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Location of early 1960s excavations by Buddy Calvin Jones at the Sam Kaufman site (41RR16), in Perttula, Walters, and Nelson article (Figure 1).
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Foreword

This volume of the *Journal of Northeast Texas Archaeology* contains articles on archaeological topics both old and new, from sites in both the Pineywoods and Post Oak Savannah of the Caddo area of Northeast Texas (Figure 1). Old archaeological topics are meant in the sense that several of the articles are concerned with the documentation of collections gathered from archaeological activities as long as 50 years ago. In the case of new archaeological topics, I mean this in the sense that with new archaeological knowledge gained through the study of the archaeology of Northeast Texas in recent years, current archaeologists working in the Caddo area may be able to understand with a finer clarity the nature of the region’s archaeological record. They can do this using both old documented collections as well as new archaeological material remains from survey, testing, and data recovery projects. and thus are able to better approach how and why the archaeological record took the character it did, especially during the millennia-long Caddo occupation.

Figure 1. Locations of sites and areas discussed in articles in this volume of the *Journal of Northeast Texas Archaeology*. 

---

*Journal of Northeast Texas Archaeology, Volume 36, 2012*
The *Journal of Northeast Texas Archaeology* exists to provide a venue for the publication of archaeological studies that provide useful and relevant information on all aspects of the archaeology of the region. As long as there are archaeologists working in the region that are willing to prepare articles that summarize their research findings—and thereby share their findings with a larger audience—we will continue to publish this journal. We urge readers, avocational and professional archaeologists alike, as well as others of like mind, to put pen to paper or finger to keyboard and take the time to prepare an article on an investigated site, a category of archaeological materials, or a specific research problem/topic relevant to Northeast Texas archaeology, and submit it to us for publication in the *Journal of Northeast Texas Archaeology*.

*Timothy K. Perttula*

*August 2011*
Early 1960s Excavations at the Sam Kaufman Site (41RR16), Red River County, Texas

Timothy K. Perttula, Mark Walters, and Bo Nelson

INTRODUCTION

The Sam Kaufman site (41RR16, also known as the Arnold Roitsch site for a time) is a well-known Caddo Indian village along Mound Prairie and the Red River in Red River County, Texas. There have been a number of reported archaeological investigations (Banks and Banks 2002; Bruseth 1998; Bruseth and Perttula 1991; Harris 1951, 1953; Harris and Wilson 1956; Harris et al. 1954; Perino 1983; Perkins 1955; Perttula 2008a; Perttula et al. 2001; Skinner et al. 1969), as well as bioarchaeological (Butler 1969; Derrick et al. 2008; Loveland 1980, 1994; Loveland and Bass 1983a, 1983b) studies, at the site, and at other nearby sites (Hampton and Moore 1936; Kenmotsu 2001, 2006; Perttula 2008b; Prikryl 2008; Reese 2001) since the 1930s.

This article reports on previously unknown investigations conducted by Buddy Calvin Jones in December 1961 through January 1962 at the Sam Kaufman site (Figure 1). His notes on the work—which primarily consist of burial plan drawings and a map or two—have recently been provided to the Gregg County Historical Museum (GCHM). Some of the collection of archaeological materials from the site have also been located at the GCHM, and in May 2011, we had the opportunity to document those materials (all ceramic vessels). Other vessels from the Jones investigations, but not in the GCHM collections, at the Sam Kaufman site are discussed in Perttula (2006:133-135) and Perttula et al. (2009:222-227).

Figure 1. Location of early 1960s excavations by Buddy Calvin Jones at the Sam Kaufman site (41RR16), in Perttula, Walters, and Nelson article (Figure 1).
EXCAVATIONS

The excavations completed by Buddy Jones at the Sam Kaufman site in the winter of 1961-1962 consisted of the excavation of eight burial features (Burials No. 1-8) near the eroding bank of the Red River (Figure 2). This prehistoric Caddo cemetery area was about 120 m due west of the West Mound at the site (see Figure 1). These areas have long been eroded away by the Red River; the West Mound was washed away in the flood of 1990 (Perttula 2008a:313).

Figure 2. Plan of the excavations along the Red River Bank.

The burial features were spaced out over an area of approximately 80 ft. east-west and 24 ft. north-south (ca. 24.4 x 7.3 m, or 178 m²). Three of the burials (No. 1, No. 4, and No. 7) were within 2-3 ft. of the Red River cut bank.

BURIAL FEATURES

In Jones’ notes, he provides detailed plan map of six of the eight burials (Nos. 2-4 and 6-8), and very small sketch maps of all the burials (see Figure 2). From these, it is apparent that eight of the nine burials (i.e., Burial No. 2 had two individuals placed in it) were placed in graves that were oriented east-west, with the face of the deceased facing west towards the Caddo’s House of the Dead in the Sky. The burials were placed in an extended supine position. Burial 6 was oriented northeast-southwest, with the head of the deceased pointing more towards the southwest. The majority of the burials from a terrace edge cemetery southeast of the East Mound were also oriented southwest-northeast (Perttula 2008a:Figures 5 and 37).

Burial 1 was placed in a pit approximately 7.2 ft in length and 3 ft. in width (see Figure 2); the burial pit size suggests this was an adult individual. The small sketch map that Jones prepared suggests that eight ceramic vessels were placed with the burial, four on each side of the body, beginning next to the head and extending to the waist area.

Five of the vessels are described by Perttula et al. (2009:222-226 and Figures 203-206). They are primarily shell-tempered. The include a large Nash Neck Banded jar, a small incised-punctated jar of undetermined type, an engraved jar of undetermined type with four lug handles, a hubcap style Simms Engraved, var. Darco carinated bowl, and a large plain grog-tempered carinated bowl. It is possible that a
Keno Trailed, *var. Phillips* bowl was among the vessels Jones recovered in Burial 1, along with a spool-necked bottle with an intertwined scroll motif on the body (Perttula 2006:134).

Burial No. 2 had two adult individuals placed in it, along with six vessels (Figure 3). The first burial (No. 1) was laid in the burial pit (the pit measured 6.5 ft x 3.5 ft.) first, in an extended position and the head facing west, and five of the six vessels were clustered by the left side of the head and left and right shoulder. Individual No. 2 was placed in the grave next to Individual No. 1, but the individual’s legs rested atop those of Individual No. 1, and the head faced almost due south. Individual No. 2 had a portion of a single vessel (a wide-mouthed bottle) placed in front of its face.

![Figure 3. Plan map of Burial No. 2.](image)

From the burial plan map, the vessels with Burial No. 2, Individual No. 1 included a Hudson Engraved bottle, two plain bowls, a Simms Engraved bowl, and an Avery Engraved deep bowl. The Simms Engraved, *var. Darco* carinated bowl has been previously documented by Perttula et al. (2009:226-227 and Figure 207).

Burial No. 3 had also been buried with their face oriented to the south (Figure 4). The burial pit was approximately 6.5 ft. in length and 3.5 ft. in width. The five burial vessels were placed around the left side of the head, at the left shoulder, and by the left leg. These vessels included a Hudson Engraved bottle, a Hudson Engraved jar (see below), two Nash Neck Banded jars, and an Avery Engraved deep bowl.

![Figure 4. Plan map of Burial No. 3.](image)
Burial No. 4 is an adult Caddo, placed in a pit that was 6.8 ft. in length and 3.25 ft. in width (Figure 5). The burial pit had been dug to 2.5 ft. bs. A small amount of wood charcoal was noted by Jones from the floor of the grave pit. This charcoal may represent the remnants of a fire constructed on the pit floor as part of the ceremonies conducted during the course of the mortuary rituals (cf. Gonzalez 2005).

A number of associated grave goods were placed in the burial pit to accompany the deceased on their journey. These include four ceramic vessels and five animal bones, several being tools. Two of the vessels are by the head of the deceased, a possible Keno Trailed, var. Phillips bowl by the right side, and a Keno Trailed bottle by the left shoulder. The other two vessels, a Nash Neck Banded jar, and a Simms Engraved shouldered bowl, were placed between the lower legs (see Figure 5). The animal bones included deer phalanges, a deer tibia tool, probably a beamer, and two bison rib tools, as well as part of a bison leg bone and a polished beaver tooth (see Figure 5).

Burial No. 5 was also that of an adult individual, based on the pit size of 6.5 ft. in length and 3.5 ft. in width (see Figure 2). The tiny sketch map of Burial 5 indicates that it had four associated ceramic vessels, three by the head and shoulders, and a fourth vessel by the lower left leg. One of the vessels was a plain shell-tempered bottle (see below) presumably placed by the head.

Burial No. 6 was placed in a burial pit that was 6.5 ft. in length and a narrow 2.2 ft. in width (Figure 6). It was accompanied by four associated ceramic vessels and a deer mandible placed by the left shoulder. The vessels depicted on Figure 6 include a large Nash Neck Banded jar (see also Perttula 2006:Figure 310) by the left side of the head, an incised jar of unknown type by and above the right side of the head, a Keno Trailed bottle (see Perttula 2006:Figure 309) resting on the right arm, and an engraved carinated bowl by the left elbow.

The Caddo adult buried in Burial No. 7 was placed in the grave in an east-west extended supine position, but the head was facing to the south (Figure 7), as was also the case for Individual No. 2 in Burial No. 1 and Burial No. 3. The Burial No. 7 pit is approximately 6.3 ft. in length and 2.5 ft. in width; the pit was excavated to 2 ft. bs.

Two ceramic vessels were apparently placed with the deceased in Burial No. 7 (see below), although there are sherds from a Hudson Engraved bottle labeled as coming from Burial No. 7 in the GCHM collections from the site; if this is the case, there is no information available on where it was placed in the grave. A Simms Engraved shouldered bowl was by the left arm, while a large Nash Neck Banded jar had been placed by the upper right leg.
Burial No. 8 excavated by Buddy Calvin Jones at the Sam Kaufman site was that of a child or adolescent. The burial pit was 4 ft. in length and 2 ft. wide (Figure 8), and had a depth of 2 ft. Notes included with the burial plan map indicate that Burial No. 8 was dug by the Caddo in a 1.3 ft. thick midden deposit, perhaps near a house location in the village, extending 0.7 ft. into a dark red and compact clay B-horizon.

The child or adolescent was accompanied at death with seven ceramic vessels. Six of them were placed along the right side of the body, from the head to its right leg. These include, from top to bottom, an Emory Punctated-Incised jar, two Hudson Engraved bottles, a second Emory Punctated-Incised jar, an Avery Engraved deep bowl, and a third Emory Punctated-Incised jar. One small Avery Engraved bowl was set on its waist.
VESSEL DESCRIPTIONS

In the GCHM are 22 vessels or vessel sections from the Sam Kaufman site (41RR16). Only a few of the vessels can be definitively identified at the present time with specific burials excavated by Jones, unfortunately. Each vessel or vessel section is described individually, following the burial vessel protocol that we adopted some years ago (Perttula et al. 1998; Perttula 2005) when we began actively documenting Caddo vessels from sites in East Texas and southwest Arkansas. In addition to several shell-tempered plain vessels (n=3), and unidentified incised (n=1) and appliqued (n=1) vessels, other shell-tempered vessels and vessel sections we have documented from the cemetery excavated by Jones in 1961-1962 include Avery Engraved (n=1), Emory Punctated-Incised (n=2), Hudson Engraved (n=5), Keno Trailed (n=1), McKinney Plain (n=1), Nash Neck Banded (n=5), Simms Engraved (n=1). There is also a grog-tempered Maxey Noded Redware bottle.

SITE NAME OR SITE NUMBER: Sam Kaufman, Burial No. 2

VESSEL NO.: 2003.08.1237

NON-PLASTICS AND PASTE: shell

VESSEL FORM: Bottle with a wide-mouth

RIM AND LIP FORM: N/A

CORE COLOR: A (fired and cooled in an oxidizing environment)

INTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: red

EXTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: red

WALL THICKNESS (RIM, BODY, AND BASE IN MM): body, 7.6 mm
INTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: none
EXTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: none
HEIGHT (IN CM): N/A
ORIFICE DIAMETER (IN CM): 8.2
DIAMETER AT BOTTOM OF RIM OR NECK (IN CM): 8.2
BASE DIAMETER (IN CM): N/A
ESTIMATED VOLUME (IN LITERS): N/A
DECORATION (INCLUDING MOTIF AND ELEMENTS WHEN APPARENT): Plain
PIGMENT USE AND LOCATION ON VESSEL: none
TYPE [IF KNOWN]: Unidentified plain ware. Associated with Individual No. 2 (see Figure 3).

SITE NAME OR SITE NUMBER: Sam Kaufman, Burial No. 2
VESSEL NO.: 2003.08.1238
NON-PLASTICS AND PASTE: shell
VESSEL FORM: Bowl with a very short rim
RIM AND LIP FORM: direct rim and a rounded, exterior folded lip
CORE COLOR: B (fired and cooled in a reducing environment)
INTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: very dark grayish-brown
EXTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: very dark grayish-brown; fire clouding on the body
WALL THICKNESS (RIM, BODY, AND BASE IN MM): rim, 2.8 mm; body, 5.8 mm; base, 7.0 mm
INTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: smoothed
EXTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: smoothed
HEIGHT (IN CM): 6.0
ORIFICE DIAMETER (IN CM): 10.0
DIAMETER AT BOTTOM OF RIM OR NECK (IN CM): 5.9
BASE DIAMETER (IN CM): 4.5
ESTIMATED VOLUME (IN LITERS): 0.24
DECORATION (INCLUDING MOTIF AND ELEMENTS WHEN APPARENT): Plain (Figure 9)
PIGMENT USE AND LOCATION ON VESSEL: none
TYPE [IF KNOWN]: Unidentified plain ware
Figure 9. Plain shell-tempered bowl, Burial 2 at the Sam Kaufman site. This vessel is associated with Burial individual No. 1 (see Figure 3).

SITE NAME OR SITE NUMBER: Sam Kaufman, Burial No. 3

VESSEL NO.: 2003.08.1117

NON-PLASTICS AND PASTE: shell

VESSEL FORM: Jar with short neck (Figure 10)

RIM AND LIP FORM: everted rim and a rounded, exterior folded lip

CORE COLOR: B (fired and cooled in a reducing environment)

INTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: very dark grayish-brown

EXTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: very dark grayish-brown; fire clouding on the body and base

WALL THICKNESS (RIM, BODY, AND BASE IN MM): rim, 5.2 mm

INTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: smoothed

EXTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: burnished

HEIGHT (IN CM): 12.0

ORIFICE DIAMETER (IN CM): 13.5

DIAMETER AT BOTTOM OF RIM OR NECK (IN CM): 10.9

BASE DIAMETER (IN CM): 8.8
ESTIMATED VOLUME (IN LITERS): 0.97

DECORATION (INCLUDING MOTIF AND ELEMENTS WHEN APPARENT): The vessel rim is plain, except for three sets of small appliqué nodes; it is also lip notched. The vessel body has three repeating sets of narrow curvilinear zones filled with cross-hatched engraved lines (Figure 10). These zones form scrolls that end in hooked arms as well as large cross-hatched elements, and there are upper and lower engraved triangles on either side of the large cross-hatched scrolls. There are also single curvilinear and ticked engraved lines that hook around two of the narrow cross-hatched zones.

PIGMENT USE AND LOCATION ON VESSEL: none

TYPE [IF KNOWN]: Hudson Engraved

Figure 10. Hudson Engraved jar, Burial No. 3 at the Sam Kaufman Site.

