

# NEWSLETTER

of the

## SOUTHEASTERN ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONFERENCE

---

Vol. 7, No. 1

Cambridge, Mass.

October, 1960.

---

### A NOTE FROM THE NEW EDITOR'S SCRAP BASKET

Since all the current anthropological journals seem to have such a department, perhaps it is appropriate on taking over from Bill Haag that I use this space to confess what has been done. As I believe the following brief history indicates, this Conference and its Newsletter have been informal. Therefore I trust that it will not come as too much of a surprise to the fellow members that you now have a new editor, without any time--consuming election and entirely without due process of law. Bill Haag and another colleague merely came to me with the problem, and asked if I would take over since Haag was off on a Caribbean idyll under the guise of field work.

I accepted, and present herewith the first issue; soon to be followed by the edited proceedings of the Sixteenth Conference held at Macon in 1959. I received from Haag a card file of the membership and find a rather large number of unpaid dues so that you can expect some action in that department in the near future, although I do not feel that the rather harsh tactics of the American Anthropologist need be applied. I mention this item since Bill accidentally neglected to forward the Newsletter's cash balance.

Haag has always piteously begged for more manuscripts, and I will follow suit. I hope that we don't have to debate our national purpose before we decide what is appropriate for this publication outlet. Therefore I welcome any contributions that my fellow members would chance to offer.

Stephen Williams  
Peabody Museum  
Harvard University  
Cambridge, Mass

---

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

"A Brief History of the Southeastern Archaeological Conference." Stephen Williams.....	2
"[A Proposal for] A Conference on Pottery Nomenclature for the Southeastern United States." Ford and Griffin.....	5
"Report of the Conference on Southeastern Pottery Typology." Ford and Griffin.....	10

# A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE SOUTHEASTERN ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONFERENCE

Stephen Williams

The Southeastern Archaeological Conference has been informal since its inception in 1938, but it has made real contributions to methodology and organization of data comparable to those made by its elder brother in the Southwest, the Pecos Conference begun in 1927. Thus it seems appropriate to preface this re-publication of the results of the First Conference, hitherto available only as what librarians are wont to call "ephemera", with a brief chronological synopsis of its history.

In the fall of 1937 a six-paged mimeographed proposal for a "Conference on Pottery Nomenclature for the Southeastern United States" was circulated to a number of archaeologists then at work in the area. The originators of this document were James A. Ford and James B. Griffin with advice and suggestions from A. R. Kelly, Gordon R. Willey, A. J. Waring, Jr., and Preston Holder. A series of methodological proposals were made including the use of a tri-nomial designation of pottery types, following the pattern set in the Southwest, but improving it with an additional modifying adjective. Here for the first time we find the use of the type names: Hopewell zoned stamp, Lamar complicated stamp, Fatherland three-line incised, and Weeden Island check stamp. From this simple beginning which is reproduced below arose the many-headed monster that is Southeastern pottery typology.

As a result of this proposal the First Southeastern Conference was held on May 16th - 17th, 1938, at the Ceramic Repository, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, with Griffin as Chairman. The proceedings of this important conference which set the main course of ceramic typology in the Southeast are to be found in the following pages; it was accompanied by a 13 page paper on "A Suggested Plan for Classifying Vessels on the Basis of Form" by Charles G. Wilder that is not reproduced here, since little or no use has been made of the system.

The Second Conference was held November 4th - 6th, 1938, at the Central Archaeological Laboratory, Birmingham, Alabama, with Jesse D. Jennings as Chairman. Ceramic classification was again the major topic of discussion and a five-period correlation chart of ceramic sequences in eleven regions of the Southeast was constructed. Minutes of the meeting and this chart, which was the first of its kind and important for later developments, were mimeographed by Wilder and distributed to the members of the Conference.

In February, 1939, Volume I, Number 1, of the Southeastern Archaeological Conference Newsletter (herein after referred to as SAC-N) was published with William G. Haag as Editor. It contained the first defined pottery types following the typology set forth at the First Conference; this prompt usage of the methodology actually resulted from what might be termed a sort of "Young Turks" movement which caught fire and took over the Southeast.

The Third Conference was held June 23rd - 24th, 1939, at the Alabama Museum - W. P. A. Archaeological Laboratory, Birmingham, Alabama, with Wilder as Chairman. A rather elaborate program on recent findings was carried out with a special section on Physical Anthropology (SAC-N, Vol. II, No. 1, pp. 1-24).

