Chickahominy Stylistic Expression: Preliminary Motif Analysis of Ceramics of the Chickahominy River Drainage

Jennifer Honora Ogborne

College of William & Mary - Arts & Sciences

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wm.edu/etd

Part of the History of Art, Architecture, and Archaeology Commons, and the Indigenous Studies Commons

Recommended Citation
https://dx.doi.org/doi:10.21220/s2-zw0y-2742

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, & Master Projects at W&M ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects by an authorized administrator of W&M ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@wm.edu.
CHICKAHOMINY STYLISTIC EXPRESSION:

Preliminary Motif Analysis of Ceramics of the Chickahominy River Drainage

__________________________

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Anthropology

The College of William and Mary in Virginia

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

__________________________

by

Jennifer Honora Ogborne

2004
APPROVAL SHEET

This Thesis is submitted in partial fulfillment of

The requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

[Signature]

Jennifer Honora Ogborne

Approved by the Committee, August 2004

[Signature]

Dr. Martin Gallivan, Chair

[Signature]

Dr. Danielle Moretti-Langholtz

[Signature]

Dr. Audrey Horning
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgements</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of Tables</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of Figures</td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>ix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 1: Chickahominy Culture History</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 2: Anthropological Theories of Style</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3: Previous Work in Native Ceramic Studies</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 4: Method and Classification</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 5: Quantitative Analysis of Motifs and Archaeological Contexts</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 6: Conclusions</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliography</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vita</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere thanks and gratitude to Dr. Martin Gallivan for his guidance, critical evaluation of my work and patience with my concerns and numerous questions throughout this analysis. I would also extend my appreciation to Dr. Danielle Moretti-Langholtz and Dr. Audrey Horning for critical reading of the manuscript and suggestions.

I am also indebted to my fellow graduate students at the College of William and Mary and other collegiate institutions for lending an ear, providing much needed support and aid during the course of my research.
LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Frequencies of motifs in Fields Two and Three</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Chickahominy River drainage</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Chickahominy River settlements on John Smith’s 1606 map of Virginia and the Chickahominy River showing the sites examined for this study</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sites found during the archaeological survey</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Griffith’s motif design elements</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lip motifs</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Incised lip and pcorded lip</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ungrouped motifs</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ungrouped motifs: concentric rectangles, incised net, dotted chevrons</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Fringed lip group</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Fringed lip motifs: incised and pcord</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Banded group submotifs</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Banded group submotifs: Type 2 and Type 1 dotted</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Banded group submotifs: Type 4, Type 9, Type 10</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Rappahannock Incised and Minguannan Incised ceramic motifs not found in the Chickahominy River drainage</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Rappahannock Incised and Minguannan Incised ceramic motifs present in the Chickahominy River drainage</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. Major motifs at each site 69
17. Major motif percentages according to context type 69
18. Motif percentages at Edgehill 70
19. Edgehill major motif percentages according to context type 70
20. Motif percentages at Buck Farm A 72
21. Buck Farm A motif percentages according to context type 72
22. Inner and outer palisade trench motif percentages 73
23. Major motif percentages at CC43 74
24. CC43 motif percentages according to context type 74
25. CC43 motif percentages according to mortuary or non-mortuary features 75
26. CC43 motif percentages for dog and human burials 76
27. Percentages of banded group submotifs 76
28. Edgehill banded group submotif percentages 78
29. Buck Farm A banded group submotif percentages 78
30. CC43 banded group submotif percentages sorted by mortuary and non-mortuary features 78
31. Non-banded vs. banded group percentages for all sites 80
32. Non-banded vs. banded group percentiles for all sites sorted by context 80
33. Field One major motifs according to site 82
34. Field One major motifs according to context type 82
35. Decorated vs. undecorated rim percentages for all sites 85
36. Decorated vs. undecorated rim percentages for all sites sorted by context 85
37. Edgehill decorated vs. undecorated percentages 86
38. Edgehill decorated vs. undecorated rim percentages sorted by mortuary feature status 86
39. Buck Farm A decorated vs. undecorated rim sherds sorted by context type 87
40. Percentages of major motifs according to period 88
41. Human mortuary contexts and percentages of major motifs 88
42. Decorated and non-decorated rim percentages 90
43. Late Woodland feature types and rim sherds 90
ABSTRACT

The concept of style has been employed by archaeologists to elucidate various social conditions of peoples. These include, but are not limited to, post martial residence, intragroup learning networks, intragroup social dynamics, intergroup group communication and trade networks. In the 1960s and 1970s Norman Barka and Ben McCary conducted an extensive survey of the Chickahominy River drainage. A collection of Native ceramic sherds from the Middle Woodland, Late Woodland and Proto-Historic Periods of considerable size was one of the results. Drawing upon previous research of Chesapeake ceramic studies, a stylistic system was developed for the Chickahominy ceramics. This system is based upon a highly detailed attribute analysis paying particular attention to the structure and composition of decorative motifs.

Of the numerous motifs present in the collection, the most numerous and intricate was the banded group motif. This motif was determined to be found in all activity contexts. However, it was found to be particular prominent in mortuary contexts, indicating that the motif not only had an ordinary application but also one that was potentially highly sensitive and distinctive related to mortuary ritual.

Previously developed style systems have been employed to explicate intergroup communication zones highlighting group differences and to create chronological typologies. This new method to describe the stylistic expression of Coastal Plain Virginia ceramics is employed to examine intragroup motif use associated with specific activities, such as mortuary practice, and intergroup similarities, highlighting shared motifs among various Chesapeake social groups. This style system has shown direct links to stylistic expression of Late Woodland peoples inhabited the state of Delaware, demonstrating many shared and nearly identical motif expression.

Because of the unique position of the Late Woodland and Contact Period Chickahominy people as a politically independent group of the Powhatan paramount chiefdom, this group of motifs is in a position to further elucidate social networks between the Chickahomines and Powhatans. Instead of indicating social boundaries, Chesapeake stylistic expression demonstrates extensive social networks of Native peoples.
CHICKAHOMINY STYLISTIC EXPRESSION
INTRODUCTION

When English explorers settled on Jamestown Island they found themselves located in the midst of an expansive and powerful chiefdom comprised of various Native groups under the leadership of Powhatan. Decreased mobility and increased social stratification had paved the way for the development of the paramount chiefdom in existence at the time of English arrival (Gallivan 2003). However, a few miles up the river from Jamestown along the Chickahominy River drainage was a group of peoples who, though surrounded on all sides by the large chiefdom, were a politically independent social group. The Chickahominies, who exhibited many of the same cultural characteristics as their neighbors, were governed by a council of eight elders. Powhatan was never able to place a chief over them. Though they remained independent, the Chickahominies allowed themselves to be employed by Powhatan for various military pursuits.

To the English, the Chickahominies represented a valuable source of sustenance and allegiance. To the Chickahominies, the English represented an ally whose support they could use to maintain their independence from Powhatan. Throughout their discussions of the Chickahominies, English observers noted that the Chickahominies were not fond of Powhatan and suggested that a certain amount of fear was present. Amidst the tumultuous years of the Contact period (1607-1650), which is included in the broader Proto-Historic Period (1500-1650), the Chickahominies would enter into an
alliance with English but ultimately join the Powhatan chiefdom in order to combat their former allies.

In 1967 a four year survey of the Chickahominy River was conducted by archaeologists from the College of William and Mary. The fruits of this study were manifest in a sizeable collection of prehistoric, Contact and historic period artifacts, including a significant amount of Native ceramic sherds. Though the bulk of this collection consists of undecorated sherds, a good proportion exhibited decorative elements. These decorated sherds present a unique opportunity to examine
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the stylistic expression of the peoples inhabiting the Chickahominy River drainage in the late prehistoric and Contact periods. Stylistic analysis for coastal plain peoples has been limited to analysis morphological and surface treatment while motifs confined to description. This study is a preliminary exploration of the stylistic system of the Chickahominy River drainage. This analysis led to the development of a stylistic system, a style grammar, which is used to describe and analyze the Native ceramic sherds from the Chickahominy River drainage. This new system may then be employed in a comparative context, for examining both the Chickahominy’s stylistic expression over
time and in various social contexts, as well as between social groups nearby, such as the Powhatan, and afar.

The motifs were first described and classified in order to fully understand the intricacies and extent of stylistic expression. Style has often been employed by archaeologists to answer questions about intergroup communications as well as intragroup social relations (i.e. Wobst 1977, Plog 1980), specifically in the contexts of social inequality. Stylistic expression is often associated with prestige goods and as indicators of elite status or specialized activities, such as feasting or mortuary practices. The stylistic system I developed the Chickahominy drainage is then in a position to elucidate social boundaries and inequalities among the Chickahominies and Powhatan groups. The most prevalent of the motifs in this collection is the banded group. It is the most elaborate, having the most number of permutations, outnumbers all other motifs, and is present in the Middle Woodland, Late Woodland and Contact Periods, demonstrating its continued importance as a decorative motif to the people of the Chickahominy River drainage.

The goal of the Chickahominy River Survey conducted by Norman Barka and Ben McCary was to assess the accuracy of the Contact Period maps drawn by John Smith and Don Pedro de Zuniga in relation to the positions of Chickahominy village sites along the river (Figure 1). The locations of major villages governed by local chiefs were indicated on these maps by "king's houses." Because the Chickahominy did not follow this political structure (Strachey 1998 [1758]: 627), no such markings existed on those areas of the maps. The survey uncovered numerous village sites along the Chickahominy
River (Figure 2). Evaluation of the artifacts and the sites' locations indicated that many of the excavated sites corresponded to those on the maps of Smith's 1607 exploration. McCary and Barka concluded that they had located eleven of the twelve sites on Smith's map and seven of Zuniga's nineteen (1977: 73-75, 85).

