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Investigation of ceramic sequences from five areas located along the major rivers of the Middle Atlantic States region shows that the region enjoyed a well-integrated development through Woodland times. A development from simple to complex with respect to decoration and vessel forms is demonstrated in all sequences. There is also an increase in the variety of ceramic styles from the Early Woodland to the Late Woodland period. Most of the outside influence in the area is seen as coming from the Iroquoian area to the north though a few traits come from the Southeast.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to discuss the ceramic sequences of the area of the United States now known as the Middle Atlantic states and to try to create some order out of the situation that now exists. To accomplish this purpose it was necessary first to collect and collate information that is presently scattered through several publications or still unpublished. This task has not been attempted to my knowledge in over fifteen years, since Karl Schmitt published in 1952. In the intervening years much new information about the ceramics of the region has been added to what was available in 1952. In addition, our control of the time perspective has increased remarkably during the last two decades. The carbon 14 method of dating has given the archaeologist a means by which he can order his data without the use of stratigraphy. Radio-carbon dating, furthermore, yields absolute dates that may tell much more than the relative dates determined by other methods. But perhaps more important to the Middle Atlantic region than the advent of carbon dating are the tremendous advances that have been made in establishing cultural sequences in the peripheral areas. Cross-dating materials
with these other sequences has been more useful than all other methods of dating used in the region.

Beyond the collection of this information, it is hoped that some of the patterns that apparently exist in the ceramic development of the Middle Atlantic region can be pointed out and explained. I propose to show that during the early periods broad, generalized patterns existed over wide areas and that these patterns broke down into many local trends during later times. I further intend to discuss the nature and extent of outside influences which are evident in the ceramic development. The latter point is especially important because most of the peripheral areas are far better understood in terms of their cultural development and content than is the Middle Atlantic region, and because there has been a tendency among some archaeologists to view much of the prehistory of this area as a pale reflection of events outside it.

To accomplish these ends within the confines of a paper of this size, it is necessary to adopt a methodology that does not entail extensive fieldwork or complex laboratory procedure. The data on which this paper is written come primarily from published works, a technique made necessary by limitations in time and money. It is also practical because there is a sufficient body of information about most of the areas covered by this study. However, direct observation of a sample of the artifacts is also useful because pottery type descriptions are
occasionally misleading and seldom accurate or refined enough to say whether or not a particular sherd belongs to a given type. Such imprecision exists because certain attributes of pottery cannot always be described in English in such a way that one type can be positively delineated from another. The problem centers around paste descriptions of the early ceramic types in the region, and is aggravated by the very nature of our concept of "type," which at best is only an approximation of reality and more often is no more than an arbitrary abstraction of reality conceived for a particular purpose, namely, to differentiate items of a given area rather than to compare items of different areas. Since such comparison is the purpose of this paper, it has been desirable to supplement the study of published type descriptions with direct observation. Furthermore, several of the pottery types used in this study have not yet been fully described in print.

Because the Middle Atlantic region is quite large and a great number of sites have been reported on, it is necessary to make some selection to reduce the mass of information to a reasonable unit. Five areas within the Middle Atlantic region were chosen as representative: from north to south; the upper Delaware River area from Port Jervis, New York, to the Delaware Water Gap; the lower Susquehanna River valley from Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, to the tidewater; the central Potomac area around
Washington, D. C.; the lower and central James River area of Virginia; and the Roanoke Basin of North Carolina. This selection can be justified for the following reasons. First, these five areas contain some of the best documented ceramic sequences in the region, and they are not likely to change radically in the near future. Also, these sequences form the bases for most of the work in intermediate areas. The areas do not, however, include all of the pottery types that have been described for the Middle Atlantic states; in particular, the coastal areas are neglected in this study. This omission is especially significant because the coastal ceramics appear to be markedly different from those found farther inland. However, it is not the purpose of this paper to survey the whole ceramic history of the region; rather, to point out the broadly integrated development. Hence, what will be said below cannot be applied to the coast. In several instances areas adjacent to or near the areas chosen could have been utilized with equal ease, but it seemed best to pick areas more or less evenly spaced and in roughly equal ecological situations.