The Fourth Conference was held November 10th - 11th, 1939, at Ocmulgee National Monument, Macon, Georgia, with J. Joe Finkelstein as Chairman. This meeting inaugurated the new Museum building and covered new developments in the local archaeological scene (SAC-N, Vol. II, No. 3, pp. 1-12).

This spate of meetings, four in two years, exemplified the actual rate of archaeology in the area at this time. The large W. P. A. projects in Louisiana, Tennessee, Alabama and Georgia especially were turning out more archaeological finds during every six-month period than had been uncovered in the several previous decades, and these conferences brought together the diggers so that they could communicate their new-found knowledge. The Newsletter was intended to disseminate information rapidly, and never aspired to be a very formal publication.

The Fifth Conference was held September 4th - 5th, 1940, at Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, with Ford as Chairman. The major topics were physical anthropology, recent archaeological investigations, and a series of local chronologies (SAC-N, Vol. II, No. 4, pp. 1-31).

The Sixth Conference was held September 4th - 5th, 1941, at the University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky, with Haag as Chairman. It covered progress in four areas of research: Early Horizons, Hopewellian Phase, Middle Mississippi pottery, and the Protohistoric Horizons (SAC-N, Vol. III, No. 1, p. 3).

The Second World War brought a halt to the Conference meetings and to the publication of the Newsletter. However, in 1950 the Conferences were resumed, and in 1951 its perennial editor, Haag, revived the Newsletter with Volume III.

The Seventh Conference was held October 13th - 14th, 1950, at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee, with T. M. N. Lewis as Chairman. The major topics covered were current work by various members and the execution of a chronology chart of pottery type sequences in the Southeast (SAC-N, Vol. III, No. 1, pp. 4-6).

The Eighth Conference was held November 2nd - 3rd, 1951, at the University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, with John M. Goggin as Chairman. The topic selected for this meeting was the classification of stone artifacts, and projectile point typology received the greatest attention (SAC-N, Vol. III, No. 2, pp. 1-6).

The Ninth Conference was held October 31st - November 1st, 1952, at Ocmulgee National Monument, Macon, Georgia, with Charles H. Fairbanks as Chairman. The topic designated for discussion at this meeting was the archaeology of the Historic tribes of the Southeast (SAC-N, Vol. III, No. 3, pp. 1-33).

The Tenth Conference was held November 20th -21st, 1953, at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, with Joffre L. Coe as Chairman. The Paleo-Indian and Archaic cultures were the theme of this meeting and the results were published in another journal (Southern Indian Studies, Vol. VI, pp. 1-48, same as SAC-N, Vol. IV).

A suggestion was made at this meeting to adopt the Ocmulgee National Monument as a sort of home base for the Conference, with every other meeting to be held there. This proposal has been in effect since 1955.

The Eleventh Conference was held November 12th-13th, 1954, at the Mound State Park, Moundville, Alabama, with David L. DeJarnette as Chairman. The very logical topic of the Southern Cult was discussed at this meeting at one of the major Cult centers (SAC-N, Vol. V, No. 1, pp. 1-32).

The Twelfth Conference was held October 21st-22nd, 1955, at Ocmulgee National Monument, Macon, Georgia, with Joel L. Shiner as Chairman. The so-called "Middle Period" or Early Woodland Cultures were discussed (SAC-N, Vol. V, No. 1, pp. 33-37).

The Thirteenth Conference was held November 30th-December 1st, 1956, at Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, with Haag as Chairman. The subject was "The Lower Mississippi Valley: Cultural Cornucopia or Sink?" A visit to the recently completed archaeological Museum at Marksville, Louisiana, was part of the program. (No published proceedings).

The Fourteenth Conference was held November 1st - 2nd, 1957, at Ocmulgee National Monument, Macon, Georgia, with James B. Griffin as Chairman. The theme of this meeting was Historic archaeology and the DeSoto dateline. (No published proceedings).

The Fifteenth Conference was held December 5th-6th, 1958, at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, with Coe as Chairman. The transition from the Archaic to the Early Woodland cultures was the major topic of this meeting, the minutes of which were tape recorded and the unedited proceedings published as a whole volume of the Newsletter (SAC-N, Vol. VI, pp. 1-62).

The Sixteenth Conference was held November 13th-14th, 1959, at Ocmulgee National Monument, with Stephen Williams as Chairman. The subject of the meeting was ceramic classification, and the interest in the historic developments of the concepts now in use in the Southeast is the reason for the following re-publication of the early work on the subject. The minutes of this last conference were also tape recorded and will appear as another volume of the Newsletter.

[A PROPOSAL FOR A]  
CONFERENCE ON POTTERY NOMENCLATURE FOR THE  
SOUTHEASTERN UNITED STATES

[by James A. Ford and James B. Griffin, 1937.]

