 2

![Vessel Group 2](image)

*fig. 3-11 Untyped Vessel group 2 (University of Arkansas Museum 1992)*

This vessel is one that is similar to others that have been found, most notably Untyped Group 4 from the Standridge Site. This one is similar not only because of the body shape and stylistic decoration, but also the technique that is used to decorate. Like those at Standridge, these are engraved, but very crudely, and most likely using a wide tipped tool when the clay was not fully hard or fired. There are other examples that were found further south in the Middle Ouachita River valley, but stylistically, they differ from that group. They are most similar to those at Standridge, and although they could still be related stylistically, the difference in technique shows a possible regional variation or replication of ones found further south.

*Paste:*

  *Texture:* Hard, compact, smooth

  *Temper:* Finely ground clay particles
Color: Uniformly dark grey, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.

Surface Finish: Finely smoothed interior and lightly burnished exterior surfaces

Thickness: Lip thickness 0.3cm, rim thickness 0.3cm, body thickness 0.4cm

Vessel Dimensions: Height 9.2cm, diameter 15.0cm with widest part at rim, top outflaring rim height 1.2cm, bottom straight/vertical rim height 4.0cm, top outflaring rim diameter 13.1cm, bottom straight/vertical rim diameter 12.7cm, carinated rim height 2.3cm, carinated rim diameter 13.0cm

Vessel Shape: This vessel is a carinated bowl with compound rim. The bottom rim is a carinated rim with sharp carination and the middle rim is straight and vertical with straight, outflaring top rim. Body shape is convex, lip is flat, and base is flat and circular.

Decoration: Decoration consists of three registers of nested ovals made of plain incised lines. Two registers are on the middle, straight rim and one register is on the bottom, carinated rim and top rim both exhibit the Bishop pattern. The lip has incised dashes on it in the Cornell 10 pattern.

Reference: Early 1993
These two vessels are grouped together because, although the pattern is not completely identical, they do share some similarities. Both are grog-tempered, short-rimmed, globular jars, with designs of plain incised lines. The main designs have elements made of short lines in circular or rectilinear patterns. No other vessels like this can be found in the immediate area. Although they are unique, more vessels would be needed to form into a type.

**Paste**

*Texture:* Hard, compact, smooth, the lighter one has a chalky texture

*Temper:* Both are tempered with finely ground clay particles

*Color:* Dark brown to dark grey, and very light brown to light brown, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.

*Surface Finish:* Finely smoothed interior and exterior surfaces.

*Thickness:* Lip thickness 0.3cm, rim thickness 0.4-0.8cm, body thickness 0.4-0.5cm
**Vessel Dimensions:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>29-1-6</th>
<th>31-2-93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Height</strong></td>
<td>10.1cm</td>
<td>9.5cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diameter</strong></td>
<td>11.7cm</td>
<td>10.0cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rim Height</strong></td>
<td>2.0cm</td>
<td>1.1cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rim Diameter</strong></td>
<td>10.4cm</td>
<td>9.0cm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3-2*

**Vessel Shape:** Body shape is globular, straight vertical rim, rounded or thickened lip, and a flat circular base.

**Decoration:** Designs are plain incised lines and short plain lines. Rim design on 29-1-6 is in the Beloit 1 pattern made of three horizontal lines and short vertical lines above and below. The body designs are made of short and long lines in a circular or rectilinear shape.

**Reference:** None

Untyped 4

![Fig. 3-14 Untyped Vessel Group 4 (University of Arkansas Museum 1992)](image)

This vessel is one that is difficult to type. In some instances, this vessel is similar to Military
Road Incised, because of the rim pattern. But, the body design is one that is difficult to place. There could be many interpretations of this vessel. Although it does have a similar rim design to Military Road Incised, the punctates on the body do not fit in that type. Instead, this vessel is most likely a derivative of Military Road Incised, denoting a regional difference or variation.

_Paste:_

*Texture:* Hard, compact, smooth

*Temper:* Finely ground clay particles

*Color:* Dark grey to dark brown, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen

*Surface Finish:* Finely smoothed on interior and exterior surfaces

_Thickmess:_ Lip thickness 0.4cm, rim thickness 0.4cm, body thickness 0.4cm

_Vessel Dimensions:_ Height 10.0cm, diameter 11.1cm, rim height 4.3cm, rim diameter 9.0cm

_Vessel Shape:_ Body shape is a high waisted jar with tall vertical, concave rim, rounded, everted lip, and circular, flat base

_Decoration:_ The rim design is similar to Military Road Incised, and has a pattern that is similar in design to the Flora pattern, but is incised and punctated, not stamped. There are three incised lines forming “waves” around the rim with arches coming off the bottom of the rim. The background is covered with punctates. The body design is made of tool-impressed, diagonal lines coming from the three horizontal lines on shoulder. The design is similar to that of the Finch pattern, but again, in punctates instead of stamping.
This vessel is one that is untyped because, although it exhibits many traits that are seen in other vessels, this combination is one that is hard to place. One could say that it is a derivative of Maydelle Incised, showing a rim pattern of rectilinear lines or that it could be related to Military Road Incised with some rim pattern similarities. Although it resembles both of those types, to an extent, it is untyped.

**Paste:**

*Texture:* Hard, compact, smooth

*Temper:* Finely ground clay particles

*Color:* Dark grey, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.

*Surface Finish:* Finely smoothed on interior and exterior surfaces

*Thickness:* Lip thickness 0.3cm, rim thickness 0.4cm, body thickness 0.5cm
**Vessel Dimensions:** Height 9.0cm, diameter 8.5cm, rim height 2.9 cm, rim diameter 7.6cm

**Vessel Shape:** This vessel exhibits a conical body shape, with tall concave rim, rounded lip, and circular, flat base.

**Decoration:** Decoration is on the rim only, composed of short incised lines making a basket weave pattern around rim, with circular, tool-impressed, punctates at both top and bottom of design.

**Reference:** None

Untyped 6

*fig. 3-16: Untyped Vessel Group 6 (University of Arkansas Museum 1992)*

This vessel is one that has many counterparts in the Upper and Middle Ouachita River Valleys. All have the square vessel shape and corner castellations. These vessels are most likely due to be a new type in the near future.

**Paste:**

*Texture:* Hard, compact, smooth
Temper: Finely ground clay particles

Color: Buff to medium brown, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.

Surface Finish: Finely smoothed on interior and exterior surfaces

Thickness: Lip thickness 0.4 cm, body thickness 0.5cm

Vessel Dimensions: Height 7.4cm, diameter 12.4cm with widest part at lip

Vessel Shape: A square bowl with castellation on the corners, flat lip, and a circular, flat base

Decoration: Decoration is composed of nested, incised lines that follow the shape of the wall, the Enox 3 pattern, with horizontal dashes or nicks in the corners of the vessel.

Reference: None

Untyped 7

fig. 3-17: Untyped Vessel Group 7 (University of Arkansas Museum 1992)

Paste:

Texture: Hard, compact, smooth
Temper: Ground clay particles

Color: Medium brown to bark brown, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.