Because the main purpose of this paper is comparative and synthetic, the type descriptions that make up

---

1The primary difference seems to be that the coastal ceramics did not have as much time in which to develop, but a further significant difference is the presence of several truly exotic influences found mainly on the Delmarva peninsula (Weslager 1942: 141-51).
these sequences have been abbreviated slightly, leaving out information that is of only local importance and is not suitable for the comparative purposes of the body of the paper. Full descriptions for those types essential to the argument will be found in the appendix.

It has been necessary, when dealing with several cultural sequences such as these, to establish some sort of time control. If absolute dates were available for all or most of the ceramic types involved, an absolute chronology would be the most obvious type of control, though possibly not the most useful. As the situation stands, an absolute chronology is not feasible. In fact, in some of the areas it is not possible to establish even a good relative chronology because of the lack of stratified sites and radiocarbon dates. This is especially true of those early types that seem to be separated by considerable stylistic differences but by apparently small time differences. If in addition to the absence of observable time differences between two types, there is no genetic relationship between them (i.e., one developed into the other), they must be treated for the present as contemporary. To facilitate handling this kind of problem, the time control scheme that has the widest acceptance in the area will be used here; that is, the one suggested by James B. Griffin (1946, 1952). It involves four periods: Early, Middle, and Late Woodland or Mississippian, and Historic. Griffin defined the periods in terms of content
rather than time; unfortunately, the original description was based chiefly on the archaeological content of cultures in the Ohio River and Mississippi River areas. Some of this content does not exist in significant amounts in the Atlantic Coast region, but that fact has not stopped archaeologists in the area from adopting the scheme. However, they use the time connotation without too much interest in the content; for instance, it is used by Stephenson in his study of the ceramics from the Accokeek Creek site (Stephenson 1963). Only Joffre Coe has refrained from adopting this scheme, mainly because it does not fit the bulk of his findings (Coe 1952). This point will be discussed later with the sequence from the Roanoke Basin.

Since these periods do not have absolute time spans and most of the ceramic types in the region do not have absolute dates, there must be some way of assigning cultures to periods. In some cases trade materials from outside areas have solved the dilemma. In others the archaeologists have assigned types to particular periods on the basis of similarities to types in other areas. In most cases I have followed previous workers in their period assignments for types.

The use of Griffin's four periods without any assignment of absolute dates allows a certain flexibility that is desirable in view of the state of our data. This flexibility also allows for the phenomenon of cultural
lag, inasmuch as some areas seem to undergo similar evolution of ceramic types even though one may start much later than the other. It furthermore permits us to handle conveniently two or more types whose relative temporal positions are not known, but which appear to be of the same general period. However, it must be remembered that these time periods are arbitrary and are not based on the same cultural content that Griffin and others proposed.

The Middle Atlantic States region as defined in this paper contains all or parts of the following states: New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, Virginia, and North Carolina. In general it can be said to be bounded on the east by the Atlantic Ocean, on the northeast by the Hudson River, on the west by the Blue Ridge escarpment of the Appalachians, and on the south by an imaginary line running through the state of North Carolina. The first three of these boundaries are natural physiographic features and are easily delineated. The fourth, the southern boundary, is cultural and will be discussed below.

The Atlantic Ocean is the only absolute barrier to the Middle Atlantic region. If there was any pre-Columbian contact with the Old World, it has left no discernible trace in this region.

The Hudson River probably acted as at least a restraint, if not a barrier. Unlike the rivers to the south, its channel is not the product of fluvial erosion;
instead, the whole course of the river is the result of glacial erosion. The valley glaciers that came down the Hudson left a deep, steep-sided channel that was cut far below present sea level for a considerable distance upstream. It is the only river in the Middle Atlantic region that is naturally navigable to ocean-going vessels for more than a few miles inland, a situation that indicates the complete absence of fords at least as far north as Albany. Thus, travel across the river was restricted to only those people with boats. Just how important this restriction was cannot be exactly ascertained at the present, but it seems plain that the river would act as somewhat of a barrier to east-west travel. The Hudson River also coincides with the end of the piedmont.