It is felt by several of the investigators working in the southeastern states that the time has arrived for the development of a standard method of designating and comparing the different varieties of pottery in Southeastern archaeological research. Through the efforts of former and present investigators, it is probable that the major types of pottery of the region have already been excavated. A most significant problem is the ordering of this material.

For the purpose of reaching a unanimous opinion as to the details of this ordering, it probably will be desirable to hold a conference of those directly interested some time next Spring. However, there is much to be done in preparation for this meeting if it is to be as effective as possible.

The following suggestions are presented by Griffin and Ford and are based on conversations and communications with Kelly, Willey and Holder. Two copies of these suggestions will be sent to each prospective member of the conference. Other copies can be obtained from the Ceramic Repository, Museums Building, Ann Arbor, Michigan. Notes, additions and criticisms can be made on the wide left-hand margins provided for the purpose. It is suggested that one copy, with full comments, be returned to the Ceramic Repository so that a revised edition of suggestions may be prepared for resubmission to conference members.

Purposes of Conference.

1. To propose a uniform system of classification of Southeastern pottery.
2. To define specifically as many as possible of the types that are recognized at present.
3. To decide on a uniform outline for describing the pottery types of area.
4. To consider the matter of a standard nomenclature to be used in describing pottery.
5. To perfect plans for the issuing of a field manual which, in the preface, will set forth the (1) basis of the classification; the outline to be used in describing new types; a glossary of the terms to be applied to ceramics; and (2) give descriptions and illustrations of the types recognized by the

conference. The book will be bound in such a way that pages describing newly-determined types may be added from time to time.

6. To develop plans for the rigorous supervision of future identification and naming of types that are to be included in the handbook.

#### Preparation for Conference.

It is suggested that:

1. Each worker describe the types which he intends to suggest, well in advance of the time of the conference. Try to apply these formulated types to his material and to the published literature.

2. Send mimeographed or carbon copies of all statements and formulated types to other members of the conference as soon as possible so that they may have adequate time to consider and compare. (The purpose of the conference is to be the discussion of matters with which we should all be thoroughly familiar, not the introduction of new facts or ideas).

3. Bring representative material, photographs, and descriptions of types to the conference for comparison and discussion. Where possible, submit representative material to the workers in adjacent areas before the time of the conference.

#### Discussion of the Theoretical Basis of Classification.

(These are the ideas of Ford and Griffin. We are most anxious to have the expression of the opinions of the others concerned as soon as possible. It is highly desirable that an agreement as to the viewpoint from which we will attempt to classify the material can be reached at the earliest possible date.)

What the conference is actually intended to do is to apply a standard term to designate each of the aboriginal styles of pottery manufacture that are now apparent. Each of these styles consisted of several characteristic elements that tended to cling together through a limited span of time and space. These styles are expressed concretely by characteristic associations of certain specific decorations, shapes, appendages, materials, firing processes, etc. It is the most clearly recognized of these associations that we want to name at this time.

The influences of a particular style could be most freely expressed in such features as decoration, surface finish, appendages and, to a certain degree, shape. Limiting factors operate more or less in the availability of materials, utility and development of firing techniques, etc. The definition of pottery types should be based mainly on those features which can best reflect stylistic trends and are least affected by extraneous factors.

A further limitation is suggested by the practical fact that the system will be most often applied to the analysis of sherd collections. In these cases, the features of shape, size, and appendages are obscured for each sherd, although the information is usually available in a general way when the entire collections

are considered. Therefore, it is suggested that in the selection and descriptions of types, particular attention be paid to all variations of decoration and surface finish that are to be included. Decoration, particularly, should be minutely described.

Griffin, however, presents the point that there are certain peculiar shapes that recur over the area in very similar forms and which in different areas are liable to have different decorations. There is also a question as to whether we shall attempt to apply names to these shapes, considering them apart from the decoration they bear. Think it over.

### Significance of Types.

If these ceramic types are to be useful in untangling the prehistory of the Southeast, they must have more than local significance. That is, there is no excuse for setting up types on the basis of a few vessels from one site only. The specific combination of features must be repeated at different sites in order to be certain that we are dealing with a pottery style that had a significant part in the ceramic history of the area. In other words, there can be no such thing as a "type site." One must have series of sites which present materials clustering about a norm which is to be designated as a type.

### Variability of Types.

Some of the types will doubtless prove to be rather variable. As demonstrated by experience in the Southwest, there is really no profit in labelling variations which can be readily recognized as related to types already set up, unless the variations can be demonstrated to have significance of either an areal or chronological nature. To do so will result only in pointless and confusing "splitting".