Surface Finish: Finely smoothed on exterior surfaces, smoothed on interior

Thickness: Lip thickness cannot be measured because it is reconstructed, rim thickness 0.3cm, body thickness 0.5cm

Vessel Dimensions: Height 9.3cm, diameter 11.0cm with widest part at shoulder, rim height 2.2cm, rim diameter cannot be properly measured because lip and most of rim is reconstructed.

Vessel Shape: Body shape is a small globular jar with straight, vertical rim, unknown lip shape, and circular, flat base.

Decoration: Rim design is the Alcorn 1 pattern with incised lines creating a chevron pattern around the rim. Body design is the Buffalo 1 pattern with interlocking spiral scrolls along the widest part of the body

Reference: None

Untyped 8

fig. 3-18: Untyped Vessel Group 8 (University of Arkansas Museum 1992)
Paste:

Texture: Hard, compact, smooth

Temper: Finely ground clay particles

Color: Uniformly medium brown, because of the condition of the vessel, cores could not be seen.

Surface Finish: Highly polished exterior surface, interior surface cannot be seen

Thickness: Thickness cannot be measured because of the size and shape of the orifice on this vessel

Vessel Dimensions: Height 6.1 cm, diameter 9.3 cm

Vessel Shape: This is a small effigy vessel that is gourd shaped, rounded on all sides, with ridged on the sides, top and bottom.

Decoration: The decoration on this vessel is made of engraved lines and appliqué ridges. The engraved lines are in a crude chevron pattern that falls between the appliqué ridges. There is an appliqué “stem” appendage on one side.

Reference: None
This vessel is unique because it is painted. There are others in the area and at other Caddo sites that are painted, but they are not similar enough to group them in the same category. There is one type, Hatinu Engraved, which is similar. Hatinu Engraved is usually found along the Red River in northeastern Texas.

**Paste:**

*Texture:* Hard, compact, smooth

*Temper:* Medium ground shell and clay particles

*Color:* Painted areas are medium red, unpainted areas are buff to reddish buff, because of the condition of the vessel, core could not be seen.

*Surface Finish:* Smoothed on outside surfaces, interior surfaces cannot be seen

*Thickness:* Lip thickness 0.6cm, rim thickness 0.6cm, neck height 0.7cm, body thickness cannot be measured because neck is too narrow
**Vessel Dimensions:** Height 19.1cm, diameter 15.4cm with widest part at shoulder, rim height 0.8cm, rim diameter 4.2cm, neck height 7.0cm, neck diameter 5.2cm

**Vessel Shape:** Vessel exhibits a sub-globular body shape with everted, flat rim, vertical, out-slanted rim, in-sloping neck, and a circular, flat base.

**Decoration:** Decoration consists of concentric circles of painted and non-painted areas.

**Reference:** Gonzalez, Cast, Perttula, and Nelson 2005

The remaining five vessels are ones that have no discernible type, pattern, or style.

![Fig. 3-20, Vessel 30-1-48 (University of Arkansas Museum 1992)](image)

**Paste:**

- **Texture:** Hard, compact, smooth
- **Temper:** Ground clay particles
- **Color:** Dark grey dark brown, cores cannot be seen
- **Surface Finish:** Smoothed on interior and exterior surfaces

**Thickness:** Lip thickness 0.4cm, rim thickness 0.4cm, body thickness 0.6cm

**Vessel Dimensions:** Height 8.0cm, diameter 10.1cm with widest part at shoulder, rim height
2.1 cm, rim diameter 7.4 cm

**Vessel Shape:** Body shape is a high-waisted jar with a straight, vertical body, rounded rim, and undistinguished, flat base

**Decoration:** Decoration consists of a wholly irregular pattern made of engraved lines

![Vessel Image](image)

*fig. 3-21, Vessel 31-2-83 (University of Arkansas Museum 1992)*

This vessel is actually a foot of a tripod vessel. The rest is missing.

**Paste:**

*Texture:* Hard, compact, smooth

*Temper:* Finely ground clay particles

*Color:* Uniformly dark grey, cores cannot be seen because rim was ground down

*Surface:* Interior surfaces are smoothed, exterior surfaces are burnished

**Thickness:** Body thickness 0.4 cm, there is no rim, lip, or neck

**Vessel Dimensions:** Height 10.9 cm, width 8.8 cm

**Vessel Shape:** Vessels is the foot of a tripod vessel.
Decoration: None

Fig. 3-22, Vessel 31-2-105 (University of Arkansas Museum 1992)

This vessel is one that is untyped due to the strange decoration on the rim, vertical lines that seem to be brushed or lightly incised. It is possible that these could be use wear markings, but it is impossible to be sure.

Paste:

Texture: Hard, compact, smooth

Temper: Ground clay particles

Color: Buff to light brown, with apparent black fire clouds, cores cannot be seen.

Surface: Roughly smoothed on both interior and exterior surfaces

Thickness: Lip thickness 0.3cm, rim thickness 0.3cm, body thickness 0.6cm

Vessel Dimensions: Height 8.0cm, diameter 6.9cm with widest part at shoulder, rim height 8.8cm, rim diameter 6.6cm

Vessel Shape: Vessel is a high-waisted jar with rounded, everted lip, straight, vertical rim,
and a circular, flat base

*Decoration:* Uneven, shaky, and crude lines drawn vertically from the lip to bottom of the rim

![Image](image.png)

*Fig. 3-23, Vessel 31-1-22 (University of Arkansas Museum 1992)*

Like the previous vessel, this one is untyped due to the strange decoration. Although the vessel is, very well made, the incised lines along the rim make it difficult to classify. It is entirely possible that this is a Poole Plain vessel, with use wear along the rim.

*Paste:*

*Texture:* Hard, compact, smooth

*Temper:* Finely ground clay particles

*Color:* Light grey to dark grey with large, black fire clouds over large parts of the vessel, cores cannot be seen.

*Surface:* Finely smoothed on interior and exterior surfaces

*Thickness:* Lip thickness 0.3cm, rim thickness 0.4cm, body thickness 0.6cm
**Vessel Dimensions:** Height 12.3cm, diameter 12.6cm with widest part at shoulder, rim height 6.6cm, rim diameter 10.4cm

**Vessel Shape:** Boyd shape is a sub-globular jar with flat, slightly everted rim, concave, vertical rim, and a flat, circular base

**Decoration:** Decoration is composed of four highly irregular incised lines along the rim, and rudimentary punctates around top and bottom of rim.

![Image](image.png)

*Fig. 3-24, Vessel 40-4-4 (University of Arkansas Museum 1992)*

**Paste:**

*Texture:* Hard, compact, smooth

*Temper:* Medium ground clay particles

*Color:* Buff to light brown, cores are similar to exterior surfaces

*Surface:* Smoothed on interior and exterior surfaces

**Thickness:** Lip thickness 0.5cm, rim thickness 0.5cm, body thickness 0.6cm

**Vessel Dimensions:** Height 7.8cm, diameter 7.7cm with widest part at rim, rim height 2.2cm, rim diameter cannot be measured.
**Vessel Shape:** This vessel is a convex jar with flat lip, straight, vertical rim, and circular, flat base.