The Blue Ridge escarpment would not have prevented travel into the region, but quite probably localized it to areas where major rivers cut through the mountains. The escarpment rises above the piedmont surface slightly more than 1,000 feet in Pennsylvania and some 3,000 feet in North Carolina. Only the Susquehanna, Delaware, and Hudson Rivers cut completely through the Appalachian highlands, although the Potomac runs almost all the way through. To the south several rivers cut well into the Blue Ridge, but they generally have exceptionally steep gradients near the points of entry to the mountains and therefore are not as easy to travel along. Although there is seldom more than a few miles between streams that flow
to the west and eventually into the Gulf of Mexico and those that flow to the east and into the Atlantic, those few miles are often virtually straight up and down.

The region delineated by these boundaries includes parts of two physiographic provinces, the piedmont and the coastal plain. The piedmont of the Carolinas and Virginia is probably the best example in the world of what Davis called a peneplain (Davis 1889: 430). It lies directly to the east of the Blue Ridge escarpment and varies in width from about 10 miles in the north to about 125 miles in North Carolina. It consists mainly of gently rolling hills with remarkably concordant elevations; there is seldom more than a 300 foot difference between the elevations of the river bottoms and the piedmont upland surfaces. The interior margin of the piedmont rises from about 250 feet in Pennsylvania to over 1,000 feet in the south. The exterior margin, where the piedmont joins the coastal plain, is relatively constant in elevation, rising slightly to the south. Besides the rolling hills and valleys, there are various lowlands throughout much of the region. These are primarily basins caused by block faulting in Triassic times, although in a few areas, such as Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, they are the result of the solution of massive limestone. These areas do not seem to be culturally different from the rest of the piedmont, so the area can be treated as a unit. The piedmont is underlain by a variety of Paleozoic rocks, which
provided early inhabitants with a number of lithic materials with which to experiment. The rivers that flow across most of the piedmont are not particularly deep; thus, they could be easily crossed.

The boundary between the piedmont and the coastal plain is known as the fall line or fall zone. The rivers that cross this zone drop at a much faster rate here than on either side of the zone, and there are usually falls and rapids associated with it. On the larger rivers these falls and rapids are a few miles in from the actual edge of the piedmont plateau because of headward erosion. Consequently, there are deep valleys between the falls and the plateau edge. Travel through these valleys is rather difficult and suitable spots on either end seem to have been frequent stopping-places for people travelling along the rivers, an important fact to archaeologists looking for stratified sites.

The coastal plain consists of a series of marine terraces, with the older ones higher and more dissected than the younger ones. The number of recognizable terraces varies with the area and the observer. Nine have been recognized in the area around Chesapeake Bay; however, the highest, Brandywine, may be fluvial in origin rather than marine (Thornbury 1965: 33-36).

Most of the Middle Atlantic region was covered by deciduous forest that gave way to coniferous cover on the southern coastal plain. The boundary between the two is
somewhat blurred and has changed through time. Unfortunately, sufficient evidence does not yet exist to say positively what the situation was in the region during the last 3,000 years. If we assume that there has not been any significant change in the climate during this time, then most of the area has been under deciduous forest, but there is some evidence that certain periods in the past were noticeably warmer than at present, and thus the coniferous forest would have spread farther to the north (Antevs 1953: 195-230).

As can be seen from the above discussion, the Middle Atlantic region is, despite many local differences, relatively homogeneous in terms of physiography and ecology, and has natural boundaries on three sides that would have served in varying degrees to restrict travel into and out of the area.

The Middle Atlantic region also exhibits a degree of cultural homogeneity; however, the boundaries are not so readily observable. During the Paleo-Indian period the evidence is mostly from scattered surface sites where Clovis and Clovis-like points seem to predominate. There also are a number of Folsom points in the region. In the south there is the Hardaway complex (Coe 1964), which probably represents an adaptation of the more general Clovis tradition to the local materials, but Coe's date for Hardaway is earlier than any other date for eastern Clovis, so it may represent something entirely different.
It is not certain how far north the Hardaway complex extends, but it seems limited to North Carolina, with broadly similar but not identical points being found as far north as Pennsylvania.