SITE NAME OR SITE NUMBER: Sam Kaufman, Burial No. 5
VESSEL NO.: 2003.08.1125
NON-PLASTICS AND PASTE: shell
VESSEL FORM: Bottle
RIM AND LIP FORM: N/A
CORE COLOR: F (fired in a reducing environment and cooled in the open air)
INTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: dark yellowish-brown
EXTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: dark yellowish-brown
WALL THICKNESS (RIM, BODY, AND BASE IN MM): body, 4.1 mm
INTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: none
EXTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: smoothed
HEIGHT (IN CM): N/A
ORIFICE DIAMETER (IN CM): N/A
DIAMETER AT BOTTOM OF RIM OR NECK (IN CM): N/A; maximum body diameter is 12.0 cm
BASE DIAMETER (IN CM): 7.0
ESTIMATED VOLUME (IN LITERS): N/A
DECORATION (INCLUDING MOTIF AND ELEMENTS WHEN APPARENT): Plain
PIGMENT USE AND LOCATION ON VESSEL: none
TYPE [IF KNOWN]: Unidentified plain ware

SITE NAME OR SITE NUMBER: Sam Kaufman, Burial No. 7
VESSEL NO.: 2003.08.977-a
NON-PLASTICS AND PASTE: shell
VESSEL FORM: Jar
RIM AND LIP FORM: everted rim and rounded lip
CORE COLOR: B (fired and cooled in a reducing environment)
INTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: dark gray
EXTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: dark gray
WALL THICKNESS (RIM, BODY, AND BASE IN MM): rim, 4.1 mm
INTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: smoothed
EXTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: none
HEIGHT (IN CM): N/A
ORIFICE DIAMETER (IN CM): 20.0
DIAMETER AT BOTTOM OF RIM OR NECK (IN CM): N/A
BASE DIAMETER (IN CM): N/A
ESTIMATED VOLUME (IN LITERS): N/A

DECORATION (INCLUDING MOTIF AND ELEMENTS WHEN APPARENT): There are three rows of neck banding on the vessel rim, along with appliqued nodes (probably four) above the neck banding and below the vessel lip.

PIGMENT USE AND LOCATION ON VESSEL: none

TYPE [IF KNOWN]: Nash Neck Banded

SITE NAME OR SITE NUMBER: Sam Kaufman, Burial No. 7
VESSEL NO.: 2003.08.977-b
NON-PLASTICS AND PASTE: shell
VESSEL FORM: Bottle
RIM AND LIP FORM: N/A
CORE COLOR: B (fired and cooled in a reducing environment)
INTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: dark gray
EXTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: dark gray
WALL THICKNESS (RIM, BODY, AND BASE IN MM): body, 6.3 mm
INTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: none
EXTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: none
HEIGHT (IN CM): N/A
ORIFICE DIAMETER (IN CM): N/A
DIAMETER AT BOTTOM OF RIM OR NECK (IN CM): N/A
BASE DIAMETER (IN CM): N/A
ESTIMATED VOLUME (IN LITERS): N/A

DECORATION (INCLUDING MOTIF AND ELEMENTS WHEN APPARENT): The vessel has narrow engraved scroll zones filled with hatched lines.

PIGMENT USE AND LOCATION ON VESSEL: none

TYPE [IF KNOWN]: Hudson Engraved

SITE NAME OR SITE NUMBER: Sam Kaufman, Burial No. 7
VESSEL NO.: 2003.08.977c
NON-PLASTICS AND PASTE: shell
VESSEL FORM: Shouldered bowl
RIM AND LIP FORM: inverted rim and a rounded lip
CORE COLOR: B (fired and cooled in a reducing environment)
INTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: black
EXTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: black
WALL THICKNESS (RIM, BODY, AND BASE IN MM): rim, 4.8 mm
INTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: burnished
EXTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: burnished
HEIGHT (IN CM): N/A
ORIFICE DIAMETER (IN CM): 15.0
DIAMETER AT BOTTOM OF RIM OR NECK (IN CM): N/A
BASE DIAMETER (IN CM): N/A
ESTIMATED VOLUME (IN LITERS): N/A
DECORATION (INCLUDING MOTIF AND ELEMENTS WHEN APPARENT): The rim of the vessel is plain, except for a notched lip. The vessel body has a single horizontal engraved line with tick marks on it.
PIGMENT USE AND LOCATION ON VESSEL: none
TYPE [IF KNOWN]: Simms Engraved

SITE NAME OR SITE NUMBER: Sam Kaufman
VESSEL NO.: 2003.08.1118
NON-PLASTICS AND PASTE: shell
VESSEL FORM: Jar
RIM AND LIP FORM: everted rim and a rounded lip
CORE COLOR: B (fired and cooled in a reducing environment)
INTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: very dark grayish-brown
EXTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: dark grayish-brown
WALL THICKNESS (RIM, BODY, AND BASE IN MM): rim, 6.2 mm; body, 5.1 mm
INTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: none
EXTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: none
HEIGHT (IN CM): 15.6
ORIFICE DIAMETER (IN CM): 18.0
DIAMETER AT BOTTOM OF RIM OR NECK (IN CM): 18.3
BASE DIAMETER (IN CM): 6.5; dimpled base
ESTIMATED VOLUME (IN LITERS): 1.68

DECORATION (INCLUDING MOTIF AND ELEMENTS WHEN APPARENT): There are six rows of horizontal neck bands on the rim, as well as four appliqued nodes near the lip. The upper vessel body has four appliqued chevrons, centered under the appliqued nodes (Figure 11).

PIGMENT USE AND LOCATION ON VESSEL: none

TYPE [IF KNOWN]: Nash Neck Banded

SITE NAME OR SITE NUMBER: Sam Kaufman
VESSEL NO.: 2003.08.1119
NON-PLASTICS AND PASTE: shell
VESSEL FORM: Jar
RIM AND LIP FORM: everted rim and a rounded lip
CORE COLOR: F (fired in a reducing environment and cooled in the open air)
INTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: dark yellowish-brown

Figure 11, Nash Neck Banded jar from the Sam Kaufman site.
EXTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: dark yellowish-brown
WALL THICKNESS (RIM, BODY, AND BASE IN MM): rim, 5.2 mm; body, 5.1 mm; base, 7.9 mm
INTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: smoothed
EXTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: none
HEIGHT (IN CM): 13.5
ORIFICE DIAMETER (IN CM): 14.5
DIAMETER AT BOTTOM OF RIM OR NECK (IN CM): 12.0
BASE DIAMETER (IN CM): 6.6
ESTIMATED VOLUME (IN LITERS): 1.2
DECORATION (INCLUDING MOTIF AND ELEMENTS WHEN APPARENT): The rim has three equally-spaced horizontal rows of tool punctations, as well as four appliqued nodes set above the punctations (Figure 12). The upper vessel body has four sets of curvilinear appliqued fillets, centered on the body between each of the appliqued nodes on the rim. This vessel closely matches the drawing of one of the vessels in Burial No. 8 (see Figure 8).

PIGMENT USE AND LOCATION ON VESSEL: none

TYPE [IF KNOWN]: Emory Punctated-Incised

SITE NAME OR SITE NUMBER: Sam Kaufman

VESSEL NO.: 2003.08.1120a

NON-PLASTICS AND PASTE: shell

VEssel FORM: Jar

RIM AND LIP FORM: everted rim and a rounded, exterior folded lip

CORE COLOR: B (fired and cooled in a reducing environment)

INTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: dark grayish-brown

EXTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: dark grayish-brown

WALL THICKNESS (RIM, BODY, AND BASE IN MM): rim, 4.9 mm

Figure 12. Emory Punctated-Incised jar from the Sam Kaufman site.
INTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: smoothed
EXTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: none
HEIGHT (IN CM): N/A
ORIFICE DIAMETER (IN CM): N/A
DIAMETER AT BOTTOM OF RIM OR NECK (IN CM): N/A
BASE DIAMETER (IN CM): N/A
ESTIMATED VOLUME (IN LITERS): N/A
DECORATION (INCLUDING MOTIF AND ELEMENTS WHEN APPARENT): The jar has at least one row of neck banding, and there are appliqued nodes (probably four) under the vessel lip.
PIGMENT USE AND LOCATION ON VESSEL: none
TYPE [IF KNOWN]: Nash Neck Banded

SITE NAME OR SITE NUMBER: Sam Kaufman
VESSEL NO.: 2003.08.1120b
NON-PLASTICS AND PASTE: shell
VESSEL FORM: Jar
RIM AND LIP FORM: N/A
CORE COLOR: F (fired in a reducing environment and cooled in the open air)
INTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: dark yellowish-brown
EXTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: dark yellowish-brown
WALL THICKNESS (RIM, BODY, AND BASE IN MM): body, 5.7 mm
INTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: smoothed
EXTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: none
HEIGHT (IN CM): N/A
ORIFICE DIAMETER (IN CM): N/A
DIAMETER AT BOTTOM OF RIM OR NECK (IN CM): N/A
BASE DIAMETER (IN CM): N/A
ESTIMATED VOLUME (IN LITERS): N/A
DECORATION (INCLUDING MOTIF AND ELEMENTS WHEN APPARENT): The vessel body has incised triangles (probably pendant from the rim-body juncture) filled with diagonal incised lines.
PIGMENT USE AND LOCATION ON VESSEL: none
TYPE [IF KNOWN]: Emory Punctated-Incised
SITE NAME OR SITE NUMBER: Sam Kaufman
VESSEL NO.: 2003.08.1120c
NON-PLASTICS AND PASTE: shell
VESSEL FORM: Jar with four appliqued lugs on the rim
RIM AND LIP FORM: everted rim and a rounded lip
CORE COLOR: F (fired in a reducing environment and cooled in the open air)
INTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: dark yellowish-brown
EXTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: dark yellowish-brown
WALL THICKNESS (RIM, BODY, AND BASE IN MM): rim, 5.4 mm; body, 4.6 mm; base, 5.9 mm
INTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: smoothed
EXTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: smoothed
HEIGHT (IN CM): 21.5
ORIFICE DIAMETER (IN CM): 17.0
DIAMETER AT BOTTOM OF RIM OR NECK (IN CM): 12.4
BASE DIAMETER (IN CM): 7.8
ESTIMATED VOLUME (IN LITERS): 3.2
DECORATION (INCLUDING MOTIF AND ELEMENTS WHEN APPARENT): The rim is decorated with three rows of horizontal neck bands sandwiched between four appliqued lugs. The vessel body has four sets of narrow triangular-shaped appliqued fillet elements that are pendant from the rim-body junction (Figure 13).
PIGMENT USE AND LOCATION ON VESSEL: none
TYPE [IF KNOWN]: Nash Neck Banded

SITE NAME OR SITE NUMBER: Sam Kaufman
VESSEL NO.: 2003.08.1121
NON-PLASTICS AND PASTE: shell
VESSEL FORM: Jar
RIM AND LIP FORM: everted rim and rounded lip
CORE COLOR: B (fired and cooled in a reducing environment)
INTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: black; organic residue on the rim and body
EXTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: black; organic residue on the body
WALL THICKNESS (RIM, BODY, AND BASE IN MM): rim, 4.3 mm; body, 5.3 mm
INTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: smoothed
EXTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: smoothed
HEIGHT (IN CM): N/A; rim height is 1.8 cm
ORIFICE DIAMETER (IN CM): 11.0
DIAMETER AT BOTTOM OF RIM OR NECK (IN CM): 10.6
BASE DIAMETER (IN CM): N/A
ESTIMATED VOLUME (IN LITERS): N/A
DECORATION (INCLUDING MOTIF AND ELEMENTS WHEN APPARENT): The vessel rim is plain, while the vessel body has four sets of appliqued ridge chevron elements that are pendant from the rim-body juncture (Figure 14).
PIGMENT USE AND LOCATION ON VESSEL: none
TYPE [IF KNOWN]: possible McKinney Plain
SITE NAME OR SITE NUMBER: Sam Kaufman
VESSEL NO.: 2003.08.1122
NON-PLASTICS AND PASTE: shell
VESSEL FORM: Bowl
RIM AND LIP FORM: everted-rounded
CORE COLOR: F (fired in a reducing environment and cooled in the open air)
INTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: red
EXTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: red
WALL THICKNESS (RIM, BODY, AND BASE IN MM): body, 5.5 mm; base, 5.7 mm
INTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: smoothed
EXTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: burnished
HEIGHT (IN CM): N/A
ORIFICE DIAMETER (IN CM): N/A
DIAMETER AT BOTTOM OF RIM OR NECK (IN CM): N/A
BASE DIAMETER (IN CM): 5.1

ESTIMATED VOLUME (IN LITERS): N/A

DECORATION (INCLUDING MOTIF AND ELEMENTS WHEN APPARENT): The vessel has a red slip on both interior and exterior surfaces as well as curvilinear engraved and negative engraved elements, including ovals and excised zones (Figure 15).

PIGMENT USE AND LOCATION ON VESSEL: none

TYPE [IF KNOWN]: Avery Engraved

Figure 15. Avery Engraved bowl sherds from the Sam Kaufman site.
SITE NAME OR SITE NUMBER: Sam Kaufman
VESSEL NO.: 2003.08.1123
NON-PLASTICS AND PASTE: shell
VESSEL FORM: Bottle
RIM AND LIP FORM: direct rim and a rounded, exterior folded lip
CORE COLOR: B (fired and cooled in a reducing environment)
INTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: dark grayish-brown
EXTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: very dark grayish-brown
WALL THICKNESS (RIM, BODY, AND BASE IN MM): rim, 4.6 mm; body, 4.6 mm
INTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: none
EXTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: burnished
HEIGHT (IN CM): N/A
ORIFICE DIAMETER (IN CM): 2.2
DIAMETER AT BOTTOM OF RIM OR NECK (IN CM): N/A
BASE DIAMETER (IN CM): N/A
ESTIMATED VOLUME (IN LITERS): N/A
DECORATION (INCLUDING MOTIF AND ELEMENTS WHEN APPARENT): The vessel body has narrow engraved curvilinear zones and bracket-shaped elements filled with hatched or opposed hatched engraved lines (Figure 16).
PIGMENT USE AND LOCATION ON VESSEL: none
TYPE [IF KNOWN]: Hudson Engraved

SITE NAME OR SITE NUMBER: Sam Kaufman
VESSEL NO.: 2003.08.1124
NON-PLASTICS AND PASTE: shell
VESSEL FORM: Bottle
RIM AND LIP FORM: N/A
CORE COLOR: B (fired and cooled in a reducing environment)
INTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: dark grayish-brown
EXTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: dark grayish-brown
WALL THICKNESS (RIM, BODY, AND BASE IN MM): body, 8.1 mm
INTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: none

EXTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: smoothed

HEIGHT (IN CM): N/A

ORIFICE DIAMETER (IN CM): N/A

DIAMETER AT BOTTOM OF RIM OR NECK (IN CM): N/A

BASE DIAMETER (IN CM): N/A

ESTIMATED VOLUME (IN LITERS): N/A

DECORATION (INCLUDING MOTIF AND ELEMENTS WHEN APPARENT): The vessel body and base has four sets of engraved meandering scrolls. The meandering scrolls are filled with hatched en-
graved lines, as well as four sets of negative ovals, including at the central part of the first scroll (Figure 17).

PIGMENT USE AND LOCATION ON VESSEL: none

TYPE [IF KNOWN]: Hudson Engraved

Figure 17. Partial Hudson Engraved bottle from the Sam Kaufman site. It closely matches a Hudson Engraved bottle in Burial No. 6 (see Figure 6).