Combinations of recognized types can be dealt with in two ways. Where they are rarely found and do not appear to have become stable products of crossing, they had better be regarded as what they seem to be - one type strongly influenced by another. If they are consistently repeated, they can be set up as a distinct new type.

### Naming of Types.

It has been suggested by Holder, Willey and Ford that names be applied to specific ceramic types in a manner similar to that used in the Southwest. It is felt by these men, however, that an improvement over the Southwestern system of nomenclature could be introduced by the use of a middle term in the name which would usually be a descriptive adjective modifying the last term. Then the first part of the name would be the name of the site from which the type was first adequately described or recognized. The second term would be a modifying or suggestive adjective; the last term would be a "constant" which would designate the broad class to which the type belongs. The following are samples:

Hopewell zoned stamp

1      2      3

[crude line drawing]

Fatherland three line incised

1      2      3

[crude line drawing]

Lamar complicated stamp

1      2      3

Weeden Island check stamp

1      2      3

The "constants" or techniques are demonstrated in the Southwest by the terms "black on white", "red on buff", etc. In the Southeast, the following techniques suggest themselves as constants:

plain	rouletted (?)	painted
incised	brushed	polished
engraved	punctuated	slipped
stamped	noded	roughened
cord-marked	applique	
fabric-marked	effigy (form of vessel)	

#### Suggested Outline for Description of Types (Ford).

(This outline to be used in conjunction with the glossary of terms developed by Kelly and Griffin, and those standards to be set by the conference of Ceramic Technologists to be held in May.)

#### SUGGESTED TYPE NAME \_\_\_\_\_

#### DECORATION

**Motif** - describe the plan of decoration (scroll, etc.)

**Elements** - the incised lines, punctates, etc., used to execute the plan.

**Features** - special and peculiar features of the decoration.

**Application** - portion of vessel covered.

#### SHAPE

**Vessel shape** - form of vessel, size

**Rim** - shape, cross section, additions to,

**Lip** - shape

**Bottom** - shape of

**Appendages** - handles, lugs, etc.

**Thickness** - lip, walls, and bottom



**SURFACE FINISH**

Smoothed, polished, scraped, etc.

Slip - addition of clay; wash - addition of color; smudged.

Paint

Color of surface, interior and exterior.

**PASTE**

Texture - consolidated, laminated; fine, coarse, etc.

Temper - material, proportion of, size.

Hardness - use Geological Scale.

**USUAL RANGE OF TYPE**

**CHRONOLOGICAL POSITION OF TYPE IN RANGE**

**BIBLIOGRAPHY OF TYPE**

Note: In giving descriptions, be brief. Whole sentences are unnecessary. First give average conditions; then detail the variations which will also be considered as forming part of the type.

Character of the Conference.

The conference is to be purely invitational, including only those who are working in, or are immediately interested in, the problems of correlating Southeastern ceramics.

The following names have been suggested:

- Kelly, Willey, Holder - Georgia
- Coe - the Carolinas
- Stirling - Florida
- Lewis, Haag, Griffin - Tennessee Valley
- Ford - Mississippi, Louisiana
- Phillips - Middle Mississippi

Of course all these men have a wide interest in the entire area, but at the same time they are best acquainted with the particular regions indicated. It is suggested that each man crystallize his ideas about other regions as well as his own, in order to be able to evaluate the type descriptions presented by his colleagues.

REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE ON SOUTHEASTERN  
POTTERY TYPOLOGY

Held at

The Ceramic Repository for the Eastern United States,  
Museum of Anthropology, University of Michigan

Ann Arbor, Michigan

May 16-17, 1938

[The Proceedings of The First Southeastern Archaeological Conference]

[Compiled by James A. Ford and James B. Griffin]

The Conference on Southeastern Ceramic Typology was an informal meeting of archaeologists directly concerned with the problems of analyzing the pottery recovered in the course of archaeological investigation of aboriginal sites in the Southeastern United States.

The purpose of the meeting was to attempt to establish in the Southeast a unified system of pottery analysis. Methodologies that have been successfully applied in other areas were reviewed. Viewpoints and procedures listed in the following pages were selected as being most applicable to the Southeastern area.

Additional copies of this report may be secured from J. A. Ford,  
School of Geology, Louisiana State University, University, Louisiana.  
[This offer is no longer in effect - Editor.]