During the Archaic the region is best viewed as a double-ended continuum. Byers looking down from Massachusetts sees the Boreal Archaic spreading to the south as far as Virginia (Byers 1959: 232-56). Coe looking up from North Carolina sees certain formal similarities to his North Carolina Archaic sequence as far north as Delaware (Coe 1964). Projectile points that fit Coe's type descriptions can be found in eastern Pennsylvania; Joseph M. Michels claims to have Kirk points at the Sheep Rock Shelter on the Juniata River (Michels and Smith 1967: 12). For most of the region the archaeological coverage is spotty at best during the Archaic and little has been done to define local complexes, except in North Carolina and to a lesser extent in Pennsylvania and New Jersey.

During Woodland times there is an increasingly wide variety of pottery styles, but the overall pattern in the region is Woodland (rather than Mississippian), and there seems to be little difference among the total archaeological collections from the separate areas. The chief distinction seems to be in ceramic styles. Since this difference is the main point of this paper, it will not be discussed here.

In the historic period we have more information
about the tribes in the region, but because the English who colonized the region were not as interested in the native cultures as were the French and Spanish, our information is limited in comparison with other places. A. L. Kroeber, in his classic work on the subject, Cultural and Natural Areas of Native North America, remarks that there were no sharply differentiated cultures in what he calls the South and Middle Atlantic Coast areas (Kroeber 1947: 93). He distinguishes several different sub-areas, mainly on the basis of language. Unlike earlier workers, Kroeber places the Powhatan and other tidewater tribes with the Delaware rather than with the Southeastern tribes. This gives a continuous band along the coast of primarily Algonquian-speaking people from North Carolina to Canada, with a few Iroquoian- and Siouan-speaking groups in North Carolina. Kroeber's map of the "Culture Areas of Native North America" (Kroeber 1947: Map 6) has my lower Susquehanna River area included within his "lower Great Lakes area" ("Northern Iroquoians"). The Susquehannocks or Conestoga were indeed Iroquoian speakers, but they were late arrivals in that locality. This point will be discussed later in the body of the paper. Kroeber sees no distinction between the tribes on the east side of the Hudson and those on the west; thus this natural boundary had little cultural reality at contact. Some tribal lines apparently follow the river, but these are all Algonquian. His lower
Great Lakes area neatly bounds the region to the northwest, his Ohio Valley and Appalachian summit areas bound the region on the west, and his Southeastern area borders the region to the south. The first three follow the natural boundaries discussed above (pp. 7-11). For the border between the South Atlantic slope area and the Southeastern area Kroeber shows a broken line on the map, indicating that the boundary is uncertain.

For the purposes of this paper, it is assumed that the presence of temple mounds, complicated stamped pottery, and fiber-tempered pottery mark the end of the Middle Atlantic area. This assumption has some drawbacks in that it excludes the Catawba and others who might better be considered within the region, but it presents a workable boundary for the intentions of the paper. Influence from the Southeast was relatively unimportant in the Middle Atlantic region; the major markers of Southeastern culture do not reach much beyond the South Carolina-North Carolina border. Historical evidence indicates that the tribes in the Middle Atlantic area were in more frequent contact with the Iroquois than with the Creek (Kroeber 1947: 94). The contact need not have been friendly, but it did allow the diffusion of some important cultural traits, particularly in ceramics.