SITE NAME OR SITE NUMBER: Sam Kaufman

VESSEL NO.: 2003.08.1228

NON-PLASTICS AND PASTE: shell

VESSEL FORM: Bottle

RIM AND LIP FORM: N/A

CORE COLOR: B (fired and cooled in a reducing environment)

INTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: dark grayish-brown

EXTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: dark grayish-brown

WALL THICKNESS (RIM, BODY, AND BASE IN MM): body, 4.1 mm

INTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: none
EXTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: none
HEIGHT (IN CM): N/A
ORIFICE DIAMETER (IN CM): N/A
DIAMETER AT BOTTOM OF RIM OR NECK (IN CM): N/A
BASE DIAMETER (IN CM): N/A
ESTIMATED VOLUME (IN LITERS): N/A
DECORATION (INCLUDING MOTIF AND ELEMENTS WHEN APPARENT): The vessel body is decorated with hatched engraved meandering scrolls.
PIGMENT USE AND LOCATION ON VESSEL: none
TYPE [IF KNOWN]: Hudson Engraved

SITE NAME OR SITE NUMBER: Sam Kaufman
VESSEL NO.: 2003.08.1240
NON-PLASTICS AND PASTE: grog
VESSEL FORM: Bottle
RIM AND LIP FORM: direct rim and a rounded lip
CORE COLOR: A (fired and cooled in an oxidizing environment)
INTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: light gray
EXTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: red
WALL THICKNESS (RIM, BODY, AND BASE IN MM): rim, 4.8 mm; body, 5.3 mm; base, 5.8 mm
INTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: none
EXTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: burnished
HEIGHT (IN CM): N/A
ORIFICE DIAMETER (IN CM): 4.9
DIAMETER AT BOTTOM OF RIM OR NECK (IN CM): 5.6
BASE DIAMETER (IN CM): 7.3
ESTIMATED VOLUME (IN LITERS): N/A
DECORATION (INCLUDING MOTIF AND ELEMENTS WHEN APPARENT): The vessel has a red slip on its exterior surface. The upper part of the vessel body has five sets of short appliqued ridges (Figure 18).
PIGMENT USE AND LOCATION ON VESSEL: none
TYPE [IF KNOWN]: Maxey Noded Redware
Figure 18. Maxey Noded Redware bottle from the Sam Kaufman site.
SITE NAME OR SITE NUMBER: Sam Kaufman
VESSEL NO.: 2003.08.1513a
NON-PLASTICS AND PASTE: shell
VESSEL FORM: Jar
RIM AND LIP FORM: everted rim and rounded lip
CORE COLOR: B (fired and cooled in a reducing environment)
INTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: dark gray
EXTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: dark gray
WALL THICKNESS (RIM, BODY, AND BASE IN MM): rim, 5.9 mm; body, 7.1 mm
INTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: none
EXTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: none
HEIGHT (IN CM): N/A
ORIFICE DIAMETER (IN CM): 18.0
DIAMETER AT BOTTOM OF RIM OR NECK (IN CM): N/A
BASE DIAMETER (IN CM): N/A
ESTIMATED VOLUME (IN LITERS): N/A
DECORATION (INCLUDING MOTIF AND ELEMENTS WHEN APPARENT): The rim has two rows of tool punctations, and four appliqued nodes set amidst the uppermost tool punctated row. The vessel body has a triangular-shaped appliqued fillet element repeated around the vessel, and centered under the appliqued nodes.
PIGMENT USE AND LOCATION ON VESSEL: none
TYPE [IF KNOWN]: Emory Punctated-Incised

SITE NAME OR SITE NUMBER: Sam Kaufman
VESSEL NO.: 2003.08.1513b
NON-PLASTICS AND PASTE: shell
VESSEL FORM: Bottle
RIM AND LIP FORM: N/A
CORE COLOR: B (fired and cooled in a reducing environment)
INTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: dark gray
EXTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: dark gray
WALL THICKNESS (RIM, BODY, AND BASE IN MM): body, 3.2 mm
INTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: none
EXTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: none
HEIGHT (IN CM): N/A
ORIFICE DIAMETER (IN CM): N/A
DIAMETER AT BOTTOM OF RIM OR NECK (IN CM): N/A
BASE DIAMETER (IN CM): N/A
ESTIMATED VOLUME (IN LITERS): N/A
DECORATION (INCLUDING MOTIF AND ELEMENTS WHEN APPARENT): The vessel body has at least seven sets of opposed incised lines that encircle the vessel.
PIGMENT USE AND LOCATION ON VESSEL: none
TYPE [IF KNOWN]: possible Keno Trailed

SITE NAME OR SITE NUMBER: Sam Kaufman
VESSEL NO.: 2003.08.1514
NON-PLASTICS AND PASTE: shell
VESSEL FORM: Jar
RIM AND LIP FORM: everted rim and rounded lip
CORE COLOR: B (fired and cooled in a reducing environment)
INTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: dark grayish-brown
EXTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: dark grayish-brown
WALL THICKNESS (RIM, BODY, AND BASE IN MM): rim, 7.4 mm; body, 6.2 mm; base, 9.0 mm
INTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: none
EXTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: none
HEIGHT (IN CM): N/A; rim height is 3.8 cm
ORIFICE DIAMETER (IN CM): 20.0
DIAMETER AT BOTTOM OF RIM OR NECK (IN CM): 16.0
BASE DIAMETER (IN CM): 7.5
ESTIMATED VOLUME (IN LITERS): N/A
DECORATION (INCLUDING MOTIF AND ELEMENTS WHEN APPARENT): There are appliqued nodes under the vessel lip, but the rim is otherwise plain.
PIGMENT USE AND LOCATION ON VESSEL: none
TYPE [IF KNOWN]: Unidentified utility ware
SITE NAME OR SITE NUMBER: Sam Kaufman

VESSEL NO.: 2003.08.1872

NON-PLASTICS AND PASTE: shell

VESSEL FORM: Jar

RIM AND LIP FORM: everted rim and a rounded, exterior folded lip

CORE COLOR: B (fired and cooled in a reducing environment)

INTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: dark grayish-brown

EXTERIOR SURFACE COLOR: dark grayish-brown

WALL THICKNESS (RIM, BODY, AND BASE IN MM): rim, 4.7 mm; body, 5.6 mm; base, 9.2 mm

INTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: smoothed

EXTERIOR SURFACE TREATMENT: smoothed

HEIGHT (IN CM): 20.0

ORIFICE DIAMETER (IN CM): 20.0

DIAMETER AT BOTTOM OF RIM OR NECK (IN CM): 20.0

BASE DIAMETER (IN CM): 10.5

ESTIMATED VOLUME (IN LITERS): 3.6

DECORATION (INCLUDING MOTIF AND ELEMENTS WHEN APPARENT): The rim is decorated with three horizontal rows of neck banding.

PIGMENT USE AND LOCATION ON VESSEL: none

TYPE [IF KNOWN]: Nash Neck Banded

SUMMARY AND SYNTHESIS

During the winter of 1961-1962, Buddy Calvin Jones located and excavated eight burials along the cut bank of the Red River at the Sam Kaufman site (41RR16). The cemetery was located about 120 m west of the West Mound at the site. The burials were Caddo adults and one adolescent individual from the Sam Kaufman village that were placed in extended supine positions in the grave pits, and these pits were aligned mostly east-west, with the head facing west; in the case of three individuals in three different burials, their bodies were oriented east-west, but their head was turned to face in a southerly direction. Burial No. 2 had two individuals placed in it, one individual lying partially over the other (see Figure 3).

Ceramic vessels were placed as associated grave goods in all eight of the burials in the cemetery, with a range of two-eight vessels per burial (Table 1). the mean number of vessels is 5.0 ± 1.5 per burial. The only other grave goods were a number of bone tools, bison bone, deer bone, and a polished beaver tooth from Burial No. 4. The relatively mundane and redundant character of the associated grave goods from these burials suggests they are the burials of typical village residents, and were not part of the elite (i.e., religious and political leaders and their retainers) population who lived at the site and were buried in the East Mound (Perttula 2008a:Figure 6; Skinner et al. 1969)
The constellation of ceramic vessel types in this collection from the Sam Kaufman site, most notably the many shell-tempered ceramic types, indicates that the eight burial features excavated by Buddy Calvin Jones date to the latter part of the Late Caddo McCurtain phase, after ca. A.D. 1450/1500 (Perino 1994:28; Perttula 1992:Table 11, 2008a:377 and Table 1), and extending to between ca. A.D. 1650/1700. This age range is consistent with the occurrence of Hudson Engraved and Keno Trailed from a number of the burials, and the hubcap-shaped variety of Simms Engraved in Burial No. 2. Other ceramic types—Avery Engraved, Emory Punctated-Incised, McKinney Plain, and Nash Neck Banded—tend to occur in both the early and late parts of the McCurtain phase.

Table 1. Associated Grave Goods from Burials 1-8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Associated Grave Goods</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B3</th>
<th>B4</th>
<th>B5</th>
<th>B6</th>
<th>B7</th>
<th>B8</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic Vessels</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone tools</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bison bone</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer bone</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver tooth</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Ceramic Types by Burial Features and Unprovenienced Contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramic Type</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B3</th>
<th>B4</th>
<th>B5</th>
<th>B6</th>
<th>B7</th>
<th>B8</th>
<th>UNK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grog-tempered</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxey Noded Redware</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shell-tempered</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avery Engraved</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory Punctated-Incised</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson Engraved</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keno Trailed</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinney Plain</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nash Neck Banded</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simms Engraved</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x=present; UNK=unknown
The grog-tempered Maxey Noded Redware bottle from an unknown provenience in the Sam Kaufman collection is very likely not associated with any of the post-ca. A.D. 1450/1500 Late Caddo burials in the cemetery. This distinctive ceramic type (see Suhm and Jelks 1962:Plate 51) is typically found in Middle Caddo period contexts along the middle Red River, in this case in Mound Prairie phase occupations dating from ca. A.D. 1100-1300 (Perttula 2008a:Table 1).
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Three Mounds Creek Site, Gregg County, Texas

Timothy K. Perttula

INTRODUCTION

One of the prehistoric Caddo sites represented in the Buddy Calvin Jones Collections at the Gregg County Historical Museum (GCHM) is the Three Mounds Creek site in Gregg County, in East Texas. The site is GC-68 in the Jones site numbering system (68th site he discovered in Gregg County).

The available information about the site in the GCHM records is sketchy at best. The site had three mounds along Spring Creek, near its confluence with the Sabine River, in the Longview area. A search of Gregg County 7.5’ USGS topographic quadrangles failed to disclose a Spring Creek in the Sabine River basin, so it is likely that the Spring Creek appellation is an informal one used by Jones at the time. Jones’ notes also fail to describe the mounds in any fashion, nor their relationship to each other or the landform they were built on, and no map is available that shows the location of the three mounds with respect to where he collected artifacts from the site.

RECOVERED ARTIFACTS

In April 1956, Jones excavated a 9.5 x 12 ft. (2.9 x 3.6 m) unit at the site, in an old cotton field. It is unknown if this unit was placed in one of the three mounds, or what the vertical, horizontal, or depositional context of the artifacts from the site in the GCHM collections was. In this work, he recovered 264 artifacts, predominantly ceramic sherds (Table 1), along with a few chipped lithic tools and debris, as well as animal bone and mussel shell fragments. The recovery of these food trash items, and the abundance of ceramic sherds, suggests that Jones’ excavation may have been placed in a domestic habitation area at the site.

The decorated ceramic sherds from the site include 31 Caddo sherds and one Woodland period rocker stamped sherd. This particular sherd has rows of rocker stamping, but is not large enough to determine if the stamping is zoned by incised lines (cf. varieties of Marksville Stamped, including var. Troyville) or not (cf. Indian Bay Stamped, Tchefuncte Stamped, or Chevalier Stamped) (see Brown 1998:33-34). In any event, the rocker stamped sherd points to a pre-A.D. 850 Woodland period use of the Three Mounds Creek site.

The Caddo sherds from the Three Mounds Creek site are dominated by utility wares, likely cooking and storage jars, decorated with brushed marks on rim and body or incised, punctated, or incised-punctated vessel sherds (Table 2). The relatively high proportion of brushed sherds (58%) suggests the site was likely to have been occupied sometime after ca. A.D. 1300.

Brushed vessel sherds are a particularly notable feature of Late Caddo ceramic assemblages in the region, but are also a significant part of the ceramic assemblage at Middle Caddo period (ca. A.D. 1200-1425) mound sites in East Texas such as Washington Square (41NA49, occupied ca. A.D. 1250-1425) and Oak Hill Village (41RK214, especially in the Late Village, dating from ca. A.D. 1350-1450). Brushed sherds comprise 55% of the decorated sherds at Washington Square (Perttula 2009:Table 2) and 26.7% of the decorated sherds in the Late Village at Oak Hill Village (Rogers and Perttula 2004:Table 68).
Table 1. Artifacts recovered from the Three Mounds Creek site (GC-68).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact category</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ceramic Artifacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain rim and body sherds</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorated body sherds</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lithic Artifacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrow point preform, quartzite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biface fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithic debris</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polishing stone, quartzite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food remains</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal bones</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mussel shell fragments</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>264</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Decorated Caddo sherds from the Three Mounds Creek site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decorative Method</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utility Wares</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brushed</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brushed-Incised</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incised</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctated</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incised-Punctated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fine Wares</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engraved, pendant triangles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The one fine ware sherd is notable in light of the possibility that the Three Mounds Creek site was occupied beginning in the Middle Caddo period. This is a bottle sherd with at least three horizontal engraved lines on the vessel body, two of which have hatched pendant triangles whose apexes point toward each other. This engraved decorative element on a bottle is one of the consistently occurring elements in a Middle Caddo style zone that has been recognized in Caddo communities in the Angelina, Sabine, and Big Cypress stream basins (Hart and Perttula 2010:203-207).

TEMPORAL AND CULTURAL AFFILIATION

In the absence of radiocarbon dates, or a larger sample of decorated sherds, the temporal age of the Three Creeks Mound site—or at least the assemblage of Caddo sherds recovered by Buddy Calvin Jones in 1956—is likely to be from the late 13th or early 14th century to the mid-15th century A.D. This is based primarily on the relative proportions of brushed sherds and the one engraved bottle sherd with pendant triangles. Nevertheless, because brushed vessels continued to be made by Caddo groups living in the Sabine River basin into the 17th century, it could have been occupied that late. Most likely, but pure speculation, the Three Mounds Creek site may have been occupied at the same time (ca. A.D. 1300 to at least the mid-A.D. 1500s) as the premier Caddo mound center in this part of the Sabine River basin—the Pine Tree Mound site (41HS15, Fields and Gadus 2011; Maki and Fields 2010:293). It may have been a subsidiary mound in a larger political community in this locale.

CONCLUSIONS

Although the available notes are skimpy, and the information they provide is not particularly substantive, it appears that Buddy Calvin Jones identified and investigated a Caddo mound site in Gregg County, Texas, back in 1956. The location of the site—Three Mounds Creek—has not been established on the ground, and the only locational information is that it is situated along a Spring Creek near its confluence with the Sabine River in the Longview, Texas, area. The shape and sizes of the mounds are also unknown.