**Decoration:** Rim is decorated with randomly spaced tool impression punctates and a single line at the bottom of the rim.
Vessels were analyzed using the standard set by the Arkansas Archaeological Survey. Analysis included measuring all aspects of the vessel, determining type (if applicable), and assigning a pattern design as outlined by Schambach.

The vessel collection at Adair consists twenty-six known types of pottery and nine unknown types. In addition to the typed and untyped groups, there were five vessels that exhibited a combination of one or more types. Within the decorated pottery there are examples of all but two (Class D, brushed, and Class F, Stamped) classes of decorative techniques as used by Schambach. For the pictures and data spreadsheet used in this analysis, refer to Appendix A and B.

Temper of the vessels was determined by visual inspection (Table 3-3). When temper could not be determined by the eye, a small hand lens was utilized. The Adair collection is 75% grog-tempered. Shell tempering is found in nearly 25% of the pottery, 15% of which is mixed with grog.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temper</th>
<th>No. of Vessels</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grog</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grog/Shell</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3-3: Temper of Adair vessels*
Decorated Pottery:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rims</th>
<th>Bodies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class A</td>
<td>Class A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class B</td>
<td>Class B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class C</td>
<td>Class C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class D</td>
<td>Class D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class E</td>
<td>Class E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class F</td>
<td>Class F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class G</td>
<td>Class G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class H</td>
<td>Class H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3-4* *Table 3-5*

Class A:  
Class A designs are made of straight, incised lines arranged vertically or diagonally in opposed fields.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th># of vessels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alfred</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcorn</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afton</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3-6* *Class A rim designs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th># of vessels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antioch</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3-7: Class A body designs*

Rims:  
There are eighteen Class A rims (fig. 3-25). Agnes is made of horizontal bands of diagonal lines. There is one example of Agnes 1, which is made of horizontal rows of diagonal incising. The Alfred pattern consists of rows of diagonal incising with medium spacing between the rows. Alcorn is basic herringbone (Alcorn 1) and zigzag patterns (Alcorn 2). Afton designs are composed of diagonal or vertical lines in a nested triangle...
pattern. Afton 1 is simple nested triangles made of diagonal lines. Afton 2 is just like Afton 1, but with lip notches. Andes is horizontal herringbone with punctuations between.

fig. 3-25, *Class A rim designs apparent in the Adair collections*

**Bodies:**

There are two Class A body designs in Adair collection, Antioch and Adrian (fig. 3-26). The Antioch pattern has vertical patterns of diagonal or vertical incised lines in triangles or rhomboids or strait line patterns and no punctates. Antioch 1 design is large rhomboids made of multiple incised lines covering the entire body of the vessel. This pattern is found on one example of Military Road Incised and one example of Untyped in the Adair collections. The Adrian pattern is composed of nested diamonds made of narrow of broad lines. The Adrian 1 pattern is medium spaced, narrow lines forming a nested, concentric diamond pattern and is found on one example of Foster Trailed Incised.
Class B:

Class B pottery is characterized by incised lines in horizontal or curvilinear lines.

Punctuations can occur on Class B pottery but only as a secondary feature. Diagonal lines are excluded as a primary design element because those are covered in Class A pottery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th># of vessels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bucknell</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrington</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bates</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethel</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beloit</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-8: Class B rim designs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th># of vessels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babson</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellarmine</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellhaven</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-9: Class B body designs

Rims:

There are nine vessels that exhibit Class B rims (fig. 3-27). The Bucknell pattern is horizontal lines interrupted by vertical lines or punctuations found on Maydelle Incised pottery. The Barrington pattern is composed of horizontal lines that are closely spaced typically found on East Incised pottery. Barrington 6 is found on castellated rims and has multiple horizontal lines. The Bates design is horizontal lines incised on a plain rim. The Bates 3 design is composed of 3 lines. The Bethel pattern is generally composed of
curvilinear incising and punctates or stamping, typical of Military Road Incised vessels. Bethel 12 has a double line of punctates along the top and bottom of the rim with a meander made of punctates, and meandering lines in the background. Bethel 16 is meandering incised lines bracketed with a single row of punctates with diagonal lines making up the background. The Butler pattern is horizontal incised lines and lip notching, but no punctates. The Butler 1 pattern is irregular wet-paste incising. The Beloit pattern is made of horizontal incising with stamping or punctation. Beloit 1 is multiple straight times with two rows of punctates on the top and bottom of the rim.

fig. 3-27, Class B rim designs in the Adair collection

Bodies:

There are six Class B body designs in the Adair collection (fig. 3-28). The Baker pattern is made of concentric circles. Baker 1 is broad line incised circles with no central node, Baker 5 is close spaced circles, no central node, and Baker 2 is similar to Baker 1 but with central nodes. The Bellhaven 5 pattern is made of nested squares around the neck of the bottle
with nested volutes around the corner of the square. Bellarmine pattern is made of incised concentric half circles on upper half of vessel. Bellarmine 1 is made of wide-spaces arches around the upper half of the vessel. Bellarmine 13 is composed of wide-spaced, narrow lines nested ¾ circles instead of half circles on the upper half of the vessel. The Buffalo pattern is made of curvilinear designs in horizontal patterns. The Buffalo 1 design is made of interlocking scrolls and Buffalo 14 is composed of wide line spirals.

fig. 3-28, Class B bodies in the Adair collection

Class C:

Class C pottery includes all punctated, pinched, tool-impressed, or ridge-pinchng decoration. Incised lines can occur, but only as a secondary design feature.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th># of vessels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caldwell</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranbrook</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chattanooga</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisco</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culver</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th># of vessels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catawba</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carver</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3-10: Class C body patterns*

Rims:

Class C rims are found on 34 vessels (fig. 3-29). The Caldwell pattern is composed of tool-impressed rims mostly found on Poole Plain in this collection. The Cranbrook pattern is horizontally placed tool punctates in either columns or all over the rim. The Chattanooga pattern is composed of designs made with diagonal punctates that are tool-formed. The Cisco design combines alternate panels of diagonal lines and tool punctates. The Carson pattern is when there are lip punctates on a plain lip; this design is similar to the Cornell pattern that has diagonal lip punctates on top of lip. The Culver pattern is when the rim is decorated with a reed, bone, or other hollow tool to create circles on the rim. The Cambridge pattern uses a linear or round tool impression to make a design on the rim, found in this collection on Sinner Linear Punctated vessels.
Bodies:

There are three vessels that exhibit Class C bodies (fig. 3-30). The Carver pattern is when a lenticular punctates are made with a tool, excluding fingernail impressions. The Catawaba patterns are made with a solid tool to make impressions in horizontal rows. The Curry design is ridge-pinching on the rim.

fig 3-30: Class C bodies in Adair collections
**Class D:**

Class D pottery includes all pottery that is brushed. Incising can occur on the vessel, but only as a secondary design element. Brushing in this system includes pottery that has multiple lines that are consistently close together. No pottery in the collection exhibited any design elements that could be classified as Class D.