The Middle Atlantic States region is a distinct cultural area with easily established eastern and western borders. The northern border as defined in this paper has
a definite physiographic reality but limited cultural reality in historic times. The southern limit of the region is purely cultural, but it is nevertheless observable if we make an arbitrary decision as to what cultural traits will distinguish one region from another. Any line so constructed would be subject to change through time, and one would expect a gradual decline in the importance of a given trait through space, which would produce a rather fuzzy line. Actually, though, this seems not to be the case in North Carolina, where the major Southeastern traits seem to form a complex that remains intact. All groups differ from their neighbors in some way, and in this instance it may be that the difference is clearly expressed in the archaeological record, whereas in other cases the difference is non-material and is not preserved. Archaeological evidence from southern North Carolina indicates that Southeastern groups were spreading northward until shortly before contact times. Coe's sequence from the Doerschuk site shows effects of the spread clearly. At this site Pee Dee Complicated Stamped pottery is found above a ceramic sequence that compares typologically with the materials from the Roanoke Basin and areas north (Coe 1964: 27, 30). The Pee Dee pottery represents an intrusion into the area by Southeastern peoples. The stockaded site of Town Creek may indicate that this northern movement met with some resistance from the indigenous
inhabitants of the area. Such a conclusion would further substantiate the ideas of a cultural discontinuity as the southern border of the Middle Atlantic region.

It seems appropriate to include in this introduction a review of previous attempts at synthesis of the archaeology of the region. The first such attempt was William H. Holmes, *Aboriginal Pottery of the Eastern United States*, published in 1903. Because of the vast scope of this work and the early date at which it was done, its limited coverage of the region is forgiveable. Holmes' Middle Atlantic ceramic area is smaller than mine because he leaves out Pennsylvania and New Jersey, and includes the former in the Iroquoian area and the latter in the North Atlantic. Apparently sizeable collections were available to him only from the upper Yadkin River in North Carolina and the area on the Potomac around Washington, D. C., and these form the basis of what he said about the whole area. When Holmes did his work, there was no way for him to order his materials temporally, so that there is no time perspective in his study.

For the Fay-Cooper Cole anniversary volume, *Archeology of Eastern United States* (1952), Karl Schmitt wrote a review of the archaeology of the Middle Atlantic region. The size and extent of Schmitt's area was determined more by the interests of archaeologists from the neighboring states than by the archaeological continuity of the area. Thus, North Carolina, which was
covered by Coe in the same volume, was left out, and parts of western Virginia, western Pennsylvania, and West Virginia were included even though they belong culturally with Ohio. By 1950 a few tentative sequences had emerged in the region, but there were no full sequences for any one area. Schmitt was most familiar with the area around Washington, D. C., and consequently the archaeology of this area is emphasized. The article was written in 1947, although publication was five years later, so the technique of carbon 14 dating had not yet been applied to the problems of the region. Schmitt uses the same time scheme as is used in this paper, but because he covers part of the Ohio River drainage system, some of the cultures he discusses have the more diagnostic traits of the Early and Middle Woodland periods. Because Schmitt was dealing with the total archaeological picture rather than just ceramics, he was able to make some cultural comparisons that this paper cannot. Furthermore, certain outside influences can be seen much more clearly in the full archaeological inventory than in the ceramics alone.

In 1955 Clifford Evans published his Ceramic Study of Virginia Archeology, which attempted to classify all the pottery of the state and to create several meaningful sequences. This work covered a more limited area than that of Holmes and Schmitt, yet it was meant to synthesize a large amount of material from a wide area, and thus is worth mentioning here. Evans used seriation,
along with some stratigraphy, to develop sequences for his five areas.

Thus, because Holmes' and Schmitt's work was limited by the amount of information available when they wrote, and because Evans covered a limited area that had only political boundaries, it seems appropriate to make a fresh attempt at synthesis.
CHAPTER II

THE ROANOKE RIVER AREA

Physical features of the Roanoke River area

The Roanoke River area extends along the river from the town of Weldon, North Carolina, northwest to the Buggs Island Dam. For the first seventeen miles of this section the stream rises rapidly as it crosses the fall zone. In this area the valley is narrow and the course of the river is rocky and dotted with many small islands and three large ones: Vincent Island, Tiller's Island, and Clements Island. Because of the narrowness of the valley and the ruggedness of the bedrock, a true meander pattern has not developed, and the main channel flows alternately on the north and south sides of the valley, with secondary channels over most of the valley.

The Gaston site, from which the sequence for this area comes (Coe 1964), is located on a narrow floodplain on the south side of the river. The floodplain at this point is protected upstream by a finger of rock coming out from the edge of the basin and sloping to the river. The rock projection allowed a greater deposition and less erosion than in unprotected parts of the basin. At the present time the basin is flooded by a dam built at
Roanoke Rapids.