All that is known at the present time is that Jones excavated a unit (2.9 x 3.6 m in size) on the site and recovered a small sample of domestic Caddo artifacts, particularly ceramic sherds. The decorated sherds in the assemblage suggest that the Caddo occupation of the site—and probably the construction of the mounds there—likely took place in the Middle Caddo period (ca. A.D. 1200-1425), but it could have lasted into the 16th century and beyond, based on the popularity of brushed utility ware vessels in local ceramic assemblages.
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DOCUMENTATION OF A COLLECTION FROM THE POOLE SITE (41TT47) IN THE BIG CYPRESS CREEK BASIN IN EAST TEXAS

TIMOTHY K. PERTTULA

INTRODUCTION

The Poole site (41TT47) is about 2.5 miles south of Mt. Pleasant, and is now situated within the Mount Pleasant Wastewater Treatment Plant. The site was originally recorded by Milton Bell and Ken Brown in 1971, who described it as “a thin scatter of artifacts, bone fragments, and charcoal flecks brought to surface on gopher hills” (Texas Historic Sites Atlas 2011). The site was estimated at ca. 50 x 50 m in size; the artifacts “occurred mostly at the south side of the site. A metate was found in the center of the darker area. Wood charcoal flecks may be from more recent clearing” (Texas Historic Sites Atlas 2011). Their site map showed a 10 x 12 m area with a dark organic staining, possibly evidence for a midden, or more recent burning activities. Bell and Brown suggested that the site may have a Late Caddo (ca. A.D. 1430-1680), Titus phase, occupation.

At the time the site was recorded in 1971, it appeared to be basically undisturbed, except for activities associated with the construction of a stock tank and its associated earthen berm just to the southeast of the Poole site. Thurmond (1990:82) subsequently examined a small collection of sherds from the Poole site, and described it as a “Late Caddoan limited use area.” The Late Caddoan attribution of the site was based on one brushed body sherd and a Maydelle Incised jar rim.

In 1990, the Mount Pleasant Wastewater Treatment Plant was under construction on the northern end of the Poole site, across a fence line from a pasture where intact archeological deposits likely remained undisturbed. At that time, a small collection of artifacts was obtained from a private individual from the northern part of the Poole site before a lab building was fully constructed on the southern part of this tract of land. It is those artifacts that are the subject of this article.

According to Perttula and Nelson (1999), who conducted an archaeological survey of a part of the Poole site in 1999 because of proposed 1999 water and sewer system lines for the new City of Mount Pleasant municipal airport, it is a small prehistoric Titus phase settlement that dates from ca. A.D. 1430-1680. Although only a small portion of the site lay within the specific project area where the archaeological survey was conducted, like most Titus phase settlements, it may well contain trash middens, evidence for structures and other features, and a small family cemetery.

SITE SETTING

The site is situated on an upland ridge (310 feet amsl) overlooking the floodplain on the west side of Hart Creek, a southward-flowing tributary of Big Cypress Creek. The ridge is about 3-6 m above the floodplain.

ARTIFACT ASSEMBLAGE

The assemblage of artifacts in this documented collection includes 36 ceramic sherds, three lithic tools or tool fragments, three pieces of lithic debris, and one core.
Ceramic Sherds

The ceramic sherds from the Poole site include 24 plain body and base sherds and 12 decorated rim and body sherds (Table 1). The plain/decorated sherd ratio is 2.0. The sherds are primarily from grog-tempered vessels, as 86% have grog as the sole or principal temper. Almost 14% of the sherds have bone temper, either as the sole temper or in combination with crushed hematite; hematite is noted in only two sherd (5.6%). One grog-tempered engraved body sherd is from a vessel made with a naturally sandy paste.

Table 1. Detailed sherd analysis, the Poole site (41TT47).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sherd Type</th>
<th>Temper</th>
<th>FC</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>Th (mm)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rim</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>diagonal incised; direct rim and rounded lip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rim</td>
<td>bone-hem.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>I/E</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>horizontal, vertical, and diagonal engraved lines; direct rim and flat lip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>parallel pinched ridges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>tool punctated row</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>fingernail punctated rows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog/SP</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>single straight engraved line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>parallel engraved lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog-bone</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I/E</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog-hem.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>I/E</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>base</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FC=firing conditions; ST=surface treatment; Th=thickness; I=interior; E=exterior; SM=smoothed; SP=sandy paste; A=firing and cooled in an oxidizing environment; B=fired and cooled in a reducing environment; E=incompletely oxidized during firing; F-H=fired in a reducing environment and cooled in the open air.
The sherds are also from vessels that were fired in a variety of ways. The majority (64%), however, are from vessels that were fired in a reducing environment, but cooled in the open air (see Table 1), leaving a thin oxidized zone on either one or both sherd core surfaces. The remainder of the sherds were fired in either an oxidizing or high oxygen environment (14.3%), were fired and cooled in a reducing or low oxygen environment (14.3%), or were incompletely oxidized during firing (7.1%).

The vessels were coil-made, beginning from a flat, thick (12.8 mm), disk base, then building the walls upwards to the rim. Rims range from 5.5-7.2 mm in thickness, while body walls range from 5.1-10.0 mm. Decorated utility ware body sherds have a mean thickness of 9.1 ± 0.73 mm, suggesting utility ware vessels were larger in size and relatively durable. The mean thickness of fine ware engraved body sherds, by contrast, is 7.1 ± 2.0 mm. Fine wares apparently included both large and durable vessels as well as small and more delicate vessels.

Decorated fine ware sherds include two body sherds with a single straight line, one on the interior vessel surface (probably from a carinated bowl), two body sherds with parallel engraved lines (Figure 1e), and a rim sherd with horizontal, vertical, and diagonal engraved lines (Figure 1c). This sherd has some resemblances to Holly Fine Engraved (Suhm and Jelks 1962), although there is no visible excised triangle area on it; such a sherd suggests a pre-A.D. 1300 age, as Holly Fine Engraved vessels were made in East Texas up until ca. A.D. 1300 or thereabouts (Story 1990).

---

Figure 1. Decorated sherds from the Poole site (41TT47): a, pinched ridge body sherd; b, diagonal incised rim sherd; c, horizontal, vertical, and diagonal engraved rim sherd; d, fingernail punctated body sherd; e, parallel engraved body sherd. Sherd drawings by Lance Trask.
The decorated utility ware sherds (n=7) are from vessels where the decoration was applied while the vessel was still wet, and had not been dried or fired. Utility ware vessels also tend to have coarse temper, thick body walls, and would have been employed for cooking or storage purposes. Two sherds have incised decorations (see Figure 1b), one has an incised-punctated decoration, three are punctated (see Figure 1d), and one has parallel pinched ridges (see Figure 1a).

The incised rim has a series of diagonal incised lines on it (see Figure 1b), and the lines would have extended around the entire vessel rim. The other incised sherd, a body sherd, has only a single straight incised line on it. One body sherd has opposed incised lines above a row of tool punctations; the punctations are likely at the rim-body juncture, although this is impossible to discern because of the small sherd size.

The pinched body sherd has closely-spaced parallel pinched ridges that cover the entire sherd surface (see Figure 1a). Given the apparent temporal context of the sherd, this may be from a Hollyknowe Pinched Ridged jar (cf. Webb and McKinney 1975).

Two of the sherd punctated body sherds have a single row of tool punctations, probably as a decorative element on the body of utility ware jars. The third punctated sherd has rows of widely spaced fingernail punctations (see Figure 1d) that would have covered much of the vessel body surface.

**Chipped and Ground Stone Tools**

Both chipped stone tools are flake tools. One is a unilateral gray chert flake tool with a 6.4+ mm use worn length, while the other is a gray novaculite side scraper (Figure 2). The scraper has a 26.0 mm use-worn length. Gray novaculite is also a non-local raw material that is available in Red River gravels or sources in the Ouachita Mountains of southeastern Oklahoma (Banks 1990).

The last tool is a small fragment, a resharpening flake, of a dark gray siliceous shale celt; this material is also from the Red River gravels and/or the Ouachita Mountains. These wood-working tools are part of the prehistoric Caddo stone tool tradition, so clearly celts were in use at the Poole site during the Caddo occupation.

**Lithic Debris**

Two of the three pieces of lithic debris are of quartzite, a locally available raw material. Both are cortical pieces, indicating that stone tool manufacture—the reduction of pebbles to obtain flakes usable for tools—occurred on the site. One of these pieces came off a heat-treated pebble. The other piece of lithic debris is a non-cortical flake of gray chert. This material is non-local, with likely sources in the Red River gravels well to the north of the site. This flake is probably indicative of the on-site resharpening of a completed tool.

In addition to the lithic debris, there is also a reddish-brown chert bipolar core in the collection. The core has 7+ flake removals, and represents an attempt to reduce a small chert pebble.
SUMMARY

Although both Thurmond (1990) and Perttula and Nelson (1999:8) described the Poole site (41TT47) as having a Late Caddo, Titus phase component, no such evidence of the Titus phase occupation is apparent in this small documented collection from the site. Instead, the absence of brushed sherds in the sherd collection strongly suggests that the Caddo occupation on the part of the Poole site that was collected predates ca. A.D. 1250. After that time, brushed pottery dominates the utility wares being made and used by Caddo groups in the Big Cypress Creek basin, such that more than 50-60% of the decorated sherds on Late Caddo sites in this area are brushed. The range of decorated sherds, including a considerable number of engraved fine wares (41.7% of the decorated sherds) support a pre-A.D. 1250 temporal estimate.

The range of artifacts in this Poole site collection is indicative of what is commonly seen on a prehistoric Caddo domestic settlement in East Texas, where artifacts of daily live (i.e., ceramic vessels, chipped and ground stone tools, and the debris from tool manufacture and use) were in regular use, and then discarded in middens and trash areas after they were broken or no longer useful. As with almost all Caddo sites in the Big Cypress Creek basin, the use of ceramic vessels for cooking, storage, holding liquids, and food service dominate the collection.
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INTRODUCTION

The Marcus Kolb site is an early to mid-19th century occupation on an upland ridge adjacent to an intermittent tributary of Gum Creek in the upper Neches River basin in East Texas (Perttula 2011:1-11). The recovered artifacts from the site, especially black transfer-printed pearlware sherds, a worked stone-ware sherd, and possibly a cut and crimped copper-based artifact, suggested that the site could have been occupied as early as the 1820s-early 1830s, during the time when this part of East Texas was occupied by the Cherokee. The tantalizing possibility of a Cherokee Indian occupation is negated to some extent by the chronological evidence that can be drawn from the decorated whiteware sherds from the site (Perttula 2011:3-4 and Figure 2), as the preponderance of that evidence is more consistent with a ca. 1840-1860 occupation, one that postdated the Cherokee occupation of East Texas. That would mean that the historic occupation of the Marcus Kolb site is most likely the product of an Anglo-American settlement.

Subsequent to the analysis of the Marcus Kolb artifacts described above, additional historic artifacts from the site were provided for study by the Kolb family. These artifacts came from surface collections on the slope south and southwest of a test unit near what was described as a “House Site Area.” The location of this area relative to the other identified archaeological deposits at the site (Perttula 2011:1) is not known. The size of the test unit is also not known, but its coordinates (N6-8 and E1-4 as well as W3) suggests it may have been 3 x 7 ft. No depth measurements were specified for the test unit excavations.

ADDITIONAL ARTIFACTS

The new artifact collection from the Marcus Kolb site, has 72 ceramic, glass, and metal artifacts (Table 1), not including a modern shotgun shell (Winchester No. 12 Repeater, W.R.A. New No. 4 Co.) from a surface collection. The most common kind of artifact in the collection are cut nails (1820-1891, see Wells 2000) and nail shanks, which together comprise 35.6% of the collection. Their presence in the collection indicates that wood-framed structure was built at or near the test unit location sometime in the early to late 19th century. More than 21.9% of this Marcus Kolb collection includes refined earthenware sherds, among them plain whiteware, plain ironstone (post-1850), and post-1840s blue annular ware with blue, black, and white bands (Majewski and O’Brien 1987:163). The four-holed porcelain button was a common clothing button on sites dating after the 1850s (Meissner 1997). There is no pre-1830s pearlware in this collection, while in the earlier ceramic assemblage from the site 30% of the sherds were pearlware (Perttula 2011:3).

The stoneware sherds found in the archaeological deposits at the Marcus Kolb site include alkaline-glazed sherds (n=2), salt-glazed sherds (n=1), and yellow ware (n=1) (see Table 1). These particular kinds of stoneware would have been manufactured and used between the 1830s and ca. 1875. Salt glazing was one of the more commonly employed glazes in the manufacture of utilitarian stoneware (Greer 1981:180). The absence of salt-glazed stoneware sherds with a natural clay slipped interior surface suggests that these particular sherds are from stoneware vessels that were made before ca. 1870 (Lebo 1987:140). Alkaline-glazed stoneware sherds were produced in the 1850s and 1860s in East Texas kilns (Lebo 1987).
Table 1. Additional artifacts from the Marcus Kolb site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact category</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refined Earthenware Sherds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain whiteware</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue annular ware</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain Ironstone</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain 4-hole button</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stoneware Sherds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alkaline-glazed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt-glazed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bottle Glass</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amber</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aqua (paneled)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clear</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Window Glass</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aqua-colored, 2.1 mm thick</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nails</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cut nail</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unidentified shank</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fork, cupreous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cast iron fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>button</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iron nut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iron file</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iron tool fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harmonica plate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crushed canister or cup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horseshoe fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Yellowware began to produced in the 1820s in England, but by the 1840s it was also being manufactured in the United States, especially in the Midwest (Leibowitz 1985:4). The peak production of yellowware vessels was in the 1860s and 1870s, although it was still being made in the early 1900s (Leibowitz 1985:14).

The bottle glass from the Marcus Kolb site are from hand-blown bottles of several different colors, including aqua (including a sherd from a paneled bottle), clear, and brown (see Table 1), as well as amber (possibly a later 20th century introduction to the archaeological deposit). These vessels or containers would have held medicinal liquids and liquor (beer and wine). There are no bottle lips or embossed lettering on the sherds, limiting any specific determination of their age.

A single piece of aqua-colored window glass is in the collection, suggesting that the likely wood-framed building in the investigated area at the Marcus Kolb site also had a window. The thickness of the window glass is 2.1 mm, which according to Moir’s (1987) window thickness regression is indicative of a pane of window glass that would have been manufactured around 1889 ± 7.

The metal artifacts found in this collection at the Marcus Kolb site represent a diverse assortment of horse gear, tools, cutlery, clothing, and part of a musical instrument (see Table 1). More specifically they range from horse parts to buttons, the handle of a copperous-based fork fragment, cast iron fragments, and a plain metal clothing button.

CONCLUSIONS

The analysis of the 2nd batch of artifacts from the Marcus Kolb site (41CE438) is from an area thought to mark the location of an historic house site. The prevalence of cut nails apparently confirms that the artifacts are from the occupation of a wood-framed house, but the known date of cut nail manufacture (1820-1891) provides only a very general 19th century time frame. The refined earthenwares, stonewares, and the one porcelain button in this batch of artifacts suggest that the historic occupation in the house area postdates the 1840s, and may have lasted until ca. 1870. The one piece of window glass suggests some use of the site area in the 1880s. Given the estimated age of the historic occupation in the house area at the Marcus Kolb site, it is reasonable to conclude that the historic occupation of the site is most likely the product of an Anglo-American farm settlement.
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INTRODUCTION

This article concerns the documentation of the artifacts from four prehistoric Caddo sites in the Saline Creek drainage basin in the Post Oak Savannah in northern Smith County, Texas (Diggs et al. 2006:Figures 1-3). Saline Creek is a northward-flowing tributary to the Sabine River. The Caddo sites are ca. 10 km south of the confluence of Saline Creek with the Sabine River. Saline Creek enters into the Sabine River about 6 km east (downstream) of the confluence of a major tributary, Lake Fork Creek, with the river.