**Class E:**

Class E pottery is that which is engraved. Engraved in this system includes all pottery that has a design that was scratched or etched into a dry paste or a fired pot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th># of vessels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eagle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmira</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enox</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effram</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3-12: Class E rim patterns*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th># of vessels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edith</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emil</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esop</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eureka</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmira</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elwyn</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebbitt</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effram</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3-13: Class E body designs*

**Rims:**

Class E designs are the most common in the Adair collection. There are nine Class E rim patterns in the collection (fig. 3-31). The Eagle pattern is made of multiple wide spaced engraved designs on the top part of a bottle, mostly Adair Engraved bottles. The Elgin pattern is composed of horizontal spurred lines. The Elaine pattern is on Friendship Engraved var. Freeman bowls. Designs are made of cross-hatching, ticked lines, circles, and
ovals, there is no crossover in panels and the upper and lower registers are offset. The Edward designs are those on Friendship Engraved var. Antoine or Trigg bowls, and are composed of cross-hatching, circles, ladders, and ovals. The Erie pattern is composed of medium spaced, horizontal lines on fineware. The Enox pattern horizontal lines surrounding a side of a square vessel, with notches in the corner. The Eddy pattern is composed of horizontal panels of ticked lines.

fig. 3-31, Class E rims in the Adair collection

Bodies:

There are twelve Class E body patterns in the Adair collection (fig. 3-33), and eight untyped Class E designs. The Elon pattern is made of crossed lines around the vessel. The Evergreen pattern is made of single engraved lines in circular patterns forming either concentric circles or swirls. The Eric pattern is found on Adair Engraved vessel and consists
of crosshatched filled areas in rectangles or vertical arches around appliqué ridges. The Earl pattern has concentric circles with a crosshatched background. The Edith pattern is single-line concentric circles made of ticked or non-ticked lines. Both the Emil and the Esop patterns are found on Blakely Engraved bottles. The Emil pattern consists of vertical line units with or without a central hook or diamond element. The Esop pattern is comprised of diagonal line unit with a curvilinear feature. The Eureka pattern is found on bottles or bowls and consists of crosshatched filled ovals. The Elmria pattern is found on many different vessel types and consists of crosshatching offset a negative design. The Evelyn pattern consists of a meander body pattern with no ticked lines. The Ebbitt pattern has crosshatched background, balls, ticked lines, meanders, scrolls, circles, and small unit designs. The Efiram pattern is technically a body pattern, but is on rims as well as bodies in the Adair collection. This design is made of ticked lines in arches and minimal other embellishment.

fig. 3-33, Class E body designs
**Class F:**
Class F pottery includes all stamped pottery. No pottery in the collection exhibited any design elements that could be classified as Class F.

**Class G:**
Class G pottery includes all painted and slipped pottery.

Only 1 vessel (untyped group 9, see previous explanation) falls into this class and both rim and body have untyped Class G designs.

**Class H:**
This class includes all noded pottery. Both vessels that have noded rims exhibit the Harvey pattern. The Harvey pattern is any rim design that has nodes either in rows or on a bias.
IV: DISCUSSION

The pottery in this collection can provide researchers interesting information about the Adair Site and its place in the Upper Ouachita River Valley when compared to other collections in the surrounding areas. Using the assumptions made about the site, the research questions that were asked at the beginning of this study can be revisited.

1. Can the archaeological context for the whole vessel collection from Adair be confirmed?
2. What was the relative degree of interaction between the people of Adair and people in the surrounding sites?
3. Can the assumption of elite status of the Adair site be seen in the ceramic collections?

Adair and Poole

Of the three sites that are being compared to Adair, it can be assumed that the Poole Site had contact with Adair. Separated by only 3km, these sites are the ones that are closest together, and most likely contemporary, and thus perfect for comparing collections. Ethnohistoric and archaeological evidence indicate Caddo communities were not isolated communities. Unlike some walled Mississippian sites further east, the Caddo were known to have large sprawling communities made up of scattered hamlets, farmsteads, and elite centers. It is entirely possible for Adair and Poole to actually be part of the same community. (fig. 4-1) The Poole Site is an example of a low mound site (see discussion in
chapter 1). Two mounds occurred at Poole but unlike the large mound at Adair, these are likely to be house mounds (Wood and Early 1981).

Fig. 4-1 Location of Poole and Adair (Wood and Early 1981)

There were two excavations at the Poole Site, both done by the University of Arkansas Museum. The first excavation was in 1931 as part of a larger project to excavate sites and survey the Upper Ouachita River Valley. This was the same project that excavated the Adair Site, and much like Adair there was little to no information recorded. According to later documents about Poole, Dellinger excavated fourteen burials north of the Ouachita River and just east of the Poole Site (Wood and Early 1981). However, there is no original documentation to support this claim. Although there are no records, there are large collections, mostly of whole vessels, in the University of Arkansas Museum.
The next excavation of Poole occurred from 1939-1940, when it was certain the site was to be inundated by Lake Ouachita. The WPA and the University of Arkansas Museum undertook the project. Excavations revealed Archaic, Woodland, and Caddo occupations. The Caddo occupation was mostly composed of burials and one burned structure (Wood and Early 1981). Three areas, or plots, (fig. 4-2) and thirty-eight burials were excavated, with most of the burials found in plot 3 (fig. 4-3).

*Fig. 4-2: WPA and 1931 excavations at the Poole Site (Wood and Early 1981)*
Dellinger and his team excavated thirty-four burials from Poole. The most common grave good was pottery, with an average of less than three vessels per grave. Five burials had no grave goods associated with them, and ten of the thirty-four graves had non-ceramic goods associated with them. Of those ten graves, they mostly contained modest, non-sociotechnic examples of chipped lithic or groundstone artifacts that did not denote any social standing or hierarchy. The preservation of the burials was very poor, with little to no bone remaining. There was enough bone to denote orientation, but little else. The
vessels that were excavated are wholly local with no evidence of being imported. The design motifs and vessel shapes were similar to pottery found elsewhere on the site and in surrounding areas. The goods found in the graves show a uniform distribution, with little evidence of high prestige or socio-technic items. The burials show no artifacts that would denote sex. Some graves had more vessels, but the types of pottery and goods are not significantly different from the others. Sixteen known types of pottery and eight unknown types (seven whole vessels and one sherd) were found within the graves (table 4-1).

| Type                  | 1  | 2  | 7  | 8  | 9  | 10 | 13 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 |
|----------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Poole Plain          | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 2  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  |
| Dunkin Incised       | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  |
| Williams Pain        | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  |
| Yokana Plain         | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  |
| Moore Nosed          | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  |
| Military Road        | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  |
| Hickory Fine         | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  |
| Plain Sherd          | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  |
| Plain Sherd          | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  |
| Untyped              | 1  | 3  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  |

Table 4-1. Number of vessels per grave found at Poole, sorted by type

The data from Poole contributes to two of the questions asked during this research, can the archaeological context be confirmed and, can elite status be seen in the ceramic collections? It is hypothesized that the Adair whole vessel collections come from a large cemetery. Comparing the burial goods from Poole to those from Adair can test this assumption. If the distribution, types, and size of vessels are similar in both collections it can be indication that they were connected.Performing a Student's t-test on the types of
pottery found can corroborate this. The comparison of collections can also look at the question of elite status. Both the whole vessels and non-ceramic goods from both assemblages can be compared and analyzed.