The sherds drawn from the collection for this study were from the Edgehill (44CC29), Buck Farm (44CC37) and 44CC43 (unnamed) sites. The Edgehill site was found to correspond to the village of Paspanegh*, which was present on both the Smith and Zuniga maps. This site on the right bank of the river was determined to be a late prehistoric site and contained five ossuary contexts. The Zuniga map indicated that the village of Mansa would be located at the top of a large bend of the river below Mount Airy. No site was found there, however, a palisaded village was found about one mile down the river. While the site did not match exactly to the Smith and Zuniga maps, the site was correlated with Zuniga's village of Mansa. This, the Buck Farm site, consisted of
a single burial, various trade goods and two palisade contexts. The outer palisade delineated a much larger settlement than the inner trench. Carbon dating indicated that the larger outer trench was several hundred years older than the inner (McCary & Barka 1977: 82-83). The third site, 44CC43, was not shown to correlate to any of the sites on either the Smith or Zuniga maps. Unfortunately, information about 44CC43 is scanty, limited to a few pages of notes and a few drawings and maps. However, the site did consist of numerous ossuary contexts which had been deposited over several hundred years during the Late Woodland period.

These three sites yielded numerous ceramic sherds with a myriad of stylistic expression. Archaeological approaches to style are numerous and diverse. However, style is most often said to be a communicative vehicle among and between peoples. I employed a modified form of Martin Wobst’s information exchange model (1977), in

---

*The village of Paspanegh (or Paspanigh as Zuniga spells it) is further up the river than the village of Paspahegh, the seat of the Paspahegh’s weroance (McCary & Barka 1977: 76, 78).
which he stated that stylistic expression was a method through which a person could communicate ideas about, among many things, status and group identity. This model can also be applied within communities to look at social differentiation as it relates to stylistic expression on prestige goods, often associated with ritual and mortuary contexts. This, in addition with its later permutations developed by Pauline Wiessner, Jay Custer and Daniel Griffith, will be used in order to evaluated the inter- and intragroup applications of motif expressions.

Drawing upon methods developed in earlier studies (Griffith 1977, Griffith & Custer 1985), I described and classified the decorated sherds from the Buck Farm, Edgehill and CC43, amalgamating the motifs into groups and then exploring the permutations, or submotifs, of each group. This classification scheme was then evaluated in conjunction with previous studies of temporally concurrent ceramics in order to explore intergroup and regional comparisons. I then employed exploratory data analysis and statistical testing in order to evaluate the relationships between motif groups and archaeological contexts in attempt to link motifs to various social activities and groups.

This preliminary exploration of the Chickahominy stylistic expression yielded intriguing results for both within the communities and on a regional scale. While it was difficult to answer questions concerning the relations between the Chickahominies and their Powhatan neighbors due to the lack of motif analysis of sherds from Powhatan contexts, the qualitative analysis of the motifs indicated striking similarities to ceramic motifs produced by Algonquian peoples of Delaware. While the Delaware ceramics were often more elaborate, many of the motifs and components of those motifs were similar to or nearly exactly the same to those discerned in the Chickahominy drainage. This
suggests that the motif expressions were not indicative of social boundary maintenance, but rather illustrative of the social networks between Native coastal groups, including the Powhatan groups and those as far north as Delaware, in both pre-Contact and Proto-Historic periods (see also Rountree 1989, 1990, 1993; Potter 1993; Turner 1976, 1992; Turner & Rountree 2002). Within the Chickahominy community the most frequent motif group, the banded group, was shown to be connected to several types of contexts. However, it was found to be specifically connected to specialized contexts associated with mortuary practice and other special activities. Stylistic expression was found to be most prolific in human mortuary contexts, reaching its peak during the Late Woodland period and declining into the early historic era. It follows that Chickahominy stylistic expression demonstrates that many of these motifs were shared on a regional scale, illustrating large scale social networks present in the pre-Contact periods and Proto-Historic, and within the drainage motifs were employed in specific contexts, most prolifically in the Late Woodland (A.D. 900-1600) period and declining in the Proto-Historic.
CHAPTER 1
CHICKAHOMINY CULTURE HISTORY

As a context for the analysis of Native ceramic style of the late prehistoric and Contact period Chickahominy River drainage, the following provides a brief culture historical overview of the peoples residing within the drainage during that period. In the years following the establishment of the Jamestown colony, Native communities living in the Chickahominy drainage were observed to be both culturally related and politically distinct from the more well-known Powhatan chiefdom which dominated the Virginia coastal plain. As a rather small pocket of independent peoples within the paramount chiefdom of Powhatan, the Chickahominies of the early colonial era were unique in the Chesapeake world. This uniqueness unfortunately did not merit frequent mention in the documentary accounts of Jamestown colonists, who were far more concerned with the much more populous and power Powhatan groups. Ethnohistorian Helen Rountree concluded in her work on the Powhatan Indians that little is known about the Chickahominies aside from their council of eight elders, a political leadership that set them apart from other Virginia Algonquian communities ruled by weroances, or chiefs (1989: 8).

In fact, a close textual analysis of these writings indicates that additional information about the Chickahominy Indians may be drawn from the historical records,
particularly with regard to their peace negotiations with the English. Although the Chickahominies exhibited social institutions that were different from those of other Algonquian-speaking communities inhabiting coastal Virginia (collectively referred to during the early colonial era as "Powhatans"), the Chickahominy resided in the same geographic area and are subsumed within the broader Powhatan world in most ethnographic and historic studies. In keeping with this practice, the basic cultural institutions and practices of the Chickahominies are assumed to be similar to those of the Powhatan. While the direct historical approach tends to freeze Native society in an artificial "ethnographic present," these accounts are perhaps the richest source of data concerning Native communities of the Chickahominy River, and however flawed, provide a powerful point of departure.

The coastal plain of the Chesapeake was inhabited by Algonquian speaking peoples living in an environment rich in marine food sources, terrestrial game, fertile soil and numerous navigable waterways. Preferring a mixed forest zone for its exploitable resources, these peoples organized themselves into households centered on domestic modes of production. Settlements were clustered into semi-permanent towns that ranged in size from a handful of dwellings to about one hundred. Settlements followed two dispersal patterns: one in the late autumn for hunting and the second for foraging after crops were sown. Settlements were located along waterways on high ground and were strung out across the landscape. This pattern was the result of their agricultural practices; dwellings were located next to the occupant’s fields, which could range from twenty to two hundred acres in size thus spreading the people out across the landscape. Some of the towns, especially those close to hostile neighbors, were ringed with palisades, i.e. the
Great Neck and Potomac Creek sites. If the soils at a particular settlement became 
exhausted the people would move to a new location, clearing their fields using a slash-

The dwellings of the coastal plain Virginia Indians were single room structures with 
a central hearth. Archaeological excavations have shown that structures were both 
circular and ovoid in shape and constructed using a framework overlaid with bark or reed 
mats. These dwellings were inexpensive to make and easily moved should the need arise 
(Rountree 1989: 58-61). English observers recorded bedsteads along the walls and 
storage facilities hanging from the roof. Additional structures included sweathouses, 
menstrual huts and if a local chief, or weroance, lived on the site then larger dwellings 
and mortuary temples could also be present (Potter 1993: 26-27).

The people observed five seasons each year. Deer were hunted in the late fall and 
winter and the anadromous fish were caught in April. The village became the social 
activity center in the fall from September to November, but dispersed for hunting and 
reconvened in the late winter or spring (Potter 1993: 40-43). While the hunting and 
fishing existed in the domain of men, women were the primary horticulturists and planted 
beans and maize together. This aided in the preservation of the nitrogen in the soil. 
Unfortunately, the accoutrements used by women, such as pottery vessels, were poorly 
recorded by the English observers. It is known, however, that planting equipment, like 
hoes, was made from stone, shells or bone. Culinary equipment was restricted to coil 
made pots that had rounded, conical bases so they could be wedged into coals. Baskets 
were employed for sieving or for gathering of floral comestibles (Rountree 1989: 33-34, 
60-65).
Kinship systems within the Powhatan world were unfortunately not recorded by European observers, however, Rountree suspected that descent was traced bilaterally. Within the family the work of men and women were separate, although sexual freedom was noted for both partners and divorce was possible. In the event of the dissolution of a marriage the woman retained the dwelling, its associated features and often the children. However, sons frequently accompanied their fathers. The progression of male life stages has been a popular subject of anthropologists and historians (i.e. Rountree 1989, 1990 and Axtell 1981), particularly the *huskanaw* initiation rite. While the original symbolism behind the event has been lost, it is known to have been a harsh and dramatic process consisting of liminal separate and reintegration of young males into society as adult individuals (Rountree 1989: 78-81, 87-99).