THE SITES AND COLLECTIONS

The four sites discussed in this article were recently recorded by Mark Walters, a Texas Archeological Stewards Network steward for East Texas, at the behest of the private landowner. During periodic land clean-up and clearing, the landowner discovered and collected visible surface artifacts at each of the sites, keeping them separate until they could be properly studied and put on record. The documentation effort took place in May 2011. A fifth site—the Bateman cache (41SM443)—is under study by Dr. Harry J. Shafer.

Sarah’s Deer Stand (41SM440)

The Sarah’s Deer Stand site is located on a sandy (Gallime fine sandy loam, 1-5% slopes, Hatherly 1993) upland ridge that slopes to the west towards Saline Creek, the current channel of which is 540 m to the west. When the site was recorded in 2010, it had small hardwoods, brush, and a weedy understory; surface visibility was 5%. It has been estimated to cover a 2500 m² area (0.62 acres). There is one area of the site that has crepe myrtle bushes and a charcoal-stained area; these probably are associated with a 19th century component (see below).

There are 155 Caddo sherds in the collections from the Sarah’s Deer Stand site, 42 (27%) of which have decorations. The plain to decorated sherd ratio is 2.69. The assemblage is from sherds that are primarily tempered only with grog (85%), although some sherds also have bone (12.9%) and hematite (2%) inclusions. Detailed analysis of a 9% sample of the sherds (Table 1) indicate that 21% of the sherds are from vessels fired in a high oxygen or oxidizing environment, and another 35.7% are from vessels incompletely oxidized during firing. The remainder of the sherds (42.9%) are from vessels fired in a low oxygen or reducing environment; half of these sherds are from vessels that were also cooled in a reducing environment, and the other half were from vessels that were cooled in the open air, leaving a thin oxidized surface and core on either one or both vessel surfaces.

The sherds from the site are well-preserved, as is indicated by the fact that 57% of them have evidence of surface treatment (smoothing) on either one or both vessel surfaces (see Table 1). Vessels were medium to large in size, based on the mean body wall thickness of 8.05 ± 0.95 mm (range 6.2-10.7 mm), many of them probably used for cooking and storage.
The 42 decorated sherds are predominantly from utility ware vessels (92.9%), with only three fine ware sherds (7.1% of the decorated sherds). Almost 43% of the decorated sherds and 46% of the utility wares have brushed body decorations, either parallel or vertical (n=16) or overlapping (n=2) brushed marks. Two parallel brushed body sherds, possibly from Bullard Brushed jars (see Suhm and Jelks 1962:Plate 11), have tool punctations pushed through the brushing marks.

Fourteen (33%) of the decorated sherds have incised lines as the decorative method, with either parallel or straight (n=12) and opposed line (n=2) elements. Four sherds (9.5% of the decorated sherds), including a rim, have rows of tool punctations either on the rim and/or the body of jars. The remaining utility ware sherd has pinched rows; this may be from a Killough Pinched jar (Suhm and Jelks 1962:Plate 46).

Two of the fine ware body sherds have curvilinear engraved lines, while the third, from a bottle, has an engraved circle within a circle surrounded by a curvilinear arc of fine engraved lines (Figure 1a). The use of a curvilinear arc of engraved lines on this sherd is similar to other examples of Poynor Engraved, possibly including Poynor Engraved, var. Lang (Perttula 2011:Figure 6-64f-g), although this style is most commonly seen on carinated bowls rather than bottles.

### Table 1. Detailed analysis of Caddo sherds from Sarah’s Deer Stand site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sherd type</th>
<th>Temper</th>
<th>FC</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>Th (mm)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>E SM</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>engraved circles and hatched triangle areas; cf. Poynor Engraved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>E SM</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I/E</td>
<td>SM 7.1</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I/E</td>
<td>SM 8.6</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog-bone</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I SM</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>parallel brushed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog-bone</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog-hem.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>parallel brushed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog-hem.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>parallel incised lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog-hem.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I/E</td>
<td>SM 6.6</td>
<td>curvilinear engraved lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog-hem.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>parallel brushed with tool punctates pushed through the brushing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog-bone-hem.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I SM</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog-bone-hem.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I SM</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

hem.=hematite; FC=firing conditions; A=fired and cooled in an oxidizing environment; C-E, incompletely oxidized during firing; B=fired and cooled in a reducing environment; F-G=fired in a reducing environment and cooled in the open air; ST-surface treatment: I=interior; E=exterior; SM=smoothed; Th=thickness
The chipped stone artifacts from the Sarah’s Deer Stand site include 13 tools or tool fragments, 84 pieces of lithic debris, and four cores (Table 2). The lithic artifacts indicate that the site was first used by aboriginal peoples during the Late Archaic (ca. 5000-2500 years ago), as marked by the Yarbrough dart points and the ferruginous sandstone gouge. The mean stem width of the five Gary points from the site (13.02 mm) suggests these are Gary, *var. Camden* points from a more intensive occupation during the latter part of the Woodland period (ca. A.D. 200-700). The arrow point preform may be associated with the prehistoric Caddo component recognized in the ceramic sherds, but its presence does mean that arrow points were made on site during some period of Caddo use.

The lithic debris from the site is primarily from locally available raw materials, especially a quartzite that had to be heat-treated before it could be successfully reduced (see Table 2). Nevertheless, non-local lithic debris (probably from Red River gravels or source areas in the Ouachita Mountains) accounts for 27% of the lithic debris sample; 25% of the cores are on non-local raw material; and 7.7% of the chipped stone tools are on non-local lithic raw materials.

In addition to the chipped stone artifacts, there are four ground stone tools in the site collection. These are a ferruginous sandstone metate and mano, used in the past for grinding maize and seeds, a bi-pitted stone of ferruginous sandstone, as well as a fragment of a polished igneous rock, probably a celt fragment. Three quartzite fire-cracked rocks suggest that a modicum of hot rock cooking of plant foods (especially roots) took place at the site during one of the occupations.
There is also a pre-Civil War component at the site, although its extent and character are unknown. This occupation is marked by a chert blade gunflint (for a rifle or musket) and several transfer-printed whiteware sherds. The latter were made from ca. 1830s-1860 (Samford 2000).

**Handicap Deer Stand (41SM441)**

This site is in a similar setting as the Sarah’s Deer Stand site, as it is located on a sandy upland ridge that slopes towards Saline Creek, about 500 m to the west. The landform has Cuthbert fine sandy loam soils. The site itself had a few hardwood trees, brush, and weeds, and a ground surface visibility of 5%. The Handicap Deer Stand site is estimated to cover 2400 m² (0.6 acres) in size.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrow point preform, quartzite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary dart point, quartzite</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary dart point, quartzite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary dart point, dark gray chert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarbrough dart point, quartzite</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dart point tip, quartzite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bifacial tool fragment, quartzite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biface preform, quartzite</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gouge, ferruginous sandstone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithic debris, subtotal</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>83.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quartzite</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>petrified wood</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chalcedony</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ferruginous sandstone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-local chert</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core, subtotal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single platform, quartzite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multiple platform, petrified wood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multiple platform, red chert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>core fragment, dark grayish-brown chert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A total of 47 sherds comprise the collection of Caddo ceramic wares from the Handicap Deer Stand site, 32 plain rim, body and base sherds and 15 decorated rim and body sherds. The sherds are from vessels that are primarily grog-tempered, but 17% also have bone temper. At least one sherd is from a vessel made with a naturally sandy paste, based on the detailed analysis of a small sample of sherds from the site (Table 3). Firing vessels in a reducing environment was the preferred manner employed by the Caddo potters at the site. A majority of the vessels were smoothed on one or both surfaces as part of finishing the vessels and making them ready for use for food serving, cooking, and storage. Rim and body wall thickness of the sherds analyzed in detail indicate that the vessels were built to be durable, with thick rims (9.3 mm) and moderately thick body walls (6.97 ± 1.48 mm, range=5.1-8.6 mm).

**Table 3. Detailed analysis of Caddo sherds from the Handicap Deer Stand site.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sherd type</th>
<th>Temper</th>
<th>FC</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>Th (mm)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>fingernail punctated row</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>I SM</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>parallel brushed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I/E SM</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>plain; ext. organic residue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I SM</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rim</td>
<td>grog-bone</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E SM</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog-bone</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I SM</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog-sandy paste</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FC=firing conditions; A=fired and cooled in an oxidizing environment; C-E, incompletely oxidized during firing; B=fired and cooled in a reducing environment; F-G=fired in a reducing environment and cooled in the open air; ST-surface treatment: I=interior; E=exterior; SM=smoothed; Th=thickness

The small sample of decorated sherds from the Handicap Deer Stand site include both utility wares (n=13, 87%) and fine wares (n=2, 13%). The utility wares include parallel brushed body sherds (n=7, 47% of the decorated sherds), three sherds (20%) with parallel incised lines, a rim sherd with horizontal incised lines, and two body sherds with rows of fingernail punctations.

Both fine ware sherds are from red-slipped vessels. The use of slipping as a decorative method first become prominent on East Texas Caddo sites between ca. A.D. 1200-1450, in the Middle Caddo period, especially in the upper Neches, upper Sabine, and parts of the middle reaches of the Red River basin.

The chipped stone tools from the site consist of one Woodland period Gary dart point and four arrow points. The Gary, var. Camden point fragment (see Schambach 1982), made from quartzite, has the narrow stem width (13.0 mm) of this defined variety. This particular variety of Gary point was manufactured between ca. A.D. 200-700, during the latter part of the Woodland period. Three of the points are parallel-stemmed Alba points, both unifacially and bifacially worked. The unifacial Alba points are made from non-local gray chert, while the bifacially worked specimen is on a local quartzite. The fourth point is a contracting stem unifacial Perdiz, made on a gray chert. The two different arrow points suggest that the site was used by the Caddo on two different occasions, since they are not thought to be contemporaneous (see Turner and Hester 1999); the Alba points were apparently made and used between ca. A. D. 800-1200/1300, based on the dating of the Alto phase component at the George C. Davis site (Story 2000),
while the Perdiz point may have first been manufactured ca. A.D. 1200, but continued to be made and used well into the early 18th century in East Texas (cf. Story 1995).

There is a large (77 x 51 mm in length and width, and 37 mm thick) cobble-sized core with five flake removals; it is of a local tan chert, with a grayish-brown cortex. A second core has a single platform of flake removals; it is on a reddish-gray chert that is probably not from a local lithic raw material source. There are 28 pieces of lithic debris in the collection, including flakes from a local quartzite (68%) and several kinds of non-local chert (32%), namely gray, dark gray, and yellowish-gray brown chert. The likely source of these raw materials is the Red River gravels and the Ouachita Mountains of southeastern Oklahoma.

The one ground stone tool from the Handicap Deer Stand site is a quartzite mano. It has smoothing on one side from its use in grinding actions on a metate or grinding slab, and there is a slight circular depression on one face, suggesting it may also have been used as a pitted stone.

Alligator Pond (41SM442)

The Alligator Pond site is situated on two sandy upland ridge slopes that extend west to Saline Creek. Currently the area is part of a 4 year old pine plantation, some portions of which have been cleared for brush control; the small pine trees, brush, and weeds limit the surface visibility to 10%, except in the cleared areas. Sediments on the landform are Attoyac fine sandy loam. The site’s extent is estimated at 6000 m² (1.5 acres).

The principal artifact in the Alligator Pond site collection is sherds from plain ware, utility ware, and fine ware ceramic vessels: 503 sherds in all. The sherds include three plain rims, 405 plain body sherds, and 23 base sherds, as well as 72 decorated sherds; these consist of four rim sherds (all from utility ware vessels) and 68 body sherds. The plain to decorated sherd ratio is a high 5.99.

The sherds are from prehistoric Caddo vessels that are principally tempered with grog (92.2%) (Table 4). Approximately 7% of the sherds are bone-tempered, along with 0.8% that have crushed hematite pieces that were employed as temper inclusions. Two plain body sherds are not tempered and have a naturally sandy paste; they are likely Woodland period sherds belonging to the type-variety Goose Creek Plain, var. unspecified (Aten and Bollich 2011); this kind of reduced fired sandy paste pottery was made between ca. 500 B.C. and A.D. 700.

Table 4. Detailed analysis of Caddo sherds from the Alligator Pond site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sherd type</th>
<th>Temper</th>
<th>FC</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>Th (mm)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>plain; int. organic residue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>plain; int. organic residue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ISM</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>I/E SM</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>int./ext. red-slipped</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Detailed analysis of Caddo sherds from the Alligator Pond site, cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sherd type</th>
<th>Temper</th>
<th>FC</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>Th (mm)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>parallel brushed and overlying opposed incised lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>parallel incised lines adjacent to a fingernail punctated zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>tool punctated rows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>fingernail punctated rows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>parallel incised lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>cross-hatched incised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog-bone</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog-bone</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog-hem.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog-hem.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog-hem.- sandy paste</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog-organics</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog-sandy paste</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>sandy paste</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>parallel incised lines paste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>sandy paste</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Woodland period sherd, plain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

hem.=hematite; FC=firing conditions; A=fired and cooled in an oxidizing environment; D-E, incompletely oxidized during firing; B=fired and cooled in a reducing environment; F-G=fired in a reducing environment and cooled in the open air; ST-surface treatment: I=interior; E=exterior; SM=smoothed; Th=thickness

Based on the detailed analysis of a small sample of sherds from the Alligator Pond site, the sherds are from vessels that were fired in several different ways. Foremost, some 64% of the sherds are from vessels fired in a low oxygen or reducing environment, 24% were incompletely oxidized during firing, and 12% were fired in a high oxygen environment (see Table 4). Only a few sherds have been smoothed on either interior and/or exterior surfaces. The vessels at the site were coil-made, starting from a flat disk base, and they have relatively thick body walls: a mean thickness of 7.44 ± 0.96 mm, with a range of 5.4-9.6 mm. Vessels of different sizes and volume were obviously in use at the Alligator Pond site during its Caddo occupation.

Of the 72 decorated sherds, 75% are from utility ware vessels (Table 5). The utility wares are dominated by sherds from vessels with incised decorations (38.9% of all the decorated sherds); the incised designs are almost exclusively from straight line/horizontal and vertical to simple geometric designs, including curvilinear, cross-hatched, and opposed elements. Vessels with tool and fingernail punctations—including rows of punctations—comprise 22.2% of the decorated sherds from the site. Other decorative methods represented in the Alligator Pond utility ware sherds are brushed (9.7%), incised-punctated (2.8%), and appliqued (1.4%) (Table 5). The low percentage of brushed sherds suggests that the Caddo occupation here took place before the other Saline Creek Caddo sites (see below), perhaps several hundred years earlier.
Table 5. Decorated Sherds in the Alligator Pond ceramic assemblage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ware and Decoration</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utility Ware</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appliqued node, body</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brushed, parallel, body</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brushed, parallel and overlying</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposed incised lines, body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brushed, overlapping and finger-nail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>punctates through brushing, body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incised, straight line, body</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incised, cross-hatched, rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incised, cross-hatched, body</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incised, curvilinear, body</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incised, parallel, body</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incised-parallel-opposed, body</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incised, vertical, rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incised, parallel, adjacent to a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fingernail punctated zone, body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>punctated row, tool, adjacent to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>straight incised line, body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>punctated, small circles, body</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>punctated rows, fingernail, body</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>punctated row, tool, rim</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>punctated row, tool, body</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, utility ware</strong></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fine Ware</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>int./ext. red slipped, body</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ext. red slipped, body</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engraved, cross-hatched column, pendant triangles and excised pendant triangles, bottle, body</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engraved, curvilinear, body</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engraved, hatched triangle, body</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engraved, parallel, body</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The fine ware sherds include both engraved (n=13) and red-slipped (n=5) body sherds (see Table 5). The engraved sherds have straight line elements, parallel lines, as well as hatched and excised triangles, pendant triangles, and cross-hatched columns; sometimes combinations of elements occur on the same vessel, particularly on bottles (see Figure 1b-d). The frequency of red-slipped sherds at the Alligator Pond site is notable, given trends in the use and discard of red-slipped vessels in parts of East Texas in Middle Caddo period contexts.