Above the fall zone the river gradient levels off as it crosses the piedmont. Forty miles upstream from the fall zone is the Buggs Island Dam, an area that produced ceramics similar to those found in the fall zone section (Coe 1964: 100).

Archaeology of the Roanoke River area

The sequence for the Roanoke River area was derived primarily from the Gaston site. However, the sequence was corroborated by findings at seventy-three other sites located in the basin, as well as numerous sites outside the area (Coe 1964: 99-100). With the exception of a survey done by the Smithsonian Institution of the Buggs Island Reservoir (Miller 1949), all of the professional archaeology has been done by the Research Laboratories of Anthropology of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, under the direction of Joffre Coe.

Ceramic wares and types of the Roanoke River area

Vincent series (Coe 1964: 101-2; South 1959: 94-96). This series consists of two major types, Vincent Cord Marked (Plate II) and Vincent Fabric Impressed (Plate I). Vincent Cord Marked is a medium thick pottery with a hard, compact paste. The temper is fine sand. The exterior is roughened with a cord-wrapped paddle with a Z-twist cord. The interior is hard and smoothed, with a few vessels exhibiting cord impression on the inside at the neck.
This is the only decoration on the pot. Vincent Fabric Impressed has the same paste characteristics as Vincent Cord Marked; the chief difference between the two is surface treatment. The surface of Vincent Fabric Impressed is roughened with a fabric-wrapped paddle. The fabric is closer to wicker than cloth, with a close weft and coarser warp. Both types have the same range of vessel forms, including simple bowls; sub-conoidal, bag-shaped vessels with straight sides; and a few pots with slightly restricted necks.

Clements series (Coe 1964: 102-5; South 1959: 83-94). This series also has two types, Cord Marked and Fabric Impressed (Plate III). The paste of the Clements series is less compact and more granular in appearance than Vincent. The temper is medium-fine to coarse, rather than fine, sand. Clements Cord Marked is malleated on the outside with a cord-wrapped paddle. The cord impressions show a tight S-twist of two strands. The exteriors of Clements Fabric Impressed vessels are roughened with a fabric-wrapped paddle. The fabric is of a much finer weave than that used in the Vincent Fabric Impressed. Interior surfaces are scraped or tooled smooth. The only decoration common to both these types is a slight lip notching. Vessel forms show an increased tendency toward restricted necks, and some vessels have a slightly inverted lip.

The Gaston series consists mainly of one type, Gaston Simple Stamped (Plate IV), but South would include two minority types which he calls Type I Cord Marked and Type I Fabric Impressed. The Gaston series has crushed quartz temper in a high ratio to clay. The paste is usually compact but the texture is porous, granular, and rough, with temper frequently visible on the outside.

The exteriors of Gaston Simple Stamped sherds show malleation with a grooved paddle. In some cases it is possible that a thong was wrapped around the paddle. The interiors are smoothed or scraped. The Gaston rim sherds show a variety of decorative techniques. The lips are usually stamped with a grooved paddle, giving a slight notching effect. A few lips are smoothed with a tool. Some of the sherds have a thickened or folded rim of one and one-half to two centimeters wide. These rims were decorated by punctations, incising, notching, or pinching. Incising usually was continued below the rim for a short distance. The necks of the vessels were frequently scraped and incised. The incised designs usually consist of a series of alternating oblique lines or crude triangles, with a few zoomorphic figures. Vessel forms are more elaborate than in the preceding Clements series, with more constricted necks and everted lips. Even the...

---

1 Coe mentions that a few sherds with different surface treatments should be included with the Gaston series but that they occur only in small quantities.
simple bowls are slightly constricted at the lip.

There are also a number of minor types at the Gaston site and elsewhere in the area. With the exception of sherds belonging to the Roanoke series, the percentage of these types is insignificant to the development of the area and may represent simply trade sherds. Coe places the Roanoke series contemporaneous with the early Gaston series and late Clements series but centered to the northwest around Clarksville, Virginia (1964: 100). The major distinguishing trait between the Roanoke series and the Gaston series at the Gaston site is a high percentage of golden mica particles in the Roanoke paste (South 1959: 108-23).