The Adair and Poole collections can yield some important information, but limitations must be understood. There were thirty-four undisturbed burials excavated at Poole, but it is not known how many burials were at Adair. Phillip Philips states in his field journal, that there were 117 burials dug at Adair between 1929-1932 (Phillips 1939). If this is correct, then we can estimate the composition of the burials. However, because this was a comment in a personal journal, we cannot place too much confidence on the fact and can only look at the collection as a whole.

It is known that the Poole site collections came from a large cemetery. One observation made when comparing the collections from Adair and Poole is the similar distribution of types of pottery in the assemblages (Table 4-2, Table 4-3). At both sites, the most common types of vessels are Poole Plain, Friendship/Adair Engraved, and Foster Trailed Incised. The Poole report did not differentiate Adair Engraved vessels from the Friendship Engraved, so they are listed together. Regardless, if the Adair Engraved counts were to be added to the Friendship Engraved counts at the Adair site, the count would rise to 19 and the percentage to 9.4%, still one of the most common types. Similarly, Wood did not distinguish Garland Engraved from Friendship Engraved. Again, if these were to be added to the vessel count, it would cause the Friendship count for Adair to rise again to 10.9%.
Table 4.2. Counts and percentages for the Poole Site, 1939-1940 excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of total vessels</th>
<th>Percent of total vessels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poole Plain</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship/Adair Engraved</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Incised</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams Plain</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Road Incised</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means Engraved</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunkin Incised</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haley Engraved</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore Noded</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Incised</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blakely Engraved</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanford Punctate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avery Engraved</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seed Jar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickory Engraved</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Engraved</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3. Counts and percentages for the Adair Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of vessels</th>
<th>Percent of Vessels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poole Plain</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untyped</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship Engraved</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Incised</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seed Jar</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maydelle Incised</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blakely Engraved</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hempstead Engraved</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keno Incised</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means Engraved</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore Noded</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Engraved</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adair Engraved</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodges Engraved</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson Engraved</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanford Punctated</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belcher Engraved</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodward Plain</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeRoche Incised</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garland Engraved</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxey Noded Redware</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Road Incised</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avery Engraved</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Incised</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardman Engraved</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killough Pinched</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poteau Plain</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinner Linear Punctated</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These two sites have similar percentages of types suggesting that these two sites were connected culturally. As can be seen in fig. 4-4, not only are the types of pottery the same, but the frequency of types is comparable as well. The overlap of sites, which is a proxy for interaction, is also high (see Adair and Standridge discussion and table 4-6). Because of the small distance between the two sites and the similarities in types of vessels in the collection as a whole, one could suggest that these sites were strongly related.
fig. 4-4: Top three types of pottery by percentage from Adair and Poole

This relationship is tested by performing a simple two-tailed paired Student’s t-test (table 4-4). This test determines if there is a significant difference between two groups. With a null hypothesis of that this no difference, when performed, the test yields the t value of 1.07, which is far below the 2.13 threshold for 0.05 significance. This means that the null hypothesis is true, with no statistically significant difference between the two sets of data.

A p value of 0.34 further indicates that it is not statistically significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adair</th>
<th>Poole</th>
<th>$t=1.07$</th>
<th>$df=4$</th>
<th>$p=0.34$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poole Plain</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship/Adair Engraved</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Trailed Incised</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-4: Student’s t-test of Adair and Poole data using the number of vessels at each site
In addition to the distribution of types, Poole Plain is the most common type at both sites. Poole Plain was first identified by Raymond Wood in his Poole site report in 1981. This type is common to the Upper Ouachita River Valley in numbers large enough to indicate that it is local to the area and not traded. This pottery type is found all over the Upper and Middle Ouachita, but it is mostly found in cemeteries and seems to be specific to burials. When plain ware is found in middens or domestic structures, it differs in the size, style, and texture of the paste. The amount of Poole Plain associated with graves in the Upper Ouachita indicates that it was the most common type of grave pottery in the area (Wood and Early 1981).

Furthermore, the vessels in both collections are a similar size. Usually vessels that are designated as grave or ritual goods are small (about 10-20cm tall) and of a higher quality than the plain wares used in domestic areas. There is no dimension data for the Poole vessels, but the Adair vessels have an average height of 10.79cm. According to the original Dellinger WPA report, the vessels and vessel fragments that were found inside the house structures were large (50-60cm tall), plain wares, and of a coarser ceramic paste. This inference of smaller size vessels in graves is one that can be seen in the entire Caddo culture area, not just the Ouachitas. Exact data of the Poole site would need to be compared to the Adair data to be certain of this hypothesis, but the size congruency is found in many other collections, not only these.

The elite status of Adair is another aspect to consider when comparing collections. As noted before, “elite” in this context refers to the sites that have aspects of a mound complex, as explained in chapter 1. When comparing Poole and Adair data, one can make several observations about possible elite status of the collections. First, there are
significantly more vessels at Adair than at Poole or many other places in the Upper Ouachita. Dellinger states that he excavated a large cemetery, but in order to have over 200 whole vessels collected, there would have had to be dozens of, most likely over a hundred, burials or more vessels per grave. This could be evidence of either a very large cemetery or indication that there were more vessels per grave, either one could denote an elite status. Second, not only are there more vessels at Adair, some of the pottery at Adair is not local to the Upper Ouachita area and is more common in the Middle Ouachita or Red River areas. Larger percentages of Middle Ouachita pottery types at Adair include seed jars, of which there are eleven examples, and Blakely Engraved bottles, of which there are eight examples, as well as examples of Hodges and Hudson Engraved types (Early 1993). Third, by studying the collections it can be inferred that the pottery at Adair is of a higher quality than those at Poole. The number of finely engraved and polished vessels at Adair is higher compared to the sample found at Poole.

In addition, the non-ceramic goods can also shed some light on the possible elite status. Where the entire burial collection at Poole is known, the same cannot be said for Adair. The University of Arkansas Museum collections and records indicate that the Adair Site has four main collections, three from 1929-1931 and one from the WPA excavations, which is the largest. In the earlier collections, those assumed to be from the cemetery and from which most of the whole vessels originate, there are some examples of non-ceramic goods. The eighteen items that are in these collections includes highly polished boat stones, earspools, polished effigy beads, polished stone beads, and large, well-made points. In addition to the artifacts from Adair, there are also many high-quality items where the provenience is not as well documented, but they are from the general area of Adair. These
include carved and polished axes, polished stone pipes, polished boat stones, and other high-quality objects. When comparing these goods with ones at Poole, there are some similarities, such as polished boat stones and large points. However, the artifacts such as the polished effigy beads, polished rounded beads, and the ear spools denote possible socio-technic objects. Since it is hypothesized that the people at both sites were contemporary and connected, the question of why are there different burial goods, both ceramic and non-ceramic, at Adair that are not present at Poole?