The political structure of Powhatan society consisted of a paramount chief known as *mamanatowick* who exercised his executive power primarily in military contexts. Below the paramount chief were the seven head priests, and his advisors or *cronoccoes*. The district chiefs or *weroances*, *weroansqua* for a female chief, occupied the next rung and said to have held life and death power over their people (Rountree 1989: 115, 117). Their position was inherited through the matriline. At the bottom of the social ladder were “common” people, as the English came to call them, and war captives, who occupied the lowest rung (Potter 1993: 16). Those of high status in Powhatan society were distinguished by their more elaborate clothing and adornment, such as fringed mantles. This hierarchical structure was deeply tied to the heavy tribute system levied by Powhatan. It was said that Powhatan demanded eight of every ten parts for his tribute, but
this may not have been the actual received amounts. The collected tribute was distributed among a small, select group (Rountree 1989: 110-113).

Recent archaeology analysis by Martin Gallivan has shown that the arrival of Europeans was not the catalyst for the consolidation of Powhatan’s power, rather that this process started long before European explorations and was a result of many processes. Beginning in the Late Woodland period both population and instances of public architecture increased. The abrupt increase in household population created a more exploitable workforce and hence a surplus. What is then seen is a shift from a household mode of production to a more community oriented one. The presence of public architecture, such as palisades, has been suggested to be indicative of an emerging communal and group identity. The presence of larger domestic structures and palisades suggests a possible emergence of village leaders and elite institutions (Gallivan 2003: 26-27, 49, 110, 120). Upon the arrival of Europeans to the shores of Tsenacomoco, the Algonquian designation of this particular area of coastal Virginia, there was already in place a system that had resulted from growing populations and increased communal structure. The paramount chiefdom may have still been young, but was already established at the time of contact.

Although Powhatan had control over numerous groups many managed to retain autonomy, including the Chickahominies. While the Chickahominies existed in the center of the chiefdom, groups living on the edge were able to retain their independence because of their geographical positions. These groups included the Accomacs and Accohannocks on the Eastern Shore and the Chicacoans to the north. While Powhatan was constructing a new Powhatan ethnic identity among the groups he controlled, these groups existed on
the “ethnic fringe” (Potter 1993: 45; Gleach 1997: 24; Rountree 1989: 14). Powhatan maintained what has been characterized as “warily friendly” relations with the chiefdoms along the Potomac River. By 1400 AD this region was dotted with nucleated palisaded settlements under the control of petty chiefdoms. Both the Powhatan and the Piscataway vied to expand their political spheres of influence into this area. Ceramic analysis, pertaining to temper and surface treatments, has been used to indicate relationships among these groups (Clark & Rountree 1993: 131-133).

Existing within the Powhatan chiefdom, the Chickahominies, or “crushed corn people” (Rountree 1989: 11), occupied a precarious position during the Contact and Early Historic periods; their status as an independent group separate from the Powhatans could have potentially placed them between the two juggernauts of the paramount chief and the newly arrived settlers. Indeed, Thomas Dale perceived them to occupy a “delicate seat” (1998[1614]: 846). However, this small group managed to negotiate their position to their advantage for many years before becoming allies of the Powhatans. Although they remained a separate political, and possibly ethnic, identity, the Chickahominies did pay Powhatan a tribute (Rountree 1989: 119).

As previously stated, the Chickahominy political system was drastically different from the one exhibited by the Powhatans. No weroance governed their towns, and Powhatan was never able to place one in their district. They were instead governed by a council of eight elders called munguys (Potter 1993: 14; Gleach 1997: 26). They had no one capital town, which is demonstrated by the markings on Smith’s map, and their fighting force consisted of 200-300 men, sometimes noted to be as many as 500 (Rountree 1989: 11-14; Hamor 1998[1615]: 811). Rountree suggests that the
Chickahominies exhibited some sort of social equality in relation to their hierarchical Powhatan neighbors (1989: 100). Their resistance to Powhatan’s domination is remarkable given Powhatan’s extraordinary ability to consolidate groups into his domain. Chickahominy independence has been attributed to their military strength and to their war-like and free nature (Gleach 1997: 26; Rountree 1989: 119). While the idea that a small group such as the Chickahominies could have competed with the military might supposedly available to Powhatan might be questionable, the Chickahominies were noted to have great military talent and though independent allowed themselves to be hired by Powhatan as mercenaries. Relations with other neighboring groups, however, were not always civil. Ethnographic and archaeological data indicate a certain friction between the Chickahominies and Pamunkey. When the Pamunkey joined the Powhatan chiefdom the threat of Chickahominy hostility was mitigated (Turner 1993: 92-93). These inter-group frictions were also noted by the early Jamestown officials, specifically noted to be with the Powhatan.

To the English, the Chickahominies were a potential source of sustenance and military alliance. Those groups, such as the Chickahominies, existing on the fringes of Powhatan’s control sought alliance with the English in the expectation of gaining leverage for their potentially precarious autonomy (Rountree 1993: 179). As an independent social group the Chickahominies saw the English as potential strategic allies. They were described as a “dogged nation” (Smith 1998[1612]: 285), “a stout and warlike nation” (Dale 1998[1614]: 846), and “a lusty and daring people who have long time lived free from Powhatan’s subjugation” (Strachey 1998[1758]: 616). Through their negotiations with the English, highly detailed in Ralph Hamor’s A True Discourse, the
English perceived a social and political rift between the independent Chickahominies and the Powhatans. According to Hamor the Chickahominies considered Powhatan to be a poor leader whose actions were often cruel and unjust and his desire for tribute fueled by pride and greed (1998[1615: 812]. While this may have been true, this assessment of Powhatan’s leadership skills may have been exacerbated by Hamor and his compatriots to cast the chief in a bad light in order to justify later actions.

In 1614, after learning that the Powhatan had sued for peace with the English, the Chickahominies also requested a truce with the new settlers. This was interpreted by the English as an offering of their service to then governor Sir Thomas Dale. The Chickamonies requested that Dale become their supreme head and they would adopt the name of tossantessas, their term for the Englishmen, and no longer apply the name of Chickahominy to themselves and hence become subjects and tributaries to King James (Hamor 1998[1615]: 809-810). In turn, the English promised:

Not only to defend and keep them from the fury and danger of Powhatan, which thing they most feared, but even from all other enemies domestic and foreign; and that we would yearly by trade furnish them... that we would permit them to enjoy their own liberties, freedoms, and laws, and to be governed as formerly by eight of their chiefest men. (Hamor 1998[1615]: 812)

The English perceived this sudden outpour of friendship to be accompanied by fear of Powhatan’s reprisal of their action, which Hamor perceived to be disobedience. Hamor also noted that “they chose rather to subject themselves to us then being enemies to both to expose and lay themselves open to Powhatan’s tyranny and oppression”(Hamor 1998[1615]: 812-813). Despite the fact that the Chickahominies had before allowed themselves to be hired by Powhatan, the relationship had deteriorated out of fear of his wrath such that the Chickahominies were willing to enter into an accord with the English settlers. This overview of shifting relations among the Chickahominies, Powhatans and
English is but a glimpse of the intricacies of this history, or our understanding of events undoubtedly colored by settlers’ accounts of these peoples. In characterizing the Chickahominies as willing allies that turned to the English in their time of need, the English may have imposed a positive spin on the events of the early seventeenth century, especially in light of the hostilities of the period. So, on the one hand the Chickahominies were depicted as desperate and fearful of the nearby Powhatans such that they were willing to subject themselves to the English to the extent that they stated they began to call themselves “Chickahominy Englishmen” (Dale 1998[1614]: 846). Viewed from another perspective the request for an alliance was in fact a shrewd strategy on the part of the Chickahominies. If we take into consideration the fact that they were able to maintain independence for many years from Powhatan, then the Chickahominies become clever political strategists who would have seen an alliance with the English to be a savvy tactic that would have allowed them to retain their autonomy and still keep Powhatan control at a distance.

Ethnohistorian Frederic Gleach has argued that this was indeed the case with the Chickahominies, stating that they gave up little in entering into an alliance with the English, especially since provisions were made for them to retain their governing council. Gleach also points out that through this agreement the Chickahominies could expect great benefits from peaceful trading relations (1997: 136-138). Since the English were also allied with the Powhatans, this alliance would presumably protect them from Powhatan domination. Also, by entering into a separate agreement with the English, the Chickahominies undercut Powhatan authority with a bold statement.
However, relations between the Chickahominies and the English did not remain in this comfortable stage of friendship for long. English requests for corn not only strained the Powhatan peoples, but the Chickahominies as well. Constant requests from Englishmen may have caused great annoyance, but environmental factors also played a part. The arrival of the English and the establishment of Jamestown coincided with a drought period. Decreases in moisture adversely effected crop yields and thereby created shortages among the native peoples, which would have made them reluctant to trade with the English (Blanton 2000). English requests for corn were often met with disdain, indifference or even open hostility (Smith 1998[1612]: 285, 1998[1624]: 859). This culminated in armed conflicts with both groups of native peoples. The result of one such engagement left approximately twelve Chickahominy dead, two of their council taken prisoner, and one hundred bushels of corn seized (Smith 1998[1624]: 860). It was in response to these hostilities that the Chickahominies formulated a truce with Powhatan in 1611 and formally joined the paramountcy 1616 (Rountree 1989:148). In 1616, a rising Opechancanough, Powhatan’s successor, seized control of the Chickahominy town of Ozinies, which effectively brought them under Powhatan domination (Gleach 1997: 141).