## PURPOSES OF POTTERY STUDY

1. For the purposes of discovering culture history, pottery must be viewed primarily as a reflector of cultural influence. Its immediate value to the field and laboratory archaeologist lies in its use as a tool for demonstrating temporal and areal differences and similarities. Interpretations of technological processes are of value in making comparisons of the similarities of the material. However, at this time, when there is still so much disagreement among the specialists in that field, the more subtle technological distinctions cannot be depended upon to provide a basis for classification. It is possible to make useful division in material which was manufactured by processes that are not yet completely understood.
2. The inadequacy of the procedure of dividing pottery into "types" merely for purposes of describing the material is recognized. This is merely a means of presenting raw data. Types should be classes of material which promise to be useful as tools in interpreting culture history.

## IDENTIFICATION OF TYPES

3. There is no predetermined system for arriving at useful type divisions. Types must be selected after careful study of the material and of the problems which they are designed to solve. A type is nothing more than a tool and is set up for a definite purpose in the unfolding of culture history. If divisions in an established type will serve that purpose more accurately, they should be made; otherwise there is little purpose in crowding the literature with types.
4. A type must be defined as the combination of all the discoverable vessel features: paste, temper, method of manufacture, firing, hardness, thickness, size, shape, surface finish, decoration, and appendages. The range of all these features, which is to be considered representative of the type, must be described. By this criteria two sets of material which are similar in nearly all features, but which are divided by peculiar forms of one feature (shell contrasted with grit tempering, for example) may be separated into two types if there promises to be some historical justification for the procedure. Otherwise they should be described as variants of one type.
5. A type should be so clearly definable that an example can be recognized entirely apart from its associated materials. Recognition must be possible by others who will use the material, as well as by the individual proposing the type.

## SYSTEMIZATION OF TYPE RECOGNITION

6. As it is possible for certain features of pottery, such as shape or decoration, to be distributed apart from the specific features with which they may formerly have been associated, it is necessary to select a set of mutually exclusive features to serve as a primary framework for the classifications. This is to prevent the possibility of defining one type mainly on the basis of a paste feature, and still another on the basis of decoration. This procedure would eventually lead to a condition in which almost every vessel would be of two or more "types."

7. As in practice the classification will usually be applied to sherds, it was decided to utilize the features of surface finish and decoration as the basis for the primary division of the material. There is also the possibility of difficulty if one type is selected on the basis of a rim decoration and another has its reference to body decoration. Crossing of types would again occur as the results of a defect of the system. It was decided that body finish and decoration should define the type.

### LIST OF CONSTANTS

8. The term constant is applied to each of the list of apparent techniques selected by the conference as the primary divisions of Southeastern surface finishes and decorations. The constants selected, with some modifying adjectives, are as follows:

<u>Constant</u>	<u>Modifiers</u>	<u>Definition</u>
1. Plain-----		No marked alteration of vessel surface.
	smoothed-----	Hand smoothed, no reflective surfaces.
	polished-----	Marks of polishing tool show - some reflective surfaces.
2. Filmed-----		Material added to surface of vessel after initial scraping of surface.
	red-----	Red slip or wash applied all over vessel exterior.
	red and white-----	Red and white pigment applied in separate areas to contrast with one another.
	zoned red-----	Red pigment applied on uncolored vessel surface in areas.
3. Incised-----		Lines drawn in paste while plastic.
	narrow-----	Made with pointed tool.
	bold-----	Lines both wide and deep.
	broad-----	Wide lines.
	punctate-----	Punctates spaced in incised lines
4. Engraved-----		Lines made by a pointed tool after paste had hardened. This may have been done either before or after firing.
5. Roughened-----		Surface scarified or made irregular in a number of ways. Some of the techniques that will be included in this constant are not fully understood.
	brush-----	Surface apparently stroked while plastic with a bundle of fibres.
	stipple-----	Shallow indentations apparently made by patting the plastic surface with a brush.

<u>Concept</u>	<u>Modifiers</u>	<u>Definition</u>
6. <b>Combed</b> -----		Lines similar to incised lines but made with an instrument having several teeth so that width between lines is mechanically constant. (Choctaw is only known example).
7. <b>Stamped</b> -----		Impressions made in vessel surface with tool having designs carved on it.
	simple-----	Impressions apparently made with a paddle having parallel grooves cut in it. In some cases these impressions may have been made with a thong-wrapped paddle.
	complicated-----	Die in which were carved complex designs used to make impressions on vessel surface.
	check-----	Die in which incisions were arranged in crosshatched fashion. Result of use of stamp is a "waffle" surface.
	dentate or linear----	Single or double row of square impressions evidently made with a narrow stamp.
8. <b>Punctated</b> -----		Indentations made one at a time with the point of a tool.
	finger-----	Indentations apparently made by punching the surface with the tip of the finger, or finger nail.
	triangle-----	Punctates triangular shaped, as though made with the corner of a cube.
	reed-----	Punctated circles made with a hollow cylinder, apparently a piece of cane, reed, or bone.
	zoned-----	Punctations arranged in areas which contrast with unpunctated areas of the vessel surface.
9. <b>Pinched</b> -----		Tips of two fingers used to raise small areas of the vessel surface by pinching.
	ridge-----	Raised areas form ridges.
10. <b>Applique</b> -----		Clay added to vessel surface to form raised areas.
	effigy-----	Applied clay indicates parts of some zoomorphic form (frog bowls, etc.)
	ridge-----	Applied strips of clay form ridges.
	node-----	Applied clay forms small protuberances.