There are many possible answers for the question. One is that the people who are buried at Adair were of a higher, more elite, class. Having such high-quality items such as the ear spools, highly polished ground stone objects, and large numbers of vessels suggests that the people who were buried at Adair required more in their graves because of their higher social status. The second possibility is that the people buried at Adair were people that traveled to the area. Because Adair was the only mound complex in the area, it would be a place where people would visit. Ethnohistoric research suggests that such centers were places where people from all over the area would go to participate in social, religious, and political events (Rogers and Sabo 2004). This theory about the Adair site being a pilgrimage point might explain why there are examples of Middle Ouachita pottery types in the Adair collections and not in surrounding areas. The third possibility is that the culture would dictate that they would have to have higher quality burials because they were buried near the mound center. Because the mound center was a central part of the Caddo world, just being buried next to the mound may have demand higher quality burial goods. It is unsure whether one or all these possibilities is the answer to the question, either way it is likely that the Adair Site did have did have an elite status within the area.
In addition to the main research questions posed, Adair’s temporal place in the Upper Ouachita can also be studied. When looking at the vessel distribution in the graves at Poole (table 4-1), one can seriate the vessels that are from Adair and Poole (table 4-5). First, based what is seen in the grave distribution, Poole Plain and Friendship/Adair Engraved occurs most commonly together (5 of 29 burials). This proves that they are contemporary, or at least partially contemporary, during the type’s use life.

Second, it has been hypothesized that Foster Trailed Incised ultimately replaced Military Road Incised in Caddo culture. This was first suggested by Frank Schambach based on his research at Cedar Grove in Southwest Arkansas along the Red River. In Schambach’s research, he proposed a temporal evolution of the Foster Trailed Incised type (Fig. 4-5). According to Schambach, change in the varieties of Foster Trailed Incised show a progressive evolution starting with var. Foster and following with var. Dobson, Red Lake, Dixon, Moore, Shaw, Finley, and Tunica (Schambach 1984). Looking at the vessels found at Adair, most of them are var. Foster or var. Dobson, with very few exhibiting traits of the later varieties. This suggests that the vessels that are found at Adair are, temporally, at the beginning of the evolution of Foster Trailed Incised.

By understanding all of the chronological discrepancies and by taking the highest numbers of pottery for both sites, a slight pattern can be seen. Williams Plain was not counted because it is known to be a Fourche Maline pottery type, and is antecedent to all the aforementioned types.
Fig. 4-5: Evolution of Foster Trailed Incised (Schambach 1984)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pottery Types</th>
<th>Number of Graves with types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military Road Incised, Friendship/Adair Engraved</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Road Incised, Friendship/Adair Engraved, Poole Plain</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole Plain, Friendship Engraved</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Trailed Incised, Poole Plain, Friendship/Adair Engraved</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Trailed Incised, Poole Plain</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4-5: Seriation based on Poole site data*
Interpretations for the occupation of Adair and Poole are made by using the seriation (table 4-5) based on data from Poole. The higher percentage of Foster Trailed Incised (6%) and the relatively low percentage of Military Road Incised (1%) at Adair suggests that either the people who were buried at the Adair Site did not value Military Road Incised, or more likely, Military Road Incised had started phasing out and was replaced with the early stages of Foster Trailed Incised. The Poole site has similar percentages of Foster Trailed Incised (7%) to Adair, but a higher percent of Military Road Incised (4%). By using this seriation, as well as the knowledge that there are more examples of Military Road Incised, it is possible that the Adair site cemetery was used longer than Poole and that Poole was occupied slightly earlier than Adair.

The comparisons of Adair and Poole shed light on a subject that was previously little known. First, by looking at the types of pottery, the distribution of types, and the relative size of the vessels compared to a known cemetery at Poole, it can be said that the collections from the Adair Site did come from a large cemetery. Second, because of the close distance between Adair and Poole, as well as the similarities in ceramic collections, it is likely that they were connected, if not the same community. Lastly, the hypothesis of the elite status of Adair is supported due to the number of vessels and the evidence of sociotechnic goods in the collection.
Adair and Standridge

The Standridge site (3MN53) is a Caddoan site located in the Upper Ouachita River Valley area along the Caddo River. This site was excavated in 1975-1976 by the Arkansas Archaeological Society members and students from the University of Arkansas under the direction of Dr. Ann Early. The site has evidence of both Fourche Maline and Caddoan occupations. The Standridge site is located 36 km from Adair. It is classified as a low mound and domestic site and has evidence of houses, burials, one mound, and middens. The Standridge Site has evidence of multiple Caddoan occupations, but the Caddo occupation was most likely not continuous (Early, Burnett, and Wolfman 1988).

Ceramic evidence from Standridge consists mostly of sherds with significantly fewer examples of whole vessels. There are twenty-eight whole, partial, or restored vessels from the ceramic collections. There are seven undecorated pottery types, and five decorated pottery types, with four untyped undecorated, and ten untyped decorated (Early, Burnett, and Wolfman 1988).

Applying the research questions to the Standridge collections is more difficult than the Poole site. Nonetheless, the Standridge collections provide some insight into the interaction that it possibly had with the people at Adair, as well as evidence what that relationship was. Moreover, the Standridge site provides information leading to a possible chronology of all four sites.

When comparing the Standridge collection to others in this study, it is most helpful to start with the Poole collection. In the Standridge Site report, Early suggests that there is a direct comparison between the pottery in the Poole collection and the pottery found from the early periods of Standridge mound construction. She points to examples of Poole Plain
bowls, Adair Engraved bottles, one Friendship Engraved var. Antoine bowl, Foster Trailed Incised jar, and two vessels that were taken from a grave at Standridge. Similarly, these types seem to have temporal counterparts at Adair as well. Using these examples of typed pottery alone, it suggests that all three sites were at least partly contemporary with each other (Early, Burnett, and Wolfman 1988). The ceramic collections at Poole indicate a greater diversity than at Standridge. This is most likely due to the longer time span that Poole was occupied.