There are 131 chipped stone artifacts in the Alligator Pond site assemblage (Table 6). This includes 17 chipped stone tools, 113 pieces of lithic debris from tool manufacture and maintenance activities, and one core. Almost 18% of the chipped stone tools are made on non-local cherts, which is a considerable amount, but not when compared to the fact that 55% of the lithic debris from the site is from the manufacture and/or resharpening of tools made from non-local cherts (i.e., gray, dark brown, light gray, dark grayish-brown, and brownish-gray cherts) and quartz. About 33% of the lithic debris is on local quartzite. The remainder of the local lithic debris includes petrified wood, ferruginous sandstone, and earth-toned cherts.

### Table 5. Decorated Sherds in the Alligator Pond ceramic assemblage, cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ware and Decoration</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fine Ware, cont.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engraved, parallel and pendant triangle, bottle, body</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engraved, single straight line, body</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engraved, triangle, bottle, body</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engraved, vertical, horizontal, and opposed lines, bottle, body</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excised triangle, bottle, body</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, fine ware</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6. Chipped Stone Artifacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expanding stem-corner notched arrow points, quartzite</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracting stem arrow point fragment, quartzite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrow point fragment, quartzite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrow point fragment, gray chert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrow point preform, quartzite</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The chipped stone arrow points from the Alligator Pond include three fragments, two preforms (evidence of on-site arrow point manufacture activities), and two expanding stem, corner-notched arrow points made from the local quartzite. These points may be identified as either Homan or Scallorn points, with both types found in pre-A.D. 1200 Caddo contexts in East Texas sites. The polished petrified wood celt was a woodworking tool also used by the Caddo during their occupation at Alligator Pond.

The one Gary point is a var. Camden specimen. Its occurrence at the site is indicative of some use during the latter part of the Woodland period. The Yarbrough and Williams points at the Alligator Pond site are dart point types that characterize the Late Archaic in East Texas, and it is estimated that they date between ca. 5000-3000 years old. These points, and probably several of the chipped stone tools listed in Table 6, represent the earliest occupation on the landform.
In addition to the chipped stone artifacts, there are five ground stone tools in the Alligator Pond site collections. This includes two quartzite and ferruginous sandstone manos, with ground smoothed areas on either one or both surfaces. The manos range from 103-114 mm in length, 82-88 mm in width, and 35-45 mm in thickness. There is a ferruginous sandstone metate with a 15 mm deep concave depression on one side in its center, this being the active grinding and pounding area. The metate is 175 mm in length, 170 mm in width, and 50 mm thick. There is also a coarse-grained ferruginous sandstone pitted stone with a 20 mm circular depression on one side. This tool is 91 x 62 mm in length and width, and 42 mm thick. The final ground stone tool is the poll end of a Caddo tradition quartzitic sandstone celt fragment; this material originates in the Ouachita Mountains of southeastern Oklahoma, but is also present in gravels in the middle reaches of the Red River valley, well north of Saline Creek in East Texas.

Six pieces of fire-cracked rock (FCR) from the hot rock cooking of plant foods in ovens and pits are in the Alligator Pond site collections. Five of the FCR are quartzite, and the other is hematite, both local stone raw materials.

**Thacker Farm House (41SM444)**

The Thacker Farm House site is located on a gravelly upland landform about 1.1 km east of Saline Creek. Soils are a Redsprings very gravelly sandy loam (2-5% slopes). The site area, estimated at 2500 m² (0.62 acres), is in a cleared orchard, but orchard plantings and weeds limit the surface visibility to 10%.

A total of 140 Caddo ceramic vessel sherds are in the collections from the Thacker Farm House, including 104 plain sherds (one rim, 98 body sherds, and five base sherds) and 36 decorated sherds. The plain to decorated sherd ratio is a moderate 2.89.

The sherds are from grog-tempered vessels, with some vessels also having bone (3.6%) and crushed hematite temper inclusions (Table 7). The detailed analysis of a sample of the sherds suggests that most of the sherds are from unsmoothed vessels that were fired in a reducing environment, while 20% are from vessels that were incompletely oxidized during firing. Vessel walls of these vessels were relatively thick (mean thickness of 8.3 ± 0.9 mm), likely because vessels at the site were large in size, and some may have served as durable storage vessels with extra-thick body walls.

**Table 7. Detailed analysis of Caddo sherds from the Thacker Farm House site.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sherd type</th>
<th>Temper</th>
<th>FC</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>Th (mm)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>parallel incised and straight appliqued ridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>parallel brushed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>parallel incised lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog-bone</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>I SM</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog-hem.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>parallel incised lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>grog-hem.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

hem. = hematite; FC=firing conditions; A=fired and cooled in an oxidizing environment; C-E, incompletely oxidized during firing; B=fired and cooled in a reducing environment; F-G=fired in a reducing environment and cooled in the open air; ST-surface treatment: I=interior; E=exterior; SM=smoothed; Th=thickness
The 36 decorated sherds are primarily from utility ware vessels (n=33, 91.6% of the decorated sherds), with only three engraved fine wares (8.3% of the decorated sherds). The utility ware sherds include brushed (n=18), incised (n=12), brushed-punctated (n=1), incised-appliqued (n=1), and incised-punctated (n=1).

The brushed body sherds have parallel brushing marks, likely from jars with vertical brushing, but the orientation of the brushing cannot be determined with confidence. All 12 incised body sherds have straight to parallel incised lines, but again the orientation of the incised decorations is not known. One body sherd has parallel brushing, with tool punctates pushed through the brushing; this is a common vessel decoration in both Middle and Late Caddo times. Another body sherd has parallel incised lines adjacent to a straight appliqued ridge; the latter was likely used to divide a vessel body into quadrants filled with different decorations; in this case, the quadrants probably were filled with vertical incised lines. Finally one incised-punctated rim sherd has opposed diagonal incised lines that create triangular zones: these zones are filled with tool punctates.

One fine ware rim sherd from a carinated bowl has two horizontal engraved lines on the rim panel. A body sherd has closely-spaced parallel engraved lines. The last engraved body/lower rim sherd (see Figure 1e) has a hatched bracket or divider, likely from a Poynor Engraved, var. Hood vessel (see Perttula 2011:Figure 6-64e).

The lithic assemblage from the site is sparse, including only one dart point and four pieces of lithic debris. The dart point is a Late Archaic Yarbrough point made from a locally available quartzite. Both local (quartzite and brown chert) and non-local (gray chert) lithic raw materials were knapped at the site, although this was done sparingly.

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Overall, the character of the lithic and ceramic artifacts from the four Saline Creek sites seems to indicate that this part of the valley was first settled by aboriginal peoples about 5000 years ago, at the beginning of the Late Archaic period. This period is marked by the recovery of Williams and Yarbrough dart parts at three of the sites, as well as a range of chipped and ground stone tools (Table 8). Likewise, during the latter part of the Woodland period, three of the four Saline Creek sites were occupied—as evidenced by the documentation of Gary, var. Camden dart points at the three sites—by Woodland peoples ancestral to the Caddo peoples that lived in East Texas after ca. A.D. 850. The Alligator Pond site
(41SM442) also had two sherds from Goose Creek Plain, var. unspecified sandy paste Woodland period vessels. The occurrence of ceramic sherds at the site, often taken as one indicator of the development of a more sedentary lifeway, suggests that the occupation during this time at the Alligator Pond site may have been more than a hunting and food processing camp, but a camp where the Woodland peoples may have stayed for a longer period of time during a seasonal occupation. Projectile point to ground stone tool ratios from the four sites suggest that hunting was a major pursuit at each of the sites, although plant foods were processed at them as well using ground stone manos, metates, and pitted stones.

A notable characteristic of the lithic assemblages from the Saline Creek sites is the use of non-local chert artifacts in the chipped stone tools, the polished celts, and the chipped stone lithic debris (see Table 8). At the Alligator Pond site, the percentage of non-local chert artifacts is 47%, while the other three have comparable, but lower, percentages of non-local cherts in their assemblages (20.0-25.7%). While it is uncertain just how many of the chipped stone artifacts from the sites can be associated with the prehistoric Caddo occupations, the fact that the Alligator Pond site is apparently the earliest site among the four Saline Creek sites, does open up the tantalizing possibility that the earlier Caddo peoples that settled in the basin had a better and broader access to non-local sources of non-local cherts (either by direct procurement or through trade and exchange). The later Caddo peoples that settled in the basin did not have the same ready access to non-local chert raw materials, and thus they had to depend on local raw materials such as quartzite, petrified wood, and ferruginous sandstone.

The major settlement of the Saline Creek valley was by the ancestors of modern Caddo people. During the Caddo occupation of the Saline Creek sites, including a relatively intensive and early occupation at Alligator Pond, arrow point preforms, arrow point fragments, and several identifiable arrow point styles suggest the sites were first occupied before ca. A.D. 1000 and continued to be occupied episodically and on a generational basis until sometime after ca. A.D. 1300 (see Table 8). Given what we know about the ceramics from these four sites, the Alligator Pond was occupied the earliest during the Caddo era, while the other three—Sarah’s Deer Stand (41SM440), Handicap Deer Stand (41SM441), and Thacker Farm House (41SM444)—may have been occupied at least one or two centuries later, but between them, more or less contemporaneously. These occupations are modest in size, from 2500-6000 m², and probably represent permanent year-round occupations by one or a few Caddo families, probably farmsteads or a small hamlet. All three sites may be part of one larger Caddo community in this part of the upper Sabine River basin.

Through several means of ceramic comparisons (Table 9), the four Saline Creek sites can be readily sorted into two groups: Group I, the Alligator Pond site, with a very high plain to decorated sherd ratio (P/DR), little brushed pottery in the assemblage, considerable numbers of wet paste utility ware ceramic sherds, and a relatively low use of bone as a temper; and Group II, the other three sites that may be part of the same community of peoples. The Group II sites have moderate P/DR values, considerable percentages of brushed decorated sherds, lower frequencies (40-50%) of wet paste utility wares, and the use of bone temper was moderate at two of the three Group II sites.

P/DR values from numerous Caddo sites in East Texas appear to hold considerable promise as an independent means of establishing the age of Caddo ceramic-bearing components (provided samples of plain and decorated sherds are larger than about 200-300 sherds per site, which three of the four sites on Saline Creek do not meet. Nevertheless, the P/DR comparisons for these assemblages still prove useful). When P/DR ratios from a number of different ceramic assemblages from the various ceramic traditions/regions in East Texas are linked with absolute ages as established by radiocarbon dating from those assemblages, it is expected that further refinements in how P/DR ratios change through time in East Texas Caddo sites will be established. At the moment, looking at Early Caddo to Historic Caddo ceramic assemblages in the region through time, the trend is that ceramic assemblages have lower proportions of undecorated sherds through time and thus a lower P/DR ratio (Perttula 2008:9, 315-317). Analyzed pre-A.D. 1200 sites in East Texas have plain/decorated sherd ratios that appear to range from 2.97 to greater than 4.80; the Alligator Pond site P/DR of 5.99 fits this pre-A.D. 1200 P/DR range (see Table 9). Middle Caddo sites (ca. A.D. 1200-1450)
Table 9. Selected ceramic comparisons between the Saline Creek sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>Plain/Decorated Sherd Ratio</th>
<th>% Brushed*</th>
<th>Wet Paste %</th>
<th>% Bone-Tempered</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41SM442</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>503+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41SM444</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41SM440</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41SM441</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*percent brushed among all decorated sherds from the site; ** percent wet paste (i.e., incised, punctated, appliqued, incised-punctated, etc.) among all decorated sherds from the site
+does not include two Woodland period sandy paste sherds

have ratios that range between 1.30-2.65; the three other Saline Creek sites generally fall in the Middle Caddo period based on their P/DR (see Table 9). In known Late Caddo sites in the Neches, Angelina, and Sabine river basins, by contrast, the P/DR ranges from only 1.30-0.47. Finally, post-A.D. 1680 Caddo occupations in the Neches-Angelina river basin have P/DR ratios that range from 0.20-0.30.

Further chronological confirmation of the ages of the four Caddo components is reflected in the percentages of brushed pottery in each assemblage (see Table 9). At the earlier Alligator Pond site, only 9.7% of the decorated sherds are brushed, compared to between 46.7-50.0% in the three other Saline Creek sites. It has been shown repeatedly in Caddo ceramic studies in much of East Texas (although not including the Red River valley, where brushed pottery is almost non-existent) that the proportion of brushed sherds in decorated sherd assemblages steadily increases through time, beginning around ca. A.D. 1200. By the early 15th century A.D., however, Caddo potters in the upper Neches River basin and parts of the upper Sabine River basin began to manufacture considerable numbers of jars with brushed vessel bodies and rims (Perttula 2011). Given the relatively high proportion of brushed sherds in three of the Saline Creek sites, and their ceramic assemblage P/DR values, it seems likely that they were occupied during the latter part of the 14th century through the mid-15th century A.D., and were probably abandoned after that time. The low percentage of brushed sherds, in concert with the high P/DR values, at the Alligator Pond site is primarily consistent with a pre-A.D. 1200 occupation, or at least an occupation that ended by that time.

How do the three Group II Caddo ceramic sites on Saline Creek compare to ceramic assemblages at other generally contemporaneous Caddo sites in the upper Sabine River such as Leaning Rock (Walters 2008), the Wolf site (Walters 2003), Bryan Hardy (Walters and Haskins 2000), Redwine (Walters and Haskins 1998), and Carlisle (Perttula et al. 1993). Using the same attribute comparisons from Table 9, Table 10 provides relevant attribute-level ceramic data from these five excavated sites on their P/DR; the percentage of brushed sherds among all the decorated sherds; the percentage of wet paste decorated sherds among all the decorated sherds; and the percentage use of bone temper. Each of these five sites also have either radiocarbon or OCR dates to establish the absolute age of their Middle Caddo occupations, and these range from as early as A.D. 1276 to as late as A.D. 1449, almost the full gamut of the Middle Caddo period in the upper Sabine River basin.
In a general sense, the most interesting aspect of these upper Sabine River basin ceramic assemblages is how different they are one from another, as if they represent assemblages from different local or community-wide ceramic traditions. P/DR values range from 1.30-3.59, even though the sites are contemporaneous, indicating that the proportions of decorated and plain vessels in each assemblage are rather divergent; this is especially the case for the Bryan Hardy site (a P/DR of 1.30) in comparison to the other four sites (P/DR values of 2.72-3.59). The proportion of brushed pottery ranges from 0.0-51.3%, and the proportion of wet paste decorated sherds range considerably from 35.8-70.7%. With the exception of Bryan Hardy, which has many brushed-punctated sherds (see Walters and Haskins 2000), the sites with the highest proportions of brushed pottery (Carlisle and Redwine) also have the lowest proportions of wet paste decorated sherds (see Table 10). Finally, while bone temper was used in the manufacture of ceramic vessels in all five Middle Caddo sites in the upper Sabine River basin, its use ranged from a low of 5% at the Carlisle site to 49.2% at the Wolf site.