<u>Constant</u>	<u>Modifiers</u>	<u>Definition</u>
11. Cord marked-----		(Pragmatically cord marking might be considered as a <u>stamped</u> . However its distinctiveness, wide areal range, and usual name warrant the use of this separate constant.) Vessel surface roughened by application of a cord wrapped paddle. Twist of cords usually discernible.
12. Fabric marked-----		Surface marked by application of fabric to plastic clay. This constant will include the so-called "coiled basket" (plain plaited) imprints. Also applied to fabric impressions found on salt pans.

9. It is recognized that there is no assurance that each of these constants includes techniques which can be considered as genetically related. They do attempt to describe all that can be determined regarding the technique of decoration. However, in some cases the techniques are in dispute and there is no certainty that this arbitrary placement is correct.

### TYPE NOMENCLATURE

10. In order to facilitate reference to a pottery type, each type will be given a name, which will normally consist of three parts.

11.

#### The Geographical Name

The first part of the name will be taken from a geographical locality. It may be the name of a site at which the type is well represented, or the name of an area in which a number of sites bearing the type are found. If possible, the names of sites from which the type has already been described in the literature should be selected. It is advantageous that the name be both distinctive and associated with the material in the minds of the workers in the area.

Numerically common types should not be given the same geographic name. In practice, the type will usually be referred to by its geographical name only. Confusion will result if more than one common type can be designated in this way. Illustrations of some good geographical names are: Lamar, Lenoir, Marksville, Moundsville, Tallapoosa, Tuscaloosa, etc.

12.

#### The Descriptive Name

The second part of the name will sometimes consist of a descriptive adjective which modifies the constant. In certain cases the "modifier" is practically demanded by peculiarities of the constant. Some of these modifiers were determined by the Conference and are contained in the foregoing list of constants (paragraph 8). Examples are: check (stamped), complicated (stamped), red and white (filmed). In other cases the modifier may be a term which serves

to suggest the peculiarities of the constant. Examples: bold, fine, narrow, etc. However, it should be stressed that to be useful, a name must be as short as possible. Unless the middle term is particularly helpful in calling the type to mind and fits naturally into the type name, it should be omitted.

13.

#### The Constant Name

The last part of the name will consist of one of the listed constants given in paragraph 8. The material should be examined carefully to determine to which of these categories it appears to belong. If it does not belong to any of them, a new constant may be proposed.

#### Examples of Type Names

14. Examples of some names which are already in use and which promise to become standard are:

Georgia - Lamar Complicated Stamped, Swift Creek Complicated Stamped,  
Vining Simple Stamped, Deptford Linear Stamped.

Louisiana - Marksville Zoned Stamped, Coles Creek Incised, Fatherland  
Incised, Deasonville Red and White Filmed.

#### Which Types Should be Named?

15. Only the materials which appear to have been manufactured at a site should receive type names based upon materials from the site. Extensive aboriginal trade in pottery seems to have occurred. Trade material had best remain unnamed until it can be examined in a region where it seems to have been manufactured and consequently is more abundant.

#### Plain Body Sherds From Decorated Vessels

16. Most Southeastern site collections will include a number of plain sherds which come from the lower parts of vessels that were decorated about the shoulder. These sherds should not be set up as types but should be described, with some indication as to the pottery types with which they may have been associated.

In cases where there is little doubt as to the derivation of the plain pieces, they may be listed under the type name but should be distinguished from the sherds showing more fully the requisite type features.

#### DISTRIBUTION OF TYPE SAMPLES

17. The Conference decided that in order to permit consistent use of Southeastern Ceramic types it was necessary to provide each of the institutions working in the area with sets of specimens representing the recognized types. Each set should illustrate the range of material to be



included in the type. Accompanying the specimens should be outline drawings of the vessel shapes.