Unlike the Adair and Poole site, the Standridge site has radiocarbon and archaeomagnetic dates. The dates from Standridge indicate that the site was intensively occupied for a relatively short amount of time. The Caddoan occupation of the site was most likely no longer than about one hundred years, with a possible less intensive Caddoan occupation a hundred years earlier. There is evidence of a possible longer Caddoan occupation, but the top-most layers of the site were plowed and cannot be researched. Although the radiocarbon dates are not trustworthy, the archaeomagnetic data show that the dates for the site cluster from A.D 1350-1450. (Early, Burnett, and Wolfman 1988)

Knowing the possible dates for the Standridge Site and also knowing that Adair and Poole were most likely occupied longer than Standridge (as evident by the size of the site and the pottery at all sites), dates for Adair and Poole can be determined. Early did not discuss the possible dates for the Poole site in her summary of Wood’s report. Yet, as the research into the Adair and Poole Sites show, it is possible that the Adair site had a longer occupation than the Poole site, but the Poole Site may have been occupied before Adair. This leads to the hypothesized dates of A.D. 1300-1475/1500 for the Poole site, and A.D. 1325-1500/1525 for the Adair site (fig. 4-6).
In addition to the evidence of contemporaneity at Standridge, Poole, and Adair, ceramic evidence shows that there is a strong possibility that the people at the Adair and Standridge had interaction, which can be measured by looking at the overlap of typed pottery. One proxy for determining social interaction between the sites could be an overlap index for the three sites (table 4-6). The interaction between Adair and Poole is seen clearly in the table, with 38% of the types overlapping. Similarly, interaction to a lesser degree can be seen in the overlap index between Adair and Standridge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total types at both sites</th>
<th>Overlap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adair/Poole</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adair/Standridge</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole/Standridge</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4-6: Overlap index for Adair, Poole, Standridge*
In addition to the typed pottery, the untyped pottery shows this interaction between sites as well. When looking at the untyped pottery from Adair and Standridge, there are some very strong correlations. Untyped Group 2 from Adair is similar to and Untyped Group 4 from Standridge. Both vessels groups are tall-rimmed, engraved carinated bowls with oval designs (fig. 4-7). Although the design motifs are not identical, they share similar forms and elements. This same vessel form and motif are not only seen at these two sites, but also from sites all over the Ouachita Mountains (Early, Burnett, and Wolfman 1988).

![fig. 4-7: a. Untyped group 2 from Adair; b. untyped group 4 from (Arkansas Archaeological Survey 1982; Arkansas Archaeological Survey 1983)]
Similarly, Untyped Group 1 from Adair is similar to Untyped Group 3 from Standridge (fig. 4-8). Both of these have similar forms, globular or sub-globular bodies with high, vertical rims, and a rolled lip. Decoration on the rims are comparable as well, all having rows of vertical or diagonal incised lines. Where the vessels differ is in the exterior surface finish. The vessels from Adair have a finely burnished to polished exterior surface, and the Standridge vessels are matte and are only smoothed. These types of jars can be seen from many sites in the upper Ouachita region. (Early, Burnett, and Wolfman 1988).
Based on comparisons in pottery, it is likely that the Adair and Standridge sites had some contact, but most likely the connection was small. The classification that Standridge was a low mound cluster indicates that not only did domestic activities take place there, but also local religious and political activities as well. In the Standridge report, Early suggests that some of the houses found there could have been religious temples, indicating that the Standridge site was most likely a local elite center. This is evident by not only the possible religious buildings, but also by the mound and at least one elite burial (Early, Burnett, and Wolfman 1988). This point that Standridge was a local elite site could also indicate why the overlap index is higher between Adair and Standridge, as opposed to Adair and Poole. Whereas Poole would have looked to Adair primarily as a place of elite status, the Standridge site most likely did not and would not have the need. The higher overlap at Adair and Standridge (which is not including the untyped examples, if added the overlap index would be 25%) could indicate that there were certain types that are more common to elite sites. The types that overlap at Poole and Standridge are the types that are common to all Upper Ouachita sites, indicating that they are most likely not connected, or only very weakly.

In addition to the possible connections that Standridge had with Adair, there is also indication that Standridge had contact with sites in the Arkansas River Valley further north as suggested by comparisons in pottery, house forms, and burial customs. It is likely that Standridge was a central place for in the area.
fig. 4-9: sites in the Upper Ouachita, Adair circled (Early 1982)
Although Adair was the only mound complex in the area, it did not seem to have the same social and political influence that mound complexes had further south in the Middle Ouachita. In the Middle Ouachita, the mound complexes are located centrally, with low mound clusters and other lower echelon sites nearby. This does not seem to be the case for Adair and the surrounding low mound sites. (fig. 4-9) This indicates that although Adair had contact with the lower echelon areas, the interaction and hierarchical relationship that it had was not strong enough to stimulate settlements closer to the mound complex.

**Adair and Hardman**

The Hardman site is the only excavated site in this study that is not located in the Upper Ouachita region, but rather in the Middle Ouachita Region further south. The Upper and Middle Ouachita regions do not differ much from each other, but still there is some distinction between the two. When the Ouachita River flows out of the Ouachita Mountains, and begins to course through less rugged land and lower altitudes, that is when it moves from the Upper Ouachita to the Middle Ouachita region. This division happens south of modern-day Lake Hamilton and north of Arkadelphia. Culturally, the differences between the Upper and Middle Ouachita can be seen in pottery styles and types, house and burial patterns, and other features.

The Hardman site has evidence of Woodland and Mississippian occupations as well as contact with the European explorers when they visited the area. One of the main draws to this site was the salt that was harvested from the salt bayous near the site. Both the Woodland and Mississippian Caddo harvested here, and it is written about in the accounts of European explorers (Early 1993; Sabo 2001).
The Caddo occupation of the Hardman site is divided into four archaeological phases. The earliest Caddo occupation dates from roughly A.D. 1150-1200 until A.D. 1350-1400. This is the East Phase, is categorized by undecorated and simple Class A designed, grog-tempered pottery sherds, notched and stemmed points, and evidence of intensive salt harvesting, but little domestic occupation. The Mid-Ouachita phase, A.D. 1350-1500, is the next phase represented at Hardman. Shell-tempered pottery appears and salt making continues to be an important activity but domestic structures are also found. The Social Hill Phase at Hardman, A.D. 1500-1650, is classified by changes in pottery designs and distribution. The final occupation of the Hardman site, the Deceiper Phase, dates from A.D. 1650-1700, and is classified by the interaction of the Caddo with European (Early 1993).

When considering the phases represented at Hardman, the Mid-Ouachita Phase would be contemporary with Adair (see fig. 4-6). During the Mid-Ouachita Phase at Hardman, the site was primarily used for salt production, but it still had some evidence of domestic occupation. This phase also marks the beginning of construction of pyramidal mound centers in the Middle Ouachita Valley. It is suspected that this is the time period when the populations in this area started to grow significantly (Early 1993).

When it comes to ceramic evidence dating to the Mid-Ouachita phase, some ceramic markers can be noted. Friendship Engraved var. Freeman is made at this time, along with Garland Engraved bowls and Military Road Incised jars. Additionally, the end of this phase is marked by the replacement of Military Road Incised with Foster Trailed Incised (see the discussion of Adair and Poole). It can be seen at Adair and Poole that Foster Trailed Incised makes up a significantly greater percentage of the pottery than Military Road Incised in both sites. This suggests that, if the evolution of pottery styles was similar in the Middle
and Upper Ouachita, the change from Military Road Incised to Foster Trailed Incised occurred somewhere during the occupation of Adair and Poole.

In the Hardman Site report, Early identifies an additional variety of Foster Trailed Incised. This variety, var. *Tupelo*, is made of Baker 22 body pattern, wide line concentric circles with central nodes, and Beloit 1 rim design, horizontal lines with vertical lines on the top and bottom (Early 1993). Early states that this is the earliest type of Foster Trailed Incised, because of the combination of a body design typically associated with Foster Trailed Incised and a rim design associated with Military Road. This new type shows the transition of Military Road Incised to Foster Trailed Incised. There is one example of this type in the Adair collection (fig. 4-10). Although not with the exact rim design as described in the Hardman report, it does exhibit a design that is usually found on Military Road Incised, rather than Foster Trailed Incised. The presence of this type of vessel shows that the change from Military Road Incised did occur sometime during the occupation of Adair, most likely early in the occupation.