Discussion

The Vincent and Clements series may best be seen as a bipolar continuum with Vincent grading into Clements. This means that a great number of sherds could be classified either way. Coe views the Gaston site as the location of a succession of small settlements, each of relatively short duration during Vincent and Clements times. The culture represented by the artifacts is conservative, with few or no innovations being introduced. The Gaston materials, on the other hand, show a break from the Vincent-Clements tradition and probably represent the occupation of the area by people from the outside.

The series of divisions are based on paste
characteristics, excluding temper size, and the types are based on surface treatment. South mentions a previous attempt to establish types on the basis of temper size and cord size, which failed to produce any meaningful result (South 1959: 59). The final separation produced a meaningful picture both in seriation studies and on stratigraphic charts. The sequence of Vincent-Clements-Gaston series appears to be correct. The stratigraphy in most of the squares and the seriation of features, as well as the seriation of other sites, all show a marked change through time (South 1959: Figures 16, 37, 38). The carbon 14 dates from the site tend to confirm this relationship. Unfortunately, the charcoal for dating was selected before the types were established (South 1959: 380). However, if the dates are applied to the seriation of features at the Gaston site, they give a date of 215 ± 200 B.P. for Gaston and 1040 ± 200 for about the middle of the Vincent-Clements tradition. On the basis of these dates, Coe estimates that the Vincent occupation began about A.D. 500 and changed slowly toward the Clements style, a change that produced a complex distinguished sufficiently to be separated typologically by A.D. 1200. The Clements occupation ended by A.D. 1600, and some time shortly after that the Gaston occupation began.

As mentioned in the Introduction (p. 6), Coe does not use the Woodland time scheme. He prefers to use two divisions for ceramic cultures, Developmental and
Climactic. Only the former would apply to the Gaston site, the latter being reserved for cultures that show a significant expansion and flowering of style.

In 1952 Coe stated that the Badin focus, which is similar typologically to Vincent, "lies well within the Early Woodland period" and the Yadkin focus, which is similar to Clements, "belongs to the Middle Woodland period" (Coe 1952: 307). However, he stated that the Woodland-Mississippian system of "quasi-time cultural periods" was not entirely satisfactory for North Carolina and could be used only to facilitate comparison with other areas (Coe 1952: 302).

Vincent is similar to Badin, but with a beginning date of A.D. 500, it is considerably later. A starting date of A.D. 1 would place it closer to the time span that is generally thought of as Early Woodland, but I am not concerned with absolute dates for these periods. To justify the assignment of Vincent to Early Woodland, we need only postulate that the piedmont area between the Yadkin and James Rivers was a cultural backwash that exhibits extreme conservatism. This seems to be in accord with the evidence now at hand, and is not seriously out of line with the general trend toward conservatism that is present in the southern part of the Middle Atlantic States region.
PLATE I

Vincent Fabric Impressed

From the Gaston site. Research Laboratories of Anthropology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
Plate I
PLATE II

Vincent Cord Marked

From the Gaston site. Research Laboratories of Anthropology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
PLATE III

Clements Fabric Impressed

Clements Cord Marked

Upper left: Clements Fabric Impressed sherd.
All others: Clements Cord Marked sherds.

From the Gaston site. Research Laboratories of
Anthropology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
PLATE IV

Gaston Simple Stamped

From the Gaston site. Research Laboratories of Anthropology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
PLATE V

Marcy Creek Plain

From the Accokeek Creek site. Research Laboratories of Anthropology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
PLATE VI

Pope's Creek Net Impressed

From the Accokeek Creek site. Research Laboratories of Anthropology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
PLATE VII

Accokeek Cord Marked

From the Accokeek Creek site. Research Laboratories of Anthropology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
PLATE VIII

Mockley Net Impressed

From the Accokeek Creek site. Research Laboratories of Anthropology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
PLATE IX

Potomac Creek Cord Impressed

From the Accokeek Creek site. Research Laboratories of Anthropology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
PLATE X