Based simply on the comparison of these ceramic assemblage attributes, the Group II Middle Caddo sites on Saline Creek appear to be most closely affiliated with the Caddo peoples that lived at the Carlisle site and other nearby sites (41WD245 and 41WD507, see Perttula et al. 1993:57-58), at and near the confluence of Lake Fork Creek and the Sabine River, about 16 km north and east of the Saline Creek sites. The Middle Caddo sites in northern Smith County appear to represent occupations by at least three different communities of people. This close ceramic similarity between the Saline Creek sites and sites in the Sabine/Lake Fork confluence area thus implies that the Saline Creek sites also date from the latter part of the 13th century to the mid-part of the 15th century A.D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>P/DR</th>
<th>% Brushed</th>
<th>% Wet Paste</th>
<th>% Bone Temper</th>
<th>C14 and OCR Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leaning Rock, 41SM325</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>mean 2 sigma calibrated age: AD 1297-1389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf, 41SM195</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>C14, 2 sigma: AD 1315-1440; OCR: AD 1317-1413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Hardy, 41SM55</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>grog-bone temper, but % not specified</td>
<td>2 sigma C14, AD 1277-1401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwine, 41SM193</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>2 sigma C14, AD 1304-1434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlisle, 41WD46</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2 sigma C14, AD 1276-1449</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a general sense, the most interesting aspect of these upper Sabine River basin ceramic assemblages is how different they are one from another, as if they represent assemblages from different local or community-wide ceramic traditions. P/DR values range from 1.30-3.59, even though the sites are contemporaneous, indicating that the proportions of decorated and plain vessels in each assemblage are rather divergent; this is especially the case for the Bryan Hardy site (a P/DR of 1.30) in comparison to the other four sites (P/DR values of 2.72-3.59). The proportion of brushed pottery ranges from 0.0-51.3%, and the proportion of wet paste decorated sherds range considerably from 35.8-70.7%. With the exception of Bryan Hardy, which has many brushed-punctated sherds (see Walters and Haskins 2000), the sites with the highest proportions of brushed pottery (Carlisle and Redwine) also have the lowest proportions of wet paste decorated sherds (see Table 10). Finally, while bone temper was used in the manufacture of ceramic vessels in all five Middle Caddo sites in the upper Sabine River basin, its use ranged from a low of 5% at the Carlisle site to 49.2% at the Wolf site.

Based simply on the comparison of these ceramic assemblage attributes, the Group II Middle Caddo sites on Saline Creek appear to be most closely affiliated with the Caddo peoples that lived at the Carlisle site and other nearby sites (41WD245 and 41WD507, see Perttula et al. 1993:57-58), at and near the confluence of Lake Fork Creek and the Sabine River, about 16 km north and east of the Saline Creek sites. The Middle Caddo sites in northern Smith County appear to represent occupations by at least three different communities of people. This close ceramic similarity between the Saline Creek sites and sites in the Sabine/Lake Fork confluence area thus implies that the Saline Creek sites also date from the latter part of the 13th century to the mid-part of the 15th century A.D.

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Perttula would like to thank Mark Thacker, the landowner, for the opportunity to document the collections from his property in Smith County, Texas. The junior author, Mark Walters, facilitated the study, as only a great Texas Archeological Steward Network steward can.
REFERENCES CITED

Aten, L. E. and C. N. Bollich
2011 Early Ceramic Sites of the Sabine Lake Area, Coastal Texas and Louisiana. Studies in Archeology 43. Texas Archeological Research Laboratory, The University of Texas at Austin.

Diggs Jr., G. M., B. L. Lipscomb, M. D. Reed and R. J. O’Kennon

Hatherly, D. T.
1993 Soil Survey of Smith County, Texas. United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, in cooperation with the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station and the Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board, Washington, D.C.

Perttula, T. K.

Perttula, T. K. (editor)

Perttula, T. K., B. D. Skiles, and B. C. Yates
1993 The Carlisle Site (41WD46), a Middle Caddoan Occupation on the Sabine River, Wood County, Texas. Notes on Northeast Texas Archaeology 1:34-62.

Samford, P. M.

Schambach, F. F.

Story, D. A.

Story, D. A. (editor)

Suhm, D. A., and E. B. Jelks (editors)
Turner, E. S. and T. R. Hester

Walters, M.


Walters, M. and P. Haskins

The Buckner Dam Site (41CE339) and Four Other Caddo Sites on Gum Creek in the Upper Neches River Basin, Cherokee County, Texas
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INTRODUCTION

Due to recent droughty conditions in East Texas in 2010 and 2011, the water levels on the man-made lakes and reservoirs in the region have been steadily lowering. This decreasing water levels is exposing considerable areas along the lakes that not only have been underwater for considerable periods of time since the lakes were constructed, but this new land exposure is also exposing and eroding archaeological sites that are now along the new lake shore boundaries. Such is the case at Lake Jacksonville, a small lake on Gum Creek in Cherokee County, Texas, and newly recorded archaeological sites have been found along its shores. This article is a summary of efforts to document archaeological collections that have been reported from five sites at Lake Jacksonville.

SETTING

The five archaeological sites at Lake Jacksonville are along Gum Creek, or one of its tributaries. Gum Creek is a southward-flowing tributary to the Neches River, in the upper Neches River basin. They are all along the western boundary of the modern extent of the Pineywoods (see Diggs et al. 2006) and the eastern boundary of the Post Oak Savannah. The Pineywoods cover large parts of East Texas, have medium-tall to tall broadleaf deciduous forests in more mesic habitats, and shortleaf and loblolly pines are common on upland fine sandy loam soils with adequate moisture. Bottomland communities along the major river and creek drainages contain a diverse hardwood and swamp forest (including cypress, tupelo, and sweet gum), with natural levees and alluvial terraces, point bar deposits, old stream channels, oxbow lakes, and backwater swamps. A less diverse bottomland hardwood community is present along the smaller creeks and their tributaries.

The Post Oak Savannah is a narrow southwest-northeast trending woodland that marks an ecotone between the more xeric Blackland Prairie to the west and south (Diggs et al. 2006:Figure 2) and the more mesic Pineywoods to the east. The woodlands in the Post Oak Savannah consist of broadleaf deciduous forests, primarily including several species of oak as well as hickory and pecan. Small areas of tall grass prairie were present in this physiographic province see Diggs et al. 2006:Figure 5) that ran from the Colorado River on the west to near the Trinity River on the east. Bottomland communities along the rivers and major tributaries in the Post Oak Savannah had a diverse hardwood and/or swamp forest, including cypress, sweet gum, and other hardwoods that tolerant periodic flood waters, on natural levees and alluvial terraces, point bar deposits, old stream channels and oxbow lakes.

THE SITES AND THEIR DOCUMENTED COLLECTIONS

As previously mentioned, during normal pool elevations at Lake Jacksonville, the five sites discussed in this article are under water. The Buckner Dam site (41CE339), before construction of the lake, was located on an upland landform overlooking Gum Creek; part of the site is now visible on a sandbar below.
the Buckner Dam (Texas Historic Sites Atlas 2011). The Jacksonville Campground site (41CE442) is situated at the confluence of Gum Creek and Byrd Branch, on one end of a sandy ridge now used by the City of Jacksonville as a city park/campground. The third site, Cat Creek (41CE444), is along the shoreline of Lake Jacksonville, about 60 m west of an old channel of Gum Creek. The Piney Point site (41CE445) is ca. 50 m north of an old channel of Cat Creek, a tributary to Gum Creek. The site was exposed along the shoreline, and this portion of the site has been heavily eroded by lake water action. Finally, the Mission site (41CE447) is ca. 199 m east of an old channel of Gum Creek. The site did not receive its name because there is a Spanish mission at this location. Rather, there is a modern residence visible from the site that was built in 18th century San Antonio mission architecture style, and thus the site was unfortunately dubbed the “Mission” site.

**Buckner Dam Site (41CE339)**

The Buckner Dam site had a substantial prehistoric Caddo component, based on the estimated size of the site (6000 m², or 1.5 acres) and the large ceramic vessel sherd collection (n=670 sherds, Table 1). The vessel sherds were from grog-tempered vessels (95.5%), with a small amount of sherds that were from vessels tempered with bone, or had hematite inclusions in addition to grog temper (12.8%). About 20% of the tempered sherds had a sandy paste, suggesting the occasional use by Caddo potters of a local naturally sandy clay; otherwise, locally available clay or silty paste clays were preferred in vessel manufacture. The plain to decorated sherd ratio of this ceramic assemblage is 1.51.

The decorated sherds from the Buckner Dam site were dominated by utility ware sherds with brushing and brushed-incised (42% of all the decorated sherds) body decorations, along with incised sherds (33.3% of the decorated sherds) with various elements and motifs, and punctated sherds (9.0% of the decorated sherds). Fine ware engraved sherds were not abundant in the assemblage, comprising only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sherd Type/Decorative Type</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent with Bone Temper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plain rim</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain body</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain base</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorated sherds</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brushed-Incised</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brushed</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck Banded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctated</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incised-Punctated</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incised</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinched</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engraved</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.7% of all the decorated sherds (Table 2). The frequency of the two decorated wares was also apparent in the proportion of rims: 16 utility ware rim sherds and only five fine ware rims (3.2:1); plain ware rims (n=15, see Table 1) were almost as common as the utility ware rim sherds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decorative method and element</th>
<th>Rim</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utility Ware</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parallel brushed</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposed brushed</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subtotal, brushed</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horizontal brushed [rim]-diagonal incised [body]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parallel brushed-incised</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overlapping brushed-incised</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposed brushed-incised</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subtotal, brushed-incised</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cross-hatched incised lines</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single curvilinear line</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diagonal incised lines</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diagonal and vertical incised lines</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diagonal and horizontal incised lines</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horizontal incised</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposed incised lines</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parallel incised lines</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>broad parallel incised lines</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>closely-spaced parallel incised lines</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>widely-spaced parallel incised lines</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single straight incised line</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single straight, broad line, incised line</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subtotal, incised</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diagonal incised lines above tool punctated row</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diagonal incised lines and triangular zone of tool punctates</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parallel lines adjacent to circular punctated zone</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parallel lines adjacent to triangular zone of fingernail punctates</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Decorative elements in the Buckner Dam ceramic assemblage, cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decorative method and element</th>
<th>Rim</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>parallel lines adjacent to tool punctated zone</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>straight incised line adjacent to tool punctates</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subtotal, incised-punctated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parallel neck bands</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horizontal pinched ridges</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parallel pinched rows</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vertical pinched ridges</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subtotal, pinched</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circular punctated rows</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fingernail punctated, rows</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single fingernail punctate</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linear tool punctated rows</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tool punctated rows</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tool punctated, free</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single tool punctate</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subtotal, punctated</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fine Ware**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decorative method and element</th>
<th>Rim</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>narrow cross-hatched engraved zone</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>closely-spaced curvilinear engraved lines</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diagonal engraved lines</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horizontal engraved lines</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horizontal and curvilinear arcing lines</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horizontal and diagonal engraved lines</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposed engraved lines</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parallel engraved lines</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single straight engraved line</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single curvilinear engraved line</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subtotal, engraved</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Totals                                                     | 21  | 246  | 267 |
The decorated rim sherds provide an indication of the range of motifs and elements in the Buckner Dam site ceramic assemblage, as well as the popularity of particular kinds of decorations. In the utility wares, 56% of the 16 rims had incised decorations, including diagonal incised lines, opposed diagonal incised lines (Figure 1a), and horizontal and/or diagonal incised lines. These are probably from Maydelle Incised jars (see Suhm and Jelks 1962). Other common rim decorative treatments in the utility wares included jars with rows of tool punctations on the rim (25%); these rows typically were placed under the lip, at mid-rim, and then at the rim-body juncture; vessel bodies may have been plain or had any number of decorative methods applied to cover the exterior surface. Other rims among the utility wares includes one with horizontal brushing on the rim and diagonal incised lines on the vessel body; a Killough Pinched jar with horizontal pinched ridges covering the rim; and a jar rim with diagonal incised lines forming one side of an incised triangle, with the incised triangle filled with tool punctates (see Table 2). This particular rim may be from a Maydelle Incised vessel (see Suhm and Jelks 1962:Plate 52e). The neck banded jar sherd is from a LaRue Neck Banded vessel.

Utility ware vessel bodies in this assemblage were most commonly covered with brushing marks, most likely vertical in orientation. There were also vessels with various incised, punctated (free or randomly placed), and pinched body decorations (see Table 2). Incised-punctated vessel decorations were most likely confined to the rim of vessels.

Among the fine ware sherds, the rims have either diagonal, horizontal, or diagonal engraved lines. The horizontal engraved sherds may be from Hickory Engraved vessels (see Suhm and Jelks 1962:Plate 36), which would suggest a Caddo occupation here that occurred prior to ca. A.D. 1300, according to the best estimates on the age of this and related East Texas types such as Holly Fine Engraved, Weches Fingernail Impressed, Pennington Punctated-Incised, or Crockett Curvilinear Incised (cf. Story 2000). None of the other pre-A.D. 1300 East Texas ceramic types occurred in the Buckner Dam site collection, leaving open the possibility that horizontal engraved vessels may also date after ca. A.D. 1300, and not be exclusively associated with these early ceramic types.

Other distinctive engraved sherds, but found among the body sherds, were two sherds of the Poynor Engraved type. These have horizontal and curvilinear arcing engraved lines (see Figure 1c), and are probably part of curvilinear hatched-filled triangles, a common Poynor Engraved element (see Perttula 2011:Figure 6-15). There was also a body sherd with a narrow engraved zone filled with cross-hatched engraved lines (see Figure 1b). Such narrow cross-hatched or cross-hatched zones are a common feature in 14th and 15th century upper Neches River Caddo ceramic assemblages (see Perttula 2011:Figures 6-13 and 6-14).

In addition to the ceramic vessel sherds, there were five ceramic pipe sherds in the Buckner Dam site collections. Four are relatively thick (4.6-6.5 mm) elbow pipe stem sherds, one with an incised line on it, and the other is a bone-tempered elbow pipe bowl rim. The one incised elbow pipe stem sherd is from either an Var. B, Var. C, or Var. D elbow pipe form, varieties of pipes recently established in the upper Neches River basin (Perttula 2011:215 and Figure 6-23). Such elbow pipes were made and used by Caddo peoples between ca. A.D. 1400-1560.

Also noteworthy in the Buckner Dam collections was a single piece of daub. This suggests there may have been a thatch and clay-covered Caddo structure on the site during its occupation.

The chipped stone artifacts in the Buckner Dam site collection were meager. The few tools included a unifacially flaked Godley dart point made from a gray chert and a Gary point preform, also of gray chert. Their occurrence at the site suggests it was used by a Woodland period group of people sometime between ca. 2500-1200 years ago, perhaps as a hunting camp. Lithic raw materials and chipped stone tools were knapped at the site, as evidenced by a small amount of lithic debris: quartzite (n=2), petrified wood (n=7), brown chert (n=1), dark gray chert (n=2), and gray chert (n=2). The gray and dark gray cherts were from non-local sources, perhaps Neches River or Trinity River gravels, while the other raw materials were likely gathered from local stream gravel sources.
The artifacts documented from the Jacksonville Campground site indicated that there were both Woodland and Caddo occupations here. The Woodland period occupation was denoted by five sandy paste Goose Creek Plain, var. unspecified body sherds. Sherds of this Woodland period type were also noted at the Cat Creek site.