For the present these collections are to be distributed to the following:

Mr. William G. Haag  
Museum of Anthropology and Archaeology  
University of Kentucky  
Lexington, Kentucky

Mr. David DeJarnette  
Alabama Museum of Natural History  
University of Alabama  
University, Alabama

Mr. T. M. N. Lewis  
Department of Archaeology  
University of Tennessee  
Knoxville, Tennessee

Dr. James B. Griffin  
Ceramic Repository for the Eastern United States  
Museums Building  
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Mr. Joffre Coe  
Archaeological Society of North Carolina  
University of North Carolina  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Dr. A. R. Kelly  
Ocmulgee National Monument  
Macon, Georgia

Mr. J. A. Ford  
School of Geology  
Louisiana State University  
University, Louisiana

#### Board of Review for Proposed Types

18. The Conference recognized the need for a Board of Review to control and unify the processes of type selection, naming, and description. The board selected to serve until the time of the next meeting is composed of James B. Griffin, Gordon Willey, and J. A. Ford (addresses in paragraph 26).

#### Handbook of Recognized Type Descriptions

19. Descriptions of recognized types are to be issued in the form of a loose-leaf handbook. This form is adopted to permit additions and replacements

from time to time as necessary. For the present the handbook will consist of mimeographed sheets, to be issued by J. A. Ford.

### Procedure for Proposing a Type

20. The procedure for proposing a new type will be as follows: the investigator proposing the type will send a representative collection of sherds specimen to all the corresponding institutions (paragraph 24).

All comments on the proposed type should be sent both to the investigator proposing the type and to the Board of Review. If the type appears to be a valid and necessary one, the Board of Review will approve it, and the type description will be issued as pages of the handbook. To avoid confusion type names should not be used in publications without this recognition.

### DEFINITION OF SOME DESCRIPTIVE TERMS

21. In order to make possible a more uniform description of pottery, the Conference recognized the desirability of a defined nomenclature. This problem required too much discussion to be fully considered at this time. It was only because of the immediate demands of type description that the following terms were discussed and agreed upon.

The following parts of vessels were not to be considered as accurately definable and measurable sections of the vessels, but rather as areas of the exterior surface. As these areas are formed by peculiarities of vessel shape, and there is a wide variation of shapes, all the defined areas are not present on every vessel.

Lip area - The area marking the termination of the vessel wall. More specifically, the lip lies between the outside and inside surfaces of the vessel. It is thus possible to speak of a squared lip, a rounded lip, a pointed lip, notched lip, etc.

Rim area - The area on the outside of the vessel wall below the lip which may be set off from the vessel wall by decoration or other special treatment. (thickened rim, smoothed rim, decorated rim, wide rim area, etc.)

Neck area - The neck area is found only on vessels which show a marked constriction between body and rim. In general, it is an area of constriction below the rim.

Shoulder area - Shoulder area appears only on certain forms. It is marked by inward curving walls. The area is considered to lie between the point of maximum diameter and the area of constriction that marks the neck.

Body - The body is the portion of the vessel which gives it form. This means that necks and rims are not considered to form part of the body.

**Base or Basal area** - The base is the area upon which a vessel normally rests. In the case of vessels with legs the base is the area of the body to which the supports are attached.

**Appendages** - Appendages are additions to the vessel which may have either functional or decorative utility. This term will refer to handles, lugs, feet, effigy heads, spouts, etc.

**Strap handle** - A handle which is attached to the vessel wall at two points and which in cross section is definitely flattened and strap like.

**Loop handle** - A handle which is attached to the vessel wall at two points and which in cross section is rounded and rod like.

**Complex of Types** - A complex is considered to be all the types that were in use at any one village at the same period of time. The association of the different types found on any village site must be proven - it cannot be assumed that every village site presents only one complex of types. Many sites show two or more recognizable complexes.

### Measurements

22.

**Gross measurements** - In presenting measurements of vessels and of their parts, the members of the Conference have agreed to use the Metric System.

**Hardness measurements** - Hardness is to be measured on the exterior surface of the vessel wall by means of the Mohs scale of graded minerals. The procedure is described in March: Standards of Pottery Description, pp. 17-22.

**Color** - Surface coloring, paste interior coloring, and color penetration are to be described by the terms already in use. (White, grey, brown, buff, fawn, black, red, yellow, etc.)

23.

### Shapes

Present descriptive terms will continue to be used for shapes. Mr. Charles Wilder, who has already done some work on the classification and nomenclature of Mississippi Valley pottery shapes, has consented to prepare a simplified classification and nomenclature of shapes to be presented for consideration at the next meeting. Members of the conference are requested to send to Wilder outline drawings of all vessel forms found in their areas ( address in paragraph 26).