In the 1640s, English colonists attacked the Chickahominies and their Pamunkey neighbors. After 1646 the Chickahominies were found to have returned to their government by a council of eight and no record of a weroance was noted. In 1761 Thomas Jefferson found that that the Chickahominy people had removed, or perhaps had been removed, from their location on the river bearing their name to the Mattaponi River (Gleach 1997: 176, 188, 203).
The body of anthropological work concentrating on the Powhatan people has perhaps overshadowed the Chickahominies. While elaborately intertwined with the rise, fall and intricacies of the Powhatan chiefdom, the Chickahominies’ position as a separate, though at times dependent, political entity deserves attention. Clearly they were a politically keen people who were able to maintain some form of autonomy from the authoritative Powhatan through manipulation of negotiations with the English. Their role in the volatile politics of the seventeenth century could perhaps be more pivotal than the historical and ethnographic work suggests. As a separate entity they would have been seen as a valuable ally to both the English and the Powhatan. And while their relatively small numbers may not have significantly upset the military balance, their control of the Chickahominy waterway and their abundant food supplies placed them in a position of import to Powhatan and the English. The question still remains if the Chickahominies thought of themselves as having a different ethnic identity than their Powhatan neighbors and if this view translated into material culture. At the very least, the Chickahominies were a distinct social group from the Powhatans. Surrounded by communities allied with or subsumed within the Powhatan polity, the Chickahominies appear to have retained a separate identity through the rise and fall of the Powhatan chiefdom. Analysis of Chickahominy material culture during the centuries prior to and including the early colonial period should shed light on these issues.
CHAPTER 2
ANTHROPOLOGICAL THEORIES OF STYLE

The examination of stylistic expression in material culture can shed light onto the social or ethnic boundaries and dynamics between and among groups. Style theory has progressed through many stages and applications in the archaeological discipline. This progression has been influenced by the shift from functional approaches to the current discussions of agency and practice theory. Those approaches discussed here pertain directly to the ways in which style theory has been and can be applied to ceramic analysis.

The development of style theory has prominently focused upon the choices of the social actors of a given social group. It has moved from seeing style as a passive element that fulfills a particular social function, to that which is socially active and the result of personal choices made by various social actors. Michelle Hegmon defines style as "a way of doing something," echoing the assessment that style is the result of a choice (1992: 517). She also correctly points out that anthropologist have accepted these basic tenants of style, yet continue to disagree on the finer points and definitions of style. Specifically, Hegmon identifies disagreement in style’s purpose, especially in reference to its communicative nature, relation to cognitive process and its place in space and time.
Anthropological discourse has touched upon many facets of what style can mean archaeologically.

Stylistic discourse began with the ceramic sociology studies of the 1960s, such as those done by Longacre (1970) and Deetz (1960). Dubbed the “learning and interaction model” by Hegmon, these studies focused on style as it related to social interaction spheres and contexts of learning. This was directly linked to the movement of women and their role as artisans. It was suggested that a woman learns certain crafts from her mother’s people and hence produces objects that are similar to those of that particular social group. Upon moving into a social group for marriage, women presumably take their learned behaviors with them, or instead, alter their applications to match those of their new social spheres (Hegmon 1992: 56).

The first of the responses to this early conception of style was functional in nature. Martin Wobst (1977) maintained that style was not handmaiden to function, but rather had a specific function of its own. Wobst identified a void in the archaeological literature about the role of artifacts in prehistoric exchange models. He based his theory of style upon a model of information exchange, which he defined as all events involving communication in which messages are both emitted and received. Once the message was emitted, then the effort of the emitter was finished and all energy expenditure was in the hands of the receiver. These messages were conveyed through stylistic behavior and could include information about social groups, class affinity, social rank, emotional state, authorship, ownership, religion and politics. The message transmitted supposedly lessened the stress involved in new social encounters. Wobst also stated that archaeological assumptions about the correspondence of social boundaries with stylistic
ones needed to be more sensitive than simply searching for concurrence (1977: 319-329). He concluded that style “reacts with great sensitivity to changes in other cultural variables and, of itself, actively supports other cultural processes, such as cultural integration and differentiation, boundary maintenance, compliance with norms and enforcing conformity” (1977: 335). Departing from initial hypotheses focused around the movement of women, Wobst brought the whole of the social group into the fold of stylistic communication. However, his approach is more exclusive than inclusive. What I mean by this is that Wobst implies that stylistic expressions are employed to differentiate “us” from “you” and can maintain the boundaries between groups, of whatever kind.

Wobst’s information exchange model was applied and altered by many archaeologists working with various classes of material culture, specifically in North American prehistoric ceramics. David P. Braun echoed Wobst’s assessment that style was an active agent, and not only helped to structure social behavior but also was structured by it. In addition to this, Braun stated that social identity could be expressed through style and defined social integration as the “shared participation in a single network of social identities” (1985: 133). He therefore painted style as a rigid concept that could be equated with a particular group. This also implied that if a stylistic expression was present in two groups, then it must indicate that the two groups shared a social identity (see also Plog 1980, 1983, 1990, 1992, Plog and Braun 1983, Hantman and Plog 1982, Kintigh 1985). Stephen Plog, as an adherent of the information exchange model, stated that “how we perceive a design to be used is a culturally determined decision- determined by our culture, not the culture of the makers” (1995: 377). Many
archaeologists have echoed this comment and the importance of recognizing that these are imposed categories should not be underestimated.

One of the more prevalent dialogues concerning style was that between James Sackett (1977, 1982, 1986) and Pauline Wiessner (1984, 1985). This was initiated by Sackett’s proposal of isochrestic, or rote leaning, and iconoclastic stylistic types. In his assessment, style was particular to a specific time and space and aptly pointed out that while an archaeologist may see style, the original maker may have seen only function (1977). Wiessner found fault with the idea of isochrestism and instead suggested “assertive” and “emblematic” as better categories. In her evaluation, style was a cognitive process and involved personal and social identification through comparison: “if style is seen as a means of identification then in exchange it must mediate between the identity of the giver and that of the receiver” (1984: 228). The two debated their ideas back and forth, disagreeing over the semantics of their conceptions of style. Both focused on the ethnic quality they saw as implicit to style. Sackett stated that isochrestism was “a model concerning the issue of where style resides, specifically the view that ethnic style does not constitute in itself a specific or restricted area of form but rather is a latent quality...An isochrestic perspective no doubt encourages the researcher to search for ethnic iconicism in as broad a range of material culture as possible, but in itself has no ready explanation of how it got there in any specific instance” (1986: 275). Again, like Wobst, Sackett and Wiessner focused on delineated the “us” from the “you” and how that discourse was communicated through exclusive stylistic expression. They assumed that each social group, which they define as an ethnic group, will want to demonstrate their uniqueness amongst others.
The introduction of Pierre Bourdieu’s (1972) concepts of *habitus* and the associated practice theory had significant impact on anthropological theory. In regards to style theory, the role of the individual potter was revitalized. As previously stated, style theory had been deeply ingrained with the concept of choice, and the addition of practice theory opened new options for this line of inquiry. Working from this particular theoretical framework, Michael Dietler and Ingrid Herbich (1989) examined the potting process among the Luo people. While they found that motifs could be indicative of individual potters, the decoration process involved the least amount of work and effort. This conclusion led them to critique Wobst’s assessment that stylistic expression necessitated extra energy on the part of the potter. Because they found that motif expression involved little effort, Dietler and Herbich concluded that the attributes containing identity expression could be constructed at any stage of the pot’s manufacture, as part of the “chaine operatoire,” the operational sequence.

Further development of Dietler’s and Herbich’s ideas led to the conclusion that decoration alone was too narrow a focus for the complete understanding of style. Dietler and Herbich found that style responded to cultural and social demands and constraints. It is from this assessment that they found the information-exchange model to be too narrow in focus due to its functional and reductionist qualities due to its lack of attention given to the actual social contexts in which the materials were constructed. Style, according to Dietler and Herbich, is not a text to be read, that it is instead the process that is the important aspect, and hence their emphasis on the chaine operatoire. They explicated this process their observed among the Luo using Bourdieu’s *habitus* as a guide. As both an agent and product of social behavior, the *habitus* of individual potters allowed them to
make certain choices in the process of potting. The boundaries of “style zones” of the Luo and their neighbors did not correspond with the perceived social boundaries. Therefore, they concluded that style was not a marker of social groups (Dietler & Herbich 1998). With the data available for this project a study such as the one conducted by Dietler and Herbich that draws upon the chaine operatoire is not possible. The lack of correspondence between social groups and style zones is, however, particularly relevant. If the Chickahominy people saw themselves as a distinct social group from the Powhatans, then, according to older models, their stylistic expression would reflect that. However, Dietler and Herbich propose that this would not be the case, that it would be the process of making these vessels that is the key.

Another adherent to postmodern approaches is Ian Hodder. Hodder (1990) begins his discussion of style with defining what it is not. He stated that it is not the summation of cultural attributes, not a set of rules dictating action, not a summary of objective motifs and not a choice made between functional options. While he agrees with Wobst in that it can transmit information, it cannot be reduced to social functions. He instead suggested that style was a relational expression of interpretive events. Style was then a variable in social strategies in creating relationships. Hodder found that style had power, that it was active and creative. Dissatisfied with other archaeological approaches to style, Hodder suggested that archaeologists instead concentrate on interpretation, rather than simplistic description (1990: 44-49). Hodder’s outright rejection of the descriptive and quantitative sort of analysis seems to be a rather hasty action. He appears to imply that descriptive and quantitative studies should be discarded in favor of more interpretive studies. However, for many areas of the world, the descriptive and quantitative sort of analysis have been
done. However, this is not the case for the Chickahominy drainage. In rejecting a
descriptive analysis, Hodder dismisses a critical step toward stylistic interpretations. In
order to produce the sort of deeper analysis Hodder calls for, one must first complete
descriptive analyses. Hodder is correct in saying that these types of studies should no
longer be the end of an analysis. Indeed, they are the beginning of the types of
approaches Hodder advocates. Hodder made a crucial point that interpretation is needed,
in which style is not solely considered a social function, but rather an “interpretive
property of events” (1990: 45). His points about style reflecting social strategies and
events is most valuable to this particular study, especially when considering the styles
present in the Delaware record (see below).