*fig. 4-10: Foster trailed Incised var. Tupelo (University of Arkansas Museum 1992)*
The types and distribution of the whole vessels between the two sites is, although alike in some places, more different than they are similar. The distribution of the pottery is vastly different at both sites. There are the twenty-seven types of pottery at Adair and twelve at Hardman. The types that are at both Adair and Hardman are mostly those that are common in the Middle Ouachita region. As mentioned before, there are some examples of Middle Ouachita pottery at Adair; conversely, there are no examples of Upper Ouachita pottery at Hardman. The pottery at Adair seems to have been brought from the Middle Ouachita, thus suggesting that there is some interaction with people who were living in the Middle Ouachita. Even though this can be seen, the lack of Upper Ouachita pottery at Hardman suggests that the people at Adair did not have interaction with the people as far south as Hardman.

Poole and Hardman both had in situ burials, but the compositions were vastly different. Poole Plain is the most common burial good in Upper Ouachita graves, but there was no Poole Plain pottery found at the Hardman site. In addition to the ceramic goods, there were non-ceramic goods interred with the Hardman burials as well. At Poole, chipped lithic and groundstone objects were the most common. Conversely, at Hardman, shells, beads, clay discs, and points were found in the burials. Although both cemeteries show modest, non-stratified burials, the differences in types of pottery and non-ceramic objects suggest that the two communities were not linked.

The comparison between Adair and Hardman shows that although these sites may have had interaction, if that were the case, the ceramic collections would likely be more similar than they are. One can say that Adair was contemporary with the Mid-Ouachita
phase at the Hardman site, the Means site, and others in the Middle Ouachita region. But, although they were contemporaneous, the people who lived at the sites were separate and most likely did not have direct contact.
V: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The Adair site has long been considered an important site in the Upper Ouachita area. The assumed elite status of the site has been a point of interest for many researchers in the past. But, questions regarding its position in relation to other sites in the area as well as its place in the hierarchical system had yet to be answered. The research done in this study has attempted to answer those questions and provides some new insights into the examination of this site and others in the Upper Ouachita River Valley. This study began with three questions.

First, can the archaeological context of the whole vessel collection be proven? Dellinger said that he excavated “a large cemetery” in the early 1930s, but the lack of field notes and general information about the site has made this statement difficult to prove. To answer this question, the vessels found at Adair were compared to those at found at Poole. The comparisons showed that the vessels from Adair were most likely grave goods. The vessels at both Adair and Poole show similarities in distribution, decoration, and size. The types of pottery that were most common at Poole were also the types of pottery that were most common at Adair. The top three types, Poole Plain, Friendship Engraved, and Foster Trailed Incised showed similar percentages at both sites (see fig. 4-4) and were statistically proved to be similar (see table. 4-5). In decoration, the same types of pottery were found at both sites, not only in types, but also in the varieties. One such example would be that Poole and the Adair had the same varieties of Friendship Engraved. The two sites also exhibited the same size vessels. The small to medium size and shape of vessels can be
found in graves at both sites as well as all over the Caddo culture area. It can be safely stated that the collections of whole vessels from Adair came from a cemetery.

The second question was, what interaction did Adair have with the sites in the surrounding areas? To answer this question, we first had to make assumptions about what is meant by “interaction”. The amount of overlap of ceramic types at each site would be a relative indicator of the interaction that those sites had (see table 4-6). When looking at the four sites together, it can be seen that there was most certainly interaction between Adair and Poole. When it comes to Adair and Standridge, it can be demonstrated that they did have some interaction, but not as much as Adair and Poole. Similarities in pottery distribution, and particularly in the untyped pottery (see fig. 4-7 and fig. 4-8), shows that there were ideas and possibly vessels exchanged between the sites. Conversely, the Adair and Hardman sites show little to no interaction and have no similarities in ceramic collections or burial goods.

The third questions was, how can the elite status of Adair be seen in the ceramic collections? The elite status of the Adair site can be seen in multiple ways. Although the variety of pottery at the site is not as large as others in the area, the large volume of vessels indicate that this was a large site. Having over 200 vessels would indicate that there were dozens, if not over a hundred burials, making it one of the largest cemeteries in the Upper Ouachita. If there were not that many burials, the high number of vessels would indicate that these were elite burials, each having numerous vessels per grave. The non-ceramic collections show possible elite status as well. When comparing the non-ceramic items at the Poole and Adair site, some differences can be seen. The Poole site has non-ceramic
grave goods such as points, pipes, and beads. All of these things are made of local material and do not show much hierarchal status between graves. Conversely, items such as large points, effigy beads, earspools, and other exotic possible sociotechnic goods can be found at Adair. All this suggests that the Adair site was an elite site in the area. Although it was the only mound complex, it is hypothesized that it did not exhibit much influence around the surrounding areas. This is evident by the lack of sites in the immediate area around Adair (see fig. 4-10).

This research shines a new light on the Adair site and its role in the Upper Ouachita River Valley relations. The Adair site was most likely a local elite site that was the central place where people from the area would come to participate in ceremonial or civil ceremonies. It would have been a place where elites and their families would have lived, with patches of hamlets and farmsteads nearby making periodic trips throughout the year to worship or participate in governmental works. The extent of the control of the people at the Adair site would have extended to surrounding sites, and possibly into the northernmost areas of the Middle Ouachita geographic area, because of the appearance of Middle Ouachita pottery at Adair. The people of the Adair site would have utilized the Ouachita River as a way to interact with those in surrounding areas. The extent of interaction with the Adair site would have followed the Ouachita River to the Middle Ouachita area of modern-day Lake Hamilton and Hot Springs, Arkansas.

Although this site can no longer be studied physically, because of its location under Lake Ouachita, looking at the surrounding areas could shed more light on the extent of the possible interaction. More investigation should also be done in the Upper Ouachita area as
a whole, so that time periods could possibly be delineated and studied. The information that is known from the Middle Ouachita shows that there are at least three distinct Caddo time periods present. But, the lack of information from the Upper regions has limited the research into these temporal divisions.

There are many other collections in the University of Arkansas Museum, in private collections, and at other places, that, much like this one, had little to no information associated with them. This research has demonstrated that these collections are important and information can be gleaned from them. Many times they are cast off as unusable because of their lack of documentation, but using techniques such as comparative studies, vessel analysis, and research into surrounding areas, information about the collections can be used. Archaeology without context is an issue that plagues many collections, but this research has shown that information can be found in such collections.

The Adair Site has yielded knowledge about Caddo interactions in the Upper Ouachita that has previously been unknown. Using the whole vessel collection from this site, this research has been able to help add to the limited knowledge of the Caddo in the Upper Ouachita River Valley. Using this information, future research can hope to expand on what is known and create a better picture of the past.
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