### OUTLINE FOR DESCRIPTION OF TYPES

24.

Illustrations of specimens of type should be placed here. Both body and rim sherds should be shown. Photographs or outline drawings may be used to show the range of shapes.

SUGGESTED TYPE NAME ----

**PASTE:**

Method of manufacture - coiled, moulded, etc.

Tempering - material, size, proportion.

Texture - consolidated, laminated, fine, coarse, etc.

Hardness - use geological scale on exterior surface.

Color - surface mottling, penetration of, paste core.

**SURFACE FINISH:**

Modifications - smoothing, paddling, brushing, scraping.

Filming - slip, wash, smudging.

(In cases where there is any doubt as to whether the surface treatment should be classed as either finish or decoration, the terms may be combined into Surface Finish and Decoration. Discussion of both may be included under this heading.)

**DECORATION:**

Technique - the method by which the decoration was executed; engraving, incising, punctating, etc.

Design - describe the plan of decoration, scroll, negative meanders, etc.

Distribution - portion of vessel surface occupied by the decoration.

**FORM:**

Rim - treatment of rim area, i. e., thickened rim (tell how thickened), out-curving rim, cambered rim, etc.

Lip - features of, or modifications of, i. e., squared lip, pointed lip, notched lip, etc.

Body - general form of vessels.

Base - shape of, peculiar treatments of, additions to.

Thickness - of the different parts of the vessel wall.

Appendages - handles, lug, legs, etc.

**USUAL RANGE OF TYPE:** Geographical position of sites at which type is found in sufficient abundance to be considered native.

CHRONOLOGICAL POSITION OF TYPE IN RANGE: Time position in relation to other types and complexes. Be certain to state reliability of evidence supporting this conclusion.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF TYPE: Reference to publications where material representative of type has been illustrated and described.

It will be noted that in general this outline follows the form given in Guthe's introductory section to Standards of Pottery Description, by Benjamin March (Occasional Contributions from the Museum of Anthropology of the University of Michigan, No. 3) Any details which are not considered in the foregoing will conform to the suggestions set forth in this volume.

25. WORDING OF DESCRIPTIONS

Make the descriptions of material as concise as practical. Complete sentences are not always necessary. First give in detail the usual conditions of each feature; then the range of variation allowed for the type.

26. LIST OF MEMBERS

The following archaeologists attended the Ann Arbor Conference:

Mr. John L. Buckner (University of Kentucky, Museum, Lexington, Kentucky)  
307 West 2nd St.  
Paris, Kentucky

Mr. Joffre Coe  
University of North Carolina  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Mr. David I. DeJarnette  
Alabama Museum of Natural History  
University, Alabama

Mr. Charles H. Fairbanks (University of Tennessee, Archaeology  
Charleston, Tennessee Knoxville, Tennessee)

Dr. Vladimar J. Fewkes  
Irene Mound Excavations  
Savannah, Georgia

Mr. J. Joe Finkelstein (University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma)  
Department of Anthropology  
University of Chicago  
Chicago, Illinois

Mr. J. A. Ford  
 School of Geology  
 Louisiana State University  
 University, Louisiana

Dr. James B. Griffin  
 Ceramic Repository for the Eastern United States  
 Museums Building  
 Ann Arbor, Michigan

Mr. William G. Haag  
 Museum of Anthropology and Archaeology  
 University of Kentucky  
 Lexington, Kentucky

Mr. Claude Johnston (Museum, University of Kentucky,  
 335 West 2nd St. Lexington, Kentucky)  
 Paris, Kentucky

Dr. Arthur R. Kelly  
 Ocmulgee National Monument  
 Macon, Georgia

Mr. T. M. N. Lewis  
 Department of Archaeology  
 University of Tennessee  
 Knoxville, Tennessee

Mr. Frederick R. Matson  
 Museum of Anthropology  
 Ann Arbor, Michigan

Mr. Stewart Neitzel (Department of Archaeology, University of Tennessee,  
 Box 81 Knoxville, Tennessee)  
 Charleston, Tennessee

Mr. Charles G. Wilder (Museum, University of Alabama, University,  
 Box 233 Alabama)  
 Scotsboro, Alabama

Archaeologists who were not able to attend the meeting, but who should be considered members of the Conference because of their interest in its purposes and their valuable assistance in developing the ideas presented are:

Mr. Preston Holder  
 326 W. 107th St.  
 New York, N. Y.

Mr. Gordon Willey  
 Ocmulgee National Monument  
 Macon, Georgia