Clemson's Island Fabric Marked

From the Clemson Mound site. William Penn Memorial Museum, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.
PLATE XI

Clemson's Island Cord Marked

Clemson's Island Zone Decorated

Top: Clemson's Island Cord Marked sherds.
Bottom: Clemson's Island Zone Decorated sherds.
From the Clemson Mound site. William Penn Memorial Museum, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.
PLATE XII

Shenk's Ferry Cord Marked Collarless

Shenk's Ferry Paddle-edge Impressed

Top five: Shenk's Ferry Cord Marked, Collarless subtype sherds.
From the Blue Rock site.
Bottom four: Shenk's Ferry Cord Marked, Paddle-edge Impressed subtype sherds.
From the Nace site.
PLATE XIII

Shenk's Ferry Cord Marked Collared

Shenk's Ferry Simple Incised

Top: Shenk's Ferry Incised, Simple Incised subtype sherds.
Bottom: Shenk's Ferry Cord Marked, Collared subtype sherds.

PLATE XIV

Shenk's Ferry Incised Multiple Banded

Lancaster Incised

Top: Shenk's Ferry Incised, Multiple Banded subtype sherd.


Bottom: Lancaster Incised sherd.

From the Shenk's Ferry site. William Penn Memorial Museum, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.
PLATE XV

Funck Incised

Right: From the Keller site. Diameter at lip 6 1/2 inches.

PLATE XVI

Schultz Incised


PLATE XVII

Washington Boro Incised

Upper left: From the Ibaugh site. Diameter at lip 6 inches.

Upper right: From the Keller site. Diameter at lip 7 1/2 inches.

Bottom: From the Keller site. Width across top 11 inches.
PLATE XVIII

Strickler Cord Marked

Left: Diameter at lip 4 1/2 inches.
Right: Diameter at lip 6 inches.
From the Keller site. William Penn Memorial Museum, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.
PLATE XIX

Vinette I

Point Peninsula Rocker Stamped

Top: Vinette I sherds. From Erb rockshelter

PLATE XX

Owasco Corded Punctate

Owasco Corded Horizontal

Left: Castle Creek Corded Punctate. 7 inches across.
From 36Pi7.

Right: Owasco Corded Horizontal. Diameter at lip 12 1/2 inches.
From Book Mound.

PLATE XXI

Kelso Corded

Top: From the MacPherson Collection.
Bottom: From 36Mr8.

PLATE XXII

Chance Incised

Top: From 36Mr8.
Bottom: Upper sherd from 36Pi33. Lower left sherd from 36Pi33.
Lower right sherd from 36Pi22.
PLATE XXIII

Munsee Incised


Plate XXIII
### Figure I

**Five Area Sequence of the Middle Atlantic States Region**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>ROANOKE</th>
<th>JAMES</th>
<th>POTOMAC</th>
<th>SUSQUEHANNA</th>
<th>DELAWARE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HISTORIC</strong></td>
<td>Gaston Series</td>
<td>Courtland Series</td>
<td>Moyaone Series</td>
<td>Susquehannocks Series</td>
<td>Munsee Incised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LATE WOODLAND</strong></td>
<td>Gaston Series</td>
<td>Dan River Series?</td>
<td>Potomac Creek Series</td>
<td>Funck Incised</td>
<td>Chance Horizon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clements Series</td>
<td>Albemarle Series</td>
<td>Townsend Series</td>
<td>Shenk's Ferry Series</td>
<td>Oak Hill Horizon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIDDLE WOODLAND</strong></td>
<td>Clements Series</td>
<td>Albemarle Series</td>
<td>Mockley Series</td>
<td>Clemson's Island Series</td>
<td>Late Owasco Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Albemarle Series</td>
<td></td>
<td>Early Owasco Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EARLY WOODLAND</strong></td>
<td>Vincent Series</td>
<td>Stoney Creek Series</td>
<td>Pope's Creek Series</td>
<td>Vinette I</td>
<td>Vinette I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARCHAIC?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marcey Creek Series</td>
<td>Marcey Creek Series</td>
<td>Marcey Creek Series</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>