These approaches characterize the bulk of stylistic interpretation and ceramic
analysis. There do exist many other contributions of no less value but of perhaps less
popularity. The first of these is the psychological model proposed by Christopher Carr
and Jill Neitzel (1995). Carr and Neitzel suggested that style results from the inner world
of a person. They also proposed that style could be better understood when universal
myths and archetypes have been identified. Another approach derives its origins from the
concepts made famous by Charles Darwin. In 1978, Robert Dunnell suggested that
stylistic elements and selection were reflective of Darwinian processes at work in a given
society. This was further expounded upon by J.N. Hill (1985), who compared style to a
set of grammatical rules in a state of flux that could transition or become extinct. A set of
people had at their disposal a stylistic pool, akin to a gene pool, from which they could
draw in order to express themselves. Change would therefore occur from mutation or
 genetic flow, which Hill analogized to invention/innovation and diffusion. He concluded
by stating that style should be considered in an ecological adaptive framework using biological evolution as an analogy because of its unique ability to answer questions about origins (see also Neiman 1995 and Bentley & Maschner 2001).

While the concept of cultural evolution is often not well received by contemporary anthropologists, there exist in this theoretical framework many ideas that of particular use to the identification of the stylistic corpus of the Chickahominy ceramics. Chief among these is the concept of stylistic grammar. While Dietler and Herbich find fault with this idea and Hodder dismisses descriptive analysis, the notion that various motifs and the components of which they are comprised can be read like a script is helpful when attempting to discern patterns. If the concept of a stylistic grammar is applied, then it is easy to see which motifs relate to each other by noting the configuration and combinations of the various components. Also helpful in this is Hill's notion of the style pool (1985: 374-380). Presumably, if one is to consider a stylistic corpus analogous to a grammar or language, then there should be a number of options available from which artisans can choose. This is not to say that there are not options for the introduction of new designs, but it logically limits the basic elements present in a stylistic tradition.

The approaches to style theory discussed herein appear to be disparate and contradictory, however several common threads exist. The notion that style is a communicative element, since its introduction of Wobst, is an important part of these models, save for that of Dietler and Herbich. Therefore, from Wobst I draw the idea that style is expressive of some set of ideas that are easily expressed in a non-verbal format. In taking this position, style is then seen to have a function. That function is indeed active in that it is communicating something, be it within a social group or outside it, on behalf
of the artisan. Expressing style does take effort; even if the effort to produce it is less than other processes in the chaine opertoire, its importance is not diminished. The ideas that style can communicate have the potential to be both intra or intergroup and are not necessarily indicative of social boundaries.

Wobst, Sackett, Wiessner and other practitioners of strains of the information-exchange model follow the idea that a style can represent a social group and reflect social boundaries. Dietler and Herbich call this into question as they saw that social boundaries did not reflect the boundaries of style zones. In considering the case of the Chickahominies, the corpus of ceramics produced by the survey offers a rich data set to address the issue. Given their unique position as an independent social group surrounded on all sides by a paramount chiefdom, their stylistic expression of the may articulate ethnic and social boundaries.

The study of ethnicity as it refers to social boundaries is often a difficult undertaking. The presence of "ethnicity" in Contact period Chesapeake is very difficult to define or even approach. Fredrik Barth discusses the concepts of social boundaries, as it relates to ethnicity, in terms of actors and performance. A social actor has the ability to choose his performance according to the stage, or social situation. He can therefore emphasize particular behaviors or characteristics in order to conform or to distance himself from the social situation. Barth and the contributors to his edited volume also stress how boundaries may be crossed and be intersected by social actors (Barth 1998[1969]: 14, 17, 20-25). A sample of ceramics from the Chickahominy River Survey will be used in order to investigate potential social boundaries of the late prehistoric and Contact period Chickahominy drainage. The ideas of style grammar from the
evolutionary models can be applied to the description and classification of the motifs present on the sherds. Wobst's information-exchange model can be modified by inserting ideas regarding intragroup communication about certain activities, such as ritual and mortuary practice, and at the same time still address intergroup exchanges, though stressing both differences and similarities.
CHAPTER 3
PREVIOUS WORK IN NATIVE CERAMIC STUDIES

The appearance of ceramics circa 1000 B.C. marks the commencement of the Woodland Period in the Mid-Atlantic. The following discussion of previous ceramic studies traces the development of ceramic classification and application in archaeological research. I begin by looking at early ceramic technology and its relation to steatite vessels before turning to a discussion of Late Woodland ceramics. This review outlines how the current ceramic typology was developed and what has been said with regard to social groups and boundaries as they are manifest in ceramic evidence as well as the uses of vessels for specific activities. The goal of this review is to highlight the importance of attribute based analysis, demonstrate the pitfalls of earlier methods and interpretations and to show the direction ceramic analysis is currently progressing.

Steatite Vessels and Marcey Creek Pottery

Before the development of ceramic technology, containers were constructed of a variety of materials, such as wood and skins, which are subject to deterioration in the archaeological record. Vessels of steatite fashioned into rectangular vessels with lug handles survive the test of time. The relative scarcity of these vessels relative to later prolific ceramic numbers has led some researchers to link steatite bowls to ritual, feasting
and long-distance exchange relations dominated by higher-status individuals (Hantman & Gold 2002: 278). The earliest ceramic forms, such as Marcey Creek Ware (950±95 B.C., uncallibrated) and Bushnell Ware (1110±60 B.C., uncallibrated), exhibited a steatite temper and were constructed using the same slab construction as steatite vessels. This shift has been characterized by Jeffrey Hantman and Debra Gold (2002) has a democratization of the steatite trade. They suggest that peoples with easy access to soapstone may have undercut elite trade networks by constructing vessels from clay using the steatite as a temper, thus allowing greater access to the same shaped vessels to all levels of the community (2002: 279-280). The quadrangle vessels were replaced with connoidal shapes constructed using coil and scrape methods. During the Early (1000 B.C.-500 B.C.) and Middle (500 B.C.- A.D. 800) Woodland periods widespread experimentation appears to have occurred with surface treatments and tempers. Surface treatments included net impression, cord marking and smoothing. Sand and lithic materials were the most common temper added to these early ceramics. Clifford Evans (1955) attempted to systematize the observed variations of ceramic types into a typological classification. Evans also defined a later ceramic characterized by a shell temper, Mockley Ware (circa 200 AD), that was present in coastal Virginia and north into New Jersey and Delaware.

Unlike their earlier steatite cousins, these ceramic forms were apparently not reserved for special events or persons but were rather used in everyday contexts. Of course, variation existed in these ceramic traditions that indicated vessels associated with exceptional circumstances. This shift has been linked with significant social development discerned in the Mid-Atlantic region. Hantman and Gold link this transition from steatite
to clay vessels to the cyclical nature observed in status objects associated with mortuary ritual (Hantman and Gold 2002: 287-289). The tradition of shell tempered wares continued into the Late Woodland with notable changes in vessel morphology, including decreasing thickness. Changes in surface treatment were also noted, shifting from cord and net impressions to fabric and simple-stamped varieties, designated Townsend and Roanoke Wares.

**Townsend Ware**

Perhaps the most critical contribution to the development of ceramic traditions in the Mid-Atlantic region were the two publications by Margaret Blaker (1950, 1963). Her first contribution (1950) was a brief article concerning the ceramics recovered from excavations at the Townsend site in Delaware. During her analysis she had discerned a homogeneous ceramic tradition that she dubbed Townsend Ware and subdivided it into five classes. These initial five classes were denoted by their surface treatment and decorative elements. They included: Townsend herringbone, corded horizontal, Townsend incised band, Rappahannock incised and Rappahannock fabric impression. Blaker dated these ceramics from the late prehistoric to the historic and suggested an Iroquoian influence. Further analysis of these ceramics (Blaker 1963) produced more detailed descriptions of the classes. She concluded that she could not determine the chronology of the classes from the stratigraphic record of the Townsend site, however, she suggested that the Rappahannock incised and fabric impressed, being the most frequently occurring, had the longest lifespan of the classes.

Not long after Blaker’s initial publication, Clifford Evans (1955) responded to what he saw as a paucity of prehistoric research in Virginia. Drawing from a total of ninety-six
sites, Evans embarked on an extensive and highly detailed analysis of the native ceramic traditions of Virginia with the goal of reaching beyond basic description and building ceramic series and complexes for the state. At the time, Evans had lacked standardized analytical processes through which to develop these series and complexes. He began by sorting each site’s ceramics by temper, followed by temper characteristics, firing features and finally by surface treatment. However, his devotion to detail and intricacies resulted in so many diverse ceramic series, almost all defined by the river systems, that synthesizing his work is a rather daunting task. While there is something to be said about paying strict attention to the nuances of ceramic attributes, his analysis resulted in a “Virginia ceramic tradition” that was disjointed and overly detailed. Evans’ series and complexes would later be revised and reworked into a more manageable and comprehensive typology.