The Caddo ceramic assemblage had 55 plain rim (n=1), body (n=53), and base (n=1) sherds as well as 24 decorated rim and body sherds. The P/DR is 2.29. The Jacksonville Campground Caddo sherds were grog-tempered, but 5.1% were noted to also contain burned and crushed bone temper inclusions.

**Jacksonville Campground (41CE442)**

The artifacts documented from the Jacksonville Campground site indicated that there were both Woodland and Caddo occupations here. The Woodland period occupation was denoted by five sandy paste Goose Creek Plain, *var. unspecified* body sherds. Sherds of this Woodland period type were also noted at the Cat Creek site.

The Caddo ceramic assemblage had 55 plain rim (n=1), body (n=53), and base (n=1) sherds as well as 24 decorated rim and body sherds. The P/DR is 2.29. The Jacksonville Campground Caddo sherds were grog-tempered, but 5.1% were noted to also contain burned and crushed bone temper inclusions.
Almost 80% of the decorated sherds from the site were from utility ware vessels, with the remaining 20% coming from fine ware bowls, carinated bowls, and bottles. Over 60% of the utility wares had brushed decorations, including a horizontal brushed rim, and parallel (n=10) and overlapping (n=1) brushed marks on vessel bodies. Sherds from vessels with incised decorations were also common, including parallel lined (n=2), cross-hatched (one rim), and a rim/body sherd with opposed incised lines; this latter sherd may be from a Maydelle Incised jar. Two other utility ware sherds had incised-punctated elements, including zones of tool punctations adjacent to straight or cross-hatched incised elements. One body sherd had a row of tool punctations across it.

The five fine ware sherds from the Jacksonville Campground site were body sherds, one from a bottle. This sherd had opposed arcs of closely-spaced engraved lines (see Figure 1d), possibly from a Poynor Engraved bottle (Suhm and Jelks 1962: Plate 63e, g). Two other engraved sherds had straight or parallel engraved lines, another had a hatched zone, and the last engraved sherd had a cross-hatched engraved zone or column element.

A few chipped stone artifacts were documented in the collection. They comprised temporally undiagnostic lithic debris and a core fragment, the product of some chipped stone tool manufacturing efforts during the course of one or both prehistoric components. These materials include a local brown chert core fragment and 10 pieces of lithic debris. All but one of these pieces are from locally available quartzite (50%) and petrified wood (40%); the one flake from a non-local raw material is a non-cortical piece of grayish-brown chert.

**Cat Creek (41CE444)**

Only a small number of artifacts were documented from the Cat Creek site. These included a hematite pitted stone, a quartzite hammerstone, and five pieces of lithic debris (1 brown-dark brown chert; 2 petrified wood; 1 brown chert; and 1 quartzite); 80% of the lithic debris had cortical remnants.

There were also five plain ceramic body sherds in the collection. Three were from grog or grog-bone-tempered vessels, while the other two were from a plain sandy paste Goose Creek Plain, var. unspecified vessel (cf. Aten and Bollich 2011). Such vessels are found in Woodland period contexts (ca. 500 B.C. to A.D. 700) in East Texas.

**Piney Point (41CE445)**

Caddo ceramic sherds were abundant in the documented collection from the Piney Point site, with 191 plain sherds (seven rim sherds, 175 body sherds, and nine base sherds) and 80 rim and body sherds with decorations. The P/DR is 2.39. The sherds were almost exclusively from grog-tempered vessels, although 5.5% of the sherds (5.8% of the plain sherds and 5% of the decorated sherds) were bone-tempered.

Among the decorated sherds, almost 89% were from utility ware jars, and only 11.3% were from fine ware bowls or carinated bowls (Table 3). Half of the utility ware sherds had brushing on them, primarily parallel (vertical on the vessel body?), including one that had both brushed marks and incised lines parallel to the brushing. Sherds from vessels with incised lines comprised 25% of the decorated sherd assemblage; the incised sherds emphasized straight line and geometric elements. Tool punctated rim and body sherds accounted for 6.3% of the decorated sherds, and these consisted of rows of tool punctates, typically horizontal to the rim, but in one case both horizontal and vertical punctations comprised the decorative element on the sherd (see Figure 1g).

Five percent of the decorated sherds from the Piney Point site had incised-punctated elements (see Table 3). These had incised triangles filled with either tool punctations or small circular punctations. There were two utility ware sherds that had appliqued elements (i.e., straight appliqued ridge or appliqued fillet) associated with either incised lines or tool punctations. The appliqued elements were employed to divide the body of utility ware jars into panels filled with decorations executed with another method such as zones of tool punctations or panels filled with opposed incised lines.
Table 3. Decorative methods and elements in the Piney Point site ceramic assemblage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decorative method and element</th>
<th>Rim</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utility Ware</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appliqued ridge adjacent to a tool punctated zone</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appliqued fillet and opposed parallel incised lines</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parallel brushed</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overlapping brushed</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horizontal brushed</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposed brushed</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curvilinear brushed</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parallel brushed-overlapping parallel incised</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diagonal incised lines</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diagonal opposed lines</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parallel incised lines</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>straight incised line</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horizontal-diagonal incised lines and incised zone filled with circular punctations</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>triangular incised zone filled with circular punctations</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>straight incised lines adjacent to tool punctated zone</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tool punctates in rows</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tool punctates in horizontal and vertical rows</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fine Ware</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curvilinear engraved lines</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horizontal engraved lines</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposed engraved lines</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parallel engraved lines</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>triangular element with arcing lines</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The fine ware sherds are primarily straight line or geometric designs (see Figure 1e and Table 3), although there is one sherd with curvilinear lines that may be from a bottle. The most distinctive engraved sherd (see Figure 1f) is one that compares favorably to several varieties of Poynor Engraved (Perttula 2011:Figure 6-64), including var. Blackburn, var. Cook, and var. Lang. These particular varieties are most common in the early and middle parts of the Frankston phase, from ca. A.D. 1400-1560 (Perttula 2011:Table 6-37).

The lithic artifacts documented from the Piney Point site included several tools and tool fragments as well as lithic debris. The tools were a quartzite Gary point preform, indicative of use of the site in Woodland period times, two petrified wood biface fragments, and a polished celt fragment made from a dark gray diorite; this material came from source areas in the Ouachita Mountains of southeastern Oklahoma (see Banks 1990), or was traded/exchanged from a Ouachita or Red River Caddo group to one of the East Texas Caddo communities living in the upper Neches River basin.

Lithic debris (n=33) from the site was primarily a product of the knapping of local lithic raw materials, among them quartzite (n=16), petrified wood (n=7), red chert (n=3), and brown chert (n=1). Cortical flakes comprised 80% of the lithic debris from these materials, clearly indicating that the initial reduction of pebbles and cobbles was an important knapping activity at the Piney Point site, probably to produce flakes usable for tools. Non-local lithic debris was a brown to dark brown chert (n=5) and a gray chert.

**Mission (41CE447)**

The prehistoric Caddo archaeological materials documented from the Mission site consisted of one piece of lithic debris (brownish-gray chert, from a non-local raw material source) and 79 ceramic vessel sherds. This included 59 plain body sherds, four plain base sherds, and 16 decorated rim and body sherds. The P/DR for this assemblage, although not of optimal sample size, is 3.94.

The ceramics were predominantly grog-tempered; 10.1% of the sherds also had crushed and burned bone added to the vessel paste as a temper. All of the decorated sherds were from utility ware jars, including brushed (50%), incised (44%), and one incised-punctated body sherd (6.3%). This sherd had an incised circle filled with tool punctations. Two of the incised sherds were rims with either diagonal or horizontal lines. The brushed sherds had parallel brushing marks on them, probably from cooking vessels with vertical brushing on the bodies.

**SUMMARY**

The documentation of the collections from five aboriginal sites along Gum Creek in the upper Neches River basin in East Texas indicates that the five sites had both Woodland period (ca. 2500-1200 years ago) and Caddo era occupations and associated material culture remains. Sparsely occupied Woodland components at the Buckner Dam (41CE339), Jacksonville Campground (41CE342), Cat Creek (41CE344), and Piney Point (41CE445) sites are marked by a few plain sandy paste Goose Creek Plain, var. unspecified ceramic sherds and Godley and Gary dart points. These sites must have been the scene of a few small camps episodically occupied for short periods of time, and not the scene of more permanent Woodland habitation. Such sites may be present along the Neches River and/or larger tributaries to the river, where resources were more predictable and seasonally abundant.

The prehistoric Caddo occupations at the Lake Jacksonville sites, especially those documented at the Buckner Dam and Jacksonville Campground sites, likely had more substantial use, probably as farmsteads or small hamlets that would have been dispersed along Gum Creek and in the upper Neches River valley and small and large tributaries. The Caddo occupation appears to have been extensive, at least during some part of the Caddo era in East Texas. Ceramic comparisons between the four sites with Caddo ceramic vessel sherds (Table 4) suggest—if one ignores the P/DR values, which are suspect in the case...
of the Jacksonville Campground and Mission sites because they do not meet the 200 plain and decorated sherd sample size threshold for reliability)—that these sites may well be from a generally contemporaneous community of Caddo peoples living along Gum Creek whose material culture included a distinctive array of ceramic characteristics.

These characteristics include the manufacture of ceramic vessels primarily using local clays and crushed sherds (grog) as the predominant temper, with little use of bone temper (4.5-10.1% of the sherds). These vessels were intended for domestic, and household, use. Utility wares, both sherds from brushed jars and vessels with wet paste decorations, including incised, punctated, incised-punctated, and pinched methods, make up the vast bulk of the decorated vessels (between 79.2-100% of the sherds) from the four Gum Creek sites. Maydelle Incised and Killough Pinched types are present in the assemblages. There are also post-A.D. 1400 Poynor Engraved sherds from two of the sites, and elbow pipes at the Buckner Dam site. Taken in concert with the fact that brushed sherds comprise between 42-50% of the decorated sherds—and such proportions of brushed sherds in assemblages are seen only in the earliest part of the Late Caddo Frankston phase (Perttula 2011:Table 6-38) in the upper Neches River basin—the Lake Jacksonville sites likely were occupied between ca. A.D. 1400-1480. As such, it is concluded that the Lake Jacksonville Caddo sites were part of an upper Neches River basin grog-tempered ceramic tradition shared by Caddo peoples specific to this area (Perttula 2011:315-318 and Figure 6-71).
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Table 4. Ceramic comparisons of the Lake Jacksonville sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>P/DR</th>
<th>% brushed</th>
<th>% wet paste</th>
<th>% bone temper</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41CE447</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41CE445</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41CE442</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41CE339</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>670</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In March 2010, Raymond Powell of Mansfield, Louisiana, allowed the examination and photographic documentation of several artifacts in his possession. The specimens were given to him approximately 60 years ago by a friend who reportedly excavated them from a burial located in either Cass County or Titus County in East Texas. The collection consists of six ceramic vessels and three stone artifacts (Figure 1). The vessels appear to relate to both the Late Caddo Titus phase (ca. A.D. 1430-1680) (Perttula 1995, 2004; Thurmond 1990) as well as to contemporaneous sites in Bowie and Cass counties on the Red River near the Great Bend area, and the lower Sulphur River, that have been associated with the Nasoni Caddo (Perttula 2005; Perttula et al. 2010).

CERAMIC VESSELS

The first of the six vessels is a Pease Brushed-Incised (?) jar (Figure 1a). This small vessel has five rows of punctations on the rim (an unusual mode for the type), vertical incised lines serve as panel dividers, and diagonal incised lines fill the various panels. Surfaces are polished and no temper particles are visible.

There are two Taylor Engraved vessels, a jar or deep bowl (Figure 1b) and a bottle (Figure 1d). Rim decoration on the jar or deep bowl consists of bands filled with short diagonal and vertical engraved lines. The body of the vessel has a scroll pattern common for the type. Red pigment appears in some of the lines. Surfaces are polished and the vessel appears to have sparse bone temper. The Taylor Engraved bottle is decorated with curvilinear scroll elements and hatched pendant triangles. Patches of red pigment are present on surfaces and in some lines. Surfaces are polished and the bottle appears to have grog temper.

The collection also has two Simms Engraved bowls (Figure 1c, e). The rim of the first bowl has a series of hatched elements typical of the type. A very similar vessel is illustrated by Suhm and Jelks (1962:Plate 71a) from the late 17th to early 18th century Clements site (41CS25) in Cass County. The vessel is lightly polished and appears to have grog temper. On the second Simms Engraved bowl, the decoration is confined to the narrow rim and consists of bands bounded by ticked horizontal lines with hatched elements between bands. Vessels illustrated by Suhm and Jelks (1962:Plate 71f) and Perttula et al. (2010:Figures 20c and 21a) from the Clements site are almost identical to the Powell collection vessel. Its surfaces are polished but pitted and it is possible that the bowl has shell temper.

The last vessel in the collection is a Maydelle Incised jar (Figure 1f). This medium-sized jar has opposed sets of diagonal incised lines on the everted rim, with a row of punctations at the juncture of the rim and body. Surfaces are rough, as would be expected with a utility ware vessel probably used for cooking over a fire, and the vessel appears to have been made with a combination of bone and grog temper.

STONE ARTIFACTS

There is a grooved axe in the collection (Figure 1g). It is made from a dark gray porphyritic igneous stone, a raw material that is definitely not local to East Texas; it may have originated in the Ouachita
Mountains of southeastern Oklahoma and southwestern Arkansas. One surface is heavily battered on a single surface.

The second stone artifact is a chipped lenticular biface (Figure 1h). This is a large biface of a light gray, non-local chert that contains small brown to tan mottles. The material appears to be Mill Creek chert from southern Illinois (Harry J. Shafer, personal communication 2010; Charles Cobb, personal communication 2010; Ray 2007:247-250). One end is highly polished and has small secondary retouch scars. Cobb (personal communication 2010) classifies this specimen as a “chisel” based on its form. Mill Creek chert

Figure 1. Artifacts in the Raymond Powell Collection: a, possible Pease Brushed-Incised jar; b, d, Taylor Engraved; c, e, Simms Engraved; f, Maydelle Incised; g, grooved axe; h, lenticular biface or chisel; i, celt.
bifaces were widely distributed among Mississippian groups (Cobb 1989), but have not been reported previously from the Caddo Area.

Finally, there is a celt in the Powell collection (see Figure 1i). This is a petaloid celt made from a tan fine-grained quartzite or chert. It is pecked on the blunt, flat, proximal end, and the wide bit has chipping scars. Although the material for celt manufacture is unusual, the form is common for celts in the Caddo Area. One of the celts at the Clements site has the same form (Perttula et al. 2010:Figure 30a, c), although it was manufactured from a green siliceous shale or greenstone, also found in the Ouachita Mountains.

REFERENCES CITED

Cobb, C. R.

Perttula, T. K.

Perttula, T. K., B. Nelson, R. L. Cast, and B. Gonzalez

Ray, J. H.

Suhm, D. A. and E. B. Jelks (editors)

Thurmond, J. P.
1990 Archeology of the Cypress Creek Drainage Basin, Northeastern Texas and Northwestern Louisiana. Studies in Archeology 5. Texas Archeological Research Laboratory, The University of Texas at Austin.