One of the more significant series for Evans was the Chickahominy Series, which he separated into eight classes based on the surface treatments. Including in the series were the ceramics recovered from the Potts site, significant for its well-defined attributes. It was from this site, and hence from the Chickahominy Series, that Evans formed his chronology of Virginia ceramic traditions. Evans concluded that net impressed and roughened surfaces were the earliest manifestations of surface treatment, which subsequently declined over time, giving way to plain and cord-marked surfaces, the latter of which declining with the onset of fabric impression. Similarly, Evans noted a decline in gravel temper as shell became more popular (1955: 93-94, 97). Unfortunately, current theoretical trends at the time of Evans’ publication did not allow for the types of studies that would later emerge in the Mid-Atlantic, specifically in Delaware.
Evans described the Chickahominy Series, named for the river upon which the sites identified along, as usually a light tan to grey-tan in color with a shell temper not unlike the Townsend Series of Delaware. The decoration on the sherds was listed as “usually none,” save for those from the Potts Site cord-wrapped dowel variety, which were “impressed with a cord wrapped dowel in parallel lines, zoned rectangles, triangles, diagonal lines” (Evans 1955:48). Noted among all of the classes of the series were nicks and gashes along the lip and rim, with the occasional cord-wrapped impression or finger pinching on the lip (Evans 1995: 44-49). The point of departure for this particular project revises Evans’ statements of decoration on Chickahominy River ceramics from “usually none” to “occasionally elaborate.” The variety and complexity of the ceramics excavated by the Chickahominy River Survey demonstrate that Evans’ original series is far more complex than previously determined.

Evans also proposed several hypotheses for connecting Virginia ceramics to those of nearby states. His review of archaeological literature indicated that the spread of design ideas originated in the middle Delaware River Valley, disseminating northward towards New York and Connecticut and southward to Virginia. Evans likened early Virginia ceramics to those of New Jersey and Maryland through the attributes he assigned to the Chickahominy Series. These sherds were similar in their basic attributes as well as the incised “V” designs and cord-wrapped dowel impressions Evans saw in the Chickahominy, the main difference being the color of the Maryland sherds. Evans went so far as to suggest that all shell tempered varieties conformed to Chickahominy Series attributes. Drawing on a rather cursory survey of Maryland studies, Evans concluded that
the Virginia Coastal Tradition extended northward into Maryland and Delaware (1955: 113-114, 117, 120-121). Subsequent research would reveal this to be the case.

While studies of this nature in Virginia were limited to Evans’ thorough contribution, research in Delaware continued. The first of these significant contributions was by Daniel Griffith (1977). Much of Griffith’s discussion of Delaware ceramics is bogged down in explicating the importance and applicability of processual archaeology. Hence, his emphasis on his analysis was on developing a chronology of the ceramic traditions. He places great emphasis on tight data control, especially upon context. He found Blaker’s original typology to be lacking, and sought to improve upon it. While much of his analysis is overburdened with processual dogma, his methodology of ceramic analysis has proved invaluable.

It was his goal to discern ceramic types. He defends the reality of types tautologically simply by stating that they exist (Griffith 1977: 33). This may be the case for the researcher, but these types may not have been constructed by the original people. He concludes that imposed types are the most efficient way to discern chronology. His types were explicated by modes, which he defined as cultural manifestations of ceramic production concepts. These modes isolated sets of attributes which made them fundamental units of analysis.

For his study, Griffith identified shell temper, coil construction and connoidal shape as universal modes of the Townsend Series. In analyzing style, Griffith first delineated areas of the vessel which he called “fields.” These included the lip, rim and body. His basic unit of stylistic analysis was the “element,” of which he had six: horizontal bands, triangles, rectangles and squares, zig-zags and herringbones, discrete lines and curvilinear
lines. "Motifs" could be comprised of any number of these elements (Figure 4). Drawing from twelve sites with 667 vessels, Griffith assigned letters to each motif. He then combined motifs into "groups" which were assigned a letter, according to design technique and application. While he could not produce a tightly controlled seriation of the decorative motifs, he did conclude that the incised band was the most populous. He discerned that direct cord was the oldest of the applications, which evolved into pseudo-cord and eventually to the incised band motif. He noted that the decorative trends moved
from complex to simplistic, a movement that began around A.D. 1045 (Griffith 1977: 46-67, 110, 116, 123-126, 133).

While Griffith’s work was thorough and replicable, many of his methodological choices resulted, like Evans, in unwieldy results. His assignation of letters and numbers to motifs and groups rendered his conclusions confusing, as one had to search through his other sections to remind one’s self as to which design each letter or number represented. In his introduction he stated that he would apply a nominal scale in order to facilitate statistical analysis. Perhaps using actual name descriptors would have alleviated his failings. Despite these weaknesses Griffith’s conclusions about the Townsend chronology have proven to be applicable to that Virginia and his analysis of the stylistic trends a source of comparative consideration.

As previously stated, one of the key goals of Griffith’s thesis was to develop a chronology of Townsend ceramics and it corresponding motifs for Delaware. Griffith (1982), as well as Evans, noted that prior to the 1948 excavations at the Townsend site ceramic analysis was confined to pure attribute description, which was often incomplete. Blaker’s analysis was the first step towards a more temporally-conscious analysis. Subsequent analysis of her conclusions and other site analyses refined her early assessments with increasing sophistication and expanded them to include a larger geographic area. Unfortunately, Griffith noticed that this attention to the development of the Townsend typology created a bias against non-Townsend ceramics. With a nod to himself, Griffith stated that this had begun to change, beginning with his thesis and his work with Richard E. Artusy (1977).
Other significant contributions to the Delaware ceramic traditions were produced by Jay F. Custer. In one of his early works Custer suggested that plotting stylistic attributes over areas and across time would better outline prehistoric social interaction spheres (1985). Later collaboration with Griffith led to the conclusion that style had the greatest potential of all ceramic attributes to reveal changes of peoples and cultures through time. Applying Griffith’s methods they examined Townsend and Minguannan ceramics. They noted that between these two ceramic traditions of Delaware there were marked similarities in the observe motifs, despite the possibilities of technical variation. They then turned to Overpeck and Bowmans Brook ceramic types also noting significant similarities. Their comparison culminated in a call for an increase in regional comparisons of ceramic designs: “ceramic designs, when analyzed at this level, are not ‘badges’ of ethnic groups or common ‘traditions,’ They are simply stylistic attributes that are sensitive to intergroup interaction” (Griffith & Custer 1985: 18).

Ceramic Studies in Virginia

These significant Delaware contributions brought into sharp focus the need for comparative consideration, and while this was significant for the state of Delaware, it left Virginia in the dark. Prehistoric cultures, obviously, did not obey modern state boundaries. Ergo, if numerous similarities were noted among the Townsend ceramics in Delaware, then conceivably some discernable stylistic relationship would be manifest with those ceramics in Virginia. This is not to suggest that there was a consistent ethnic identity along the Mid-Atlantic coast, but as Custer and Griffith suggested, an analysis of the technical and stylistic attributes from both states contain the great potential for further explication and elaboration of the social and political relationships of Middle-Atlantic
peoples, especially in light of the rise of the Powhatan chiefdom. Presumably, if the technical ceramic traditions can be discerned in Delaware and southern Virginia, then certain stylistic elements would travel as well. While these stylistic patterns may not survive intact as they travel, as new people absorb them into their style pool and reconfigure them according to particular cultural or aesthetic standards, particular elements may be observed to be consistent, perhaps in the most basic of forms.

The work of Evans in Virginia long stood as the source for ceramic analysis. However, his exhaustive descriptions of ceramic types were refined in 1982 by Keith Egloff and Stephen Potter. While they concentrated on the coastal plain of Virginia, their descriptions and accompanying photographs combined many of Evans’ series into more manageable classes. Their analysis in affect “cleaned-up” the rather unwieldy typology which differed for each river. This resolved the fractious tone of Evans’ study and created a more cohesive picture of Virginia Native ceramics.

While work in Delaware appears to have reached a state in which comparison and conclusions regarding the social interaction spheres as well as ethnic and social boundaries could be discerned from the ceramic typological evidence, as it stands now, this may not be the case in Virginia. While a great deal is known about some of the attributes, such as surface treatment, motifs have been limited to attribute description.

Current work in Virginia has focused on elucidating social interaction spheres as they relate to ceramic types, not specifically motifs, but focusing on attributes rather than types. Michael Klein’s (1994) dissertation employed an absolute seriation method in order to more accurately define ceramic typology. Work conducted by Klein (see also 1997), Hantman and Gold (2002) and Gallivan (2003) have highlighted the fluctuating social
hierarchies of Virginia Indians using vessels and their attributes to explicate elite activity. As previously mentioned at the outset of this review, steatite vessels were linked to specialized activities and elite exchange. In looking at the rise of social inequality in the James River system, Gallivan concluded that increased stylistic variation in the Woodland period indicated small social networks. The increase of permanent settlements led to stylistic exchange on the local level to express shifting inequalities. Using Wiessner's symbolic approach, Gallivan concluded that style was employed to manipulate these relationships. He also found that social interaction between the smaller, discrete units, was becoming more unrestricted. The subsequent increased social heterogeneity necessitated more prestigious goods (Gallivan 2003: 127-142, 151, 175).

Gallivan's focus, on ceramics, was on surface treatment as a stylistic expression. While I concur with the stress of analysis being placed on attributes rather than type, I wish to move beyond these types of attributes into motif analysis. In many studies, motif expression has been limited to description. Motif expression holds the potential to even further elucidate the intricacies of intergroup communication and intragroup social stratification. Motifs, regardless of their method of application, can be infinitely more intricate than other ceramic attributes. Through the nuances of motif expression one can discern connections on the local level, and a more regional scale, by breaking down motifs into their components and comparing and contrasting them.
CHAPTER 4

METHOD AND CLASSIFICATION

In order to answer questions about intragroup activity and social expression and intergroup social networks, the stylistic expressions of the Chickahominy River drainage must be first classified. Analysis of ceramic style is first a descriptive process. Researchers examine vessels or sherds and look for configurations and layouts of designs. There are many ways this can be done. I have focused on motif structure, or the configuration of the pieces of the motifs and how they are articulated into whole motifs. Elements have been isolated and explained according to spatial occurrence. Others such avenues include studying symmetry of motifs and rotational qualities, or examining the presence or absence of whole motifs or motif components. The most critical step in this process is the grouping of motifs into classes (Rice 1987: 244-273). The motifs described here were drawn from all the sherds available from the three of the sites from the Chickahominy River survey: CC43, Edgehill and Buck Farm.

In the initial analysis of the sherds from the collection the motifs were described with great detail. Each sherd was also photographed as an aid in refining the descriptive process. No whole pots were available in the collection. Instead, each sherd was the unit of analysis for this study. In addition to sherd attributes, context information was also entered in the same manner in order to facilitate later analysis on context and site levels. All contexts, including the plow zone, were included in the initial development of the
stylistic patterns, but many were later filtered from the statistical analysis in order to discern coherent patterns amidst considerable diversity. The development of a “style language” or grammars was codified without considering archaeological contexts.

The recording of ceramic attributes followed a standard format which included temper, thickness, surface treatment and interior treatment. Using Griffith’s methods from his thesis as an example, the hypothetical whole pots were divided into three areas: the lip, the rim and the body. The lip was designated “Field 1” and the rim, or the area just below the lip, as “Field 2.” It should be noted that the second region, the rim, also included those decorative items found on the interior of the sherds. A vast majority of the sherds from the collection were from the vessel body. All such sherds were grouped with the Field 3 sherds: all those pertaining to the body of the hypothetically whole pot. The next attribute was the method of application, defined as an element, following Griffith’s earlier methods. This was indicated by the tool used to apply the various stylistic elements, such as punctuation, incised or cord wrapped dowel. The language used to describe the motifs evolved rather organically in the course of the analysis. Without being cognizant of the entire stylistic corpus of the collection, the initial descriptors were very detailed and lengthy. These early labels included design components and treatments. A component was defined as a simple unit that was manipulated and then joined with other elements to create a motif. This is not unlike Custer’s (1987) use of motif elements. In his analysis Custer demonstrated how an element could be maneuvered by rotating while the design was being configured. This maneuvering was noted as “treatment” in this study, and included such things as its rotation or a subtype of the initial component. As the study progressed I noted that several recognizable motifs appeared often, and thus the
descriptors became shorter in length and more representative rather than descriptive. While the categories of component and treatment remained crucial in the refining of earlier recorded sherds, they became less important as the vocabulary of motif types became codified.

Once the permutations of the components were identified in the treatment attribute section, the next step was to name the motifs. As with the early descriptions, the early motif names were rather long. As the collection became more familiar, the vocabulary was tightened and the motif names more coherent. I noted that many motifs were related to each other and were either elaborations upon or new variations of a basic motif. My recognition of these correlations led to the naming of motifs and submotifs. The motif denominations tended to be briefer in length than those of the submotifs, simply because by definition the submotifs were elaborations of the main motifs. This created a mutually exclusive and exhaustive set of main motifs and submotifs, which lent itself to further statistical analysis.

In his work in Delaware, Griffith used a numeric and alphabetic system in identifying the major motifs and their permutations for his ceramic collection. The system I developed for this study was based on descriptive names, rather than letters or numbers, limited to one or two words if possible. This aided in both the statistical analysis and will undoubted make the comparisons easier to comprehend. There were exceptions to this rule, but is confined to the banded group main motif group. The reason for the assigned of type numbers was that the submotifs could not be named with anything short of a phrase, which proved to be very unwieldy for writing and for statistical analysis. Although numbers were used to describe the various submotifs of this motif group, many
occurred with such limited frequency that this is anticipated to not be an element of confusion in the discussion of the motifs.

Motifs on Sherd Lip (Field 1)

These motifs occurred only on the lip of the rim sherds. The appearance of these motifs are unlike those found in other fields, most likely due to the unique space on which they occur. These motifs were created with incising, punctuation and pseudo-cord impressions. All these motifs save one were created using a single element in repetition, various permutations achieved by changes in the treatments. The notable exception is the cross-hatching incised lip which is comprised of compounding two permutations of incised lines.

Crenellation (Figure 5 a)

This terms applies to all lips with strikingly deep punctuation or incising that creates the appearance of divots, or crenellation as it appears on the parapets of a castle. This is not to say that the crenellation observed here is square, for it is not. This motif is characterized by rounded impressions that are far more severe than actual punctuation or incising. It is probable that this motif was achieved using the side of a stick but the goal of this application was to create an undulating lip motif. The spacing, degree of depth and roundness vary but all bear the same basic traits.
Incised Lip (Figure 5b and Figure 6)

The incised lip motif occurs in two varieties: diagonal and cross-hatched. The diagonal characterization is by far the most numerous, and it refers to angled incised lines. The degree and direction of this incising vary; some are very angled while others almost straight. The thickness also varies, with some forming a very fine line to a thick line, which produces an effect very similar to the crenellation motif. All of these have been grouped into the “diagonal” submotif because the incised lines were all observed to have some sort of angle to them, however slight, and for simplicity’s sake were grouped together. The second submotif is “cross-hatched.” This consists of two sects of diagonal incised lines crossing each other to form an “X” shape on the lip.

Punctated Lip (Figure 5c)

As the name implies, lips with elongated dots produced from punctuations were grouped into this category. Included are all directions of dots, such as diagonally angled ones or those that are perpendicular to the lip.

Psuedo-Cord Lip (Figure 5d and Figure 6)

This motif is extremely rare, having only one case for all three sites included in the study. The rim to support this motif was extremely everted which produced an adequate platform on which to apply the cord wrapped dowel. The pseudo-cord markings occurred at relatively regular intervals perpendicular to the lip, producing an effect not wholly dissimilar to the pseudo-cord fringe motif.
Motifs On Rim and Body (Fields 2 and 3)

Ungrouped Motifs (Figure 7)

These motifs do not occur very frequently or with many permutations; some have no permutations. Due to the sizes of the sherds, many of these stand-alone motifs may be parts of more complicated motifs. However, this cannot be accurately postulated given the data available. Where possible, suggestions for links to other motifs have been noted as well as possible correlations between sherds possibly originally part of the same vessel.

Cross-hatching (Figure 7a)

This motif is produced by incised lines applied in, usually, angles to produce an “X” effect more elaborate that the one observed on the lip. This motif is differentiated from the incised net by its lack of regular spacing between lines and the tightness of their rapidity. Cross-hatching occurs in a diagonal or straight variety, although the straight variety is rare. These two varieties have not been differentiated in the recording.

Banded Zig-Zag (Figure 7b)

The term “banded” refers to a group of lines that occur in the same area close together and are employed in the same elemental treatment, such as horizontal, vertical or
diagonal. The designation *banded* also implies that many identical elements form a cohesive unit that acts as a whole. Often, they serve as a base for motifs. In this case angled lines are grouped to form zig-zags. These zig-zags are then stacked upon each other, or lined up, in close formation depending upon the direction of the design, to create a multiple zig-zag. Due to the size of the sherds in the collection the extent to which the design is repeated on a pot cannot be determined. Nor can it be determined if there is specific directionality involved with this motif, such as always pointing up or to the side.

**Herringbone (Figure 7c)**

This motif is quite similar to the banded zig-zag. Many examples of herringbone may actually be part of a banded zig-zag. However, since it cannot be stated with any certainty that these sherds are pieces of banded zig-zags they have been separated out into their own motif, but their similarities and association should be noted. Similar to the banded zig-zag the herringbone appears as a banded group of angled lines put together to form an arrow. As before, directionality and length of design are unknown due to the size of the sherds.

**Concentric Rectangles (Figure 7d and Figure 8)**

While the component of this motif may actually be a square the term rectangle was used due to the variation observed in the construction of the quadrangles. This motif consists of rectangles set inside each other, the next a fraction smaller than the one preceding it. The central rectangle is bisected by a single line.

**Rectangle and Dot (Figure 7e)**

These two motifs are single components that occur only once on the particular sherd. It is possible that they are part of a larger motif, but this cannot be determined.
Dotted Chevron (Figure 7f and Figure 8)

This motif occurs only once in all three sites. It consists of angled lines grouped into an arrow pattern and then banded. This is surrounded by an elongated dot line that pulls away from the angled lines. This motif may actually be a dotted rectangle, however, only one corner is observed. Therefore a definition other than “chevron” would be highly speculative.

Filled Chevron (Figure 7g)

The filled chevron resembles the banded group motif but lacks the continuation of the horizontal bands outside the confines of the angled lines. It has therefore been differentiated into a separate motif. The filled chevron is observed to be a double strand, meaning is it comprised of two lines. As the name implies, a double strand chevron is filled with parallel lines in its interior.
Incised Net (Figure 7h and Figure 8)

As previously stated this design is differentiated from the cross-hatching because of its regularity and attention to spacing between lines. It resembles the net impression surface treatment but is clearly applied by incising methods and lacks the distinctive knot impressions observed in net impressed surfaces. The incised net motif occurs in two varieties: double and single. The double is observed to have a pair of lines achieving the same net effect the single ones. Both of these varieties can have a border and it is suspected that most may indeed have a border, which would have been observable had the sherd been larger. This border, as it occurs in this collection, is a pair of parallel lines that runs perpendicular to the net pattern and serves as a demarcation for the beginning and end of the motif and empty space.

Random

Lines in this motif occur at not regular interval but are seen to be haphazard in application.

Dash Line (Figure 7i)

This motif does have differentiated subgroups, but occur with such little frequency that they have been included in this first group of motifs. The dash line is a short line of approximately one to two centimeters in length. It can occur in a line of sequential horizontal dashes or has vertical dashes placed next to each other. This can also occur in a stacked pattern of horizontal dashes in groups that are spaced apart.

Dot Line (Figure 7j)

There are five submotifs for this motif. The dots are produced by a punctuation technique and occur in both rounded form, an oval shape and a dragged dot, in which the
depth of the punctuation tapers off at one end. The first of the dot lines is the dragged dot line, which exhibits the dragged dot occurring side by side. The dot line can also be double, or two side by side applications of oval shaped dots occurring on top of the other. This double submotif can again be doubled; two of the double dot lines evenly spaced apart for a doubled submotif. Dot lines, in single form, also are applied at angles. These angles can be simply diagonal lines or in shapes, although it is suspected that the diagonal line may be part of a larger shape. The angle submotif occurs as two single dot lines joining at a point. This is only a partial representation of the entire submotif and it is unknown what the larger shape is.

Figure 8

Ungrouped motifs (from left to right): concentric rectangles, incised net, dotted chevrons

Fringed Lip Group (Figure 9)

The fringed lip motif has several submotifs and all occur in Field 2, the rim or area directly under the lip. Both pseudo-cord and incising are employed in this motif. This motif begins at the edge of the lip and extends perpendicularly downward on the pot, often crossing into the body beyond the rim, and it has the appearance of a fringed garment.
Incised (Figure 9a and Figure 10)

This is the simplest of the submotifs of the fringed lip group and the most frequently observed. It consists of incised lines beginning at the edge of the lip and extending downward into Field 2. The lines may be perpendicular or angled in either a right or left direction. The spacing and thickness of the lines varies. Spacing can also be severe in that groups of incised lines are set off from each other by even amounts of empty space. The lines can also be bordered, in which they exhibit a perpendicular line at the base of the motif stopping it from occurring further.

Dashed (Figure 9b)

The dashed motif consists of short dashes perpendicular to the lip of the sherd and appears to be a shortened version of the incised submotif.

Herringbone (Figure 9c)

This submotif is exactly like the previously mentioned herringbone save for one difference, it occurs just below the lip. The herringbone can be opened toward the lip creating a concentric triangle effect or can open to side creating arrows.
Pseudo-Cord (Figure 9d and Figure 10)

The pseudo-cord fringed lip submotif occurs in either a perpendicular or diagonal direction from the lip. The length of each impression varies but is usually between two to four centimeters and possibly longer in length. The pseudo-cording can occur on either the exterior or interior of the sherd. Those occurring on the interior are most often perpendicular rather than diagonal to the lip. The interior and exterior varieties were separated in the identification process.

Figure 10
Fringed lip motifs: incised (left), pcord (right)

The Banded Group Motif Group (Figure 11)

This motif is by far the most frequent motif overall and in each of the sites. Each submotif has a descriptive name derived from the observed characteristics. However, on numerous occasions assigning a short name to a submotif was impossible. The observed characteristics needed more than a few words to name them. Consequently they were given a type number and will be fully explicated here rather than in the tables. Those submotifs labeled with “Type” followed by a number were designated arbitrarily. It is most patent in this group that elements are grouped together to form complex wholes.
The base for each submotif, the “root” so to speak, is the plain banded group (see below). It is upon this root that other treated elements are added.

Plain (Figure 1a)

This is the basic background for all cases of this motif group. It is comprised of many straight lines parallel to one another in a group of four or more. The plain submotif is identified by a lack of incising within and outside the banded group as well as a lack of punctuations or any other markings in or around the submotif. It is by far the most common submotif of this motif group. Due to the small size of many of the examples it is possible that they belong to a different subgroup had the sherd been larger or the pot intact, however, for the purpose of this study have been included here.

Type 1 (Figure 11b and Figure 12)

The basic plain submotif is here superimposed with a three-strand band that occurs in a zig-zag pattern. The angles of the zig-zags vary; some are almost perpendicular to the lip of the sherd while others are almost perfect 45 degree angles. Type 1 submotif can be with dots or not, with the dots occurring on the top of the decoration.

Type 2 (Figure 11c)

On this submotif a line of dots is arranged in an ascending diagonal line. The dots more or less regularly occur between the parallel lines of the band like notes on a music staff. The dot lines occur at regular intervals and directionality is constant on any one sherd. While most of these dot lines occur in an ascending direction many of the sherds may in fact be descending but due to lack of directionality on sherds with no intact lip, this is undeterminable.

Type 3 (Figure 11d)
The Type 3 submotif is similar to Type 1 in that it encompasses a variety of zig-zag patterns. However, this type is distinguished by exhibiting a two-strand zig-zag. No dotted varieties were observed in this subgroup.

Type 4 (Figure 11c and Figure 13)

The basic plain banded group is elaborated here by the addition of dashed lines inscribed at an angle. These angled dashes are then stacked upon each other in vertical lines that occur with relative equidistant frequency across the band. There were no observed dotted or fringed varieties of this submotif.
Type 5 (Figure 11f)
One of the most elaborate submotifs, Type 5 appears to be a composite of several over submotifs, namely the herringbone and Type 2 submotifs. Type 5 exhibits the ascending dot lines as in Type 2. The bottom of this submotif is incised with concentric triangles that act as a sort of fringed. The hanging triangles decrease in size as they approach the edge of the banded group.

Type 6 (Figure 11g)

This type is the combination of several banded groups at various angles. The base group is present as the plain submotif. Beneath the plain banded group are diagonal banded groups. The variation on their direction and pattern depends upon the size of the sherd and thereby the percentage of submotif retained.

Type 7 (Figure 11h)

Perhaps the most unique of the banded groups Type 7 at first to be a random collection of incised lines. Upon closer examination groups of short plain banded groups are observed all intersecting in a cross-hatching pattern. There is only one example of this submotif from the three sites of this study.

Figure 12
Banded group Submotifs: Type 12 (right), Type 1 dotted

Type 8 (Figure 11i)
Similar to both Type 1 and Type 3 this type groups together a variety of examples that are classified as a single submotif due to the number strands of the zig-zag pattern. Type 8 is distinguished by four and five strand zig-zags. The strand widths are more varied than in Type 1 and Type 3 and all are part of larger motifs. However, due to their partial nature they have been categorized into this submotif.

Type 9 (Figure 11j and Figure 13)

This submotif is comprised of a basic plain banded group with a triangular fringe. The hanging triangles are not similar to those exhibited in Type 5; these are characterized by vertical stripes. The basic plain banded group may be elaborated upon, but no consisted components were observed to warrant the breaking down of this submotif into varieties.

Type 10 (Figure 11k and Figure 13)

Also demonstrating hanging triangles, this submotif also exhibits characteristics of Type 1. The plain banded group is elaborated by two-strand zig-zag patterns. The patterns follow a standard zig-zag shape but are also observed to form “V” shaped elements that are separate from the zig-zag progressions. The hanging triangles are not isosceles triangles, as observed in Type 9, but right triangles with their short side attached to the base of the horizontal bands. Atop the triangles is a dot line produced from punctuations that is superimposed on the bottom strand of the banded group.

Type 11 (Figure 11m)

This submotif is distinguished by the “K” shaped elements incised onto the banded group. The “K”s are produced by a single vertical line and radiating diagonals either from
a midpoint or from the base. Separating the “K” shapes are two-strand vertical groups. The submotif is crowned with a simple dot line.

Type 12 (Figure 11n and Figure 12)

The plain banded group in this submotif is decorated with two-strand arrows. Pairs of arrows open into each other creating a diamond shaped element. This diamond is then framed by two arrows on either side that are opened to it. This submotif may or may not exhibit the central diamond element. The top and base of this submotif are punctated with single dot lines.

Type 13 (Figure 11o)

This submotif is comprised of two banded groups, the plain horizontal variety and an additional diagonal plain banded group incised atop the first. The second banded group is elaborated by a diagonal dash line running parallel to the top. No fringes to dotted varieties of this were noted.

Bordered (Figure 11p)

The bordered variety is the least elaborate banded group aside from the plain submotif. A bordered submotif is indicated by no elaborated of the plain band itself and is “ended” on one side by a vertical line, after which the plain band is discontinued.

Dotted (Figure 11q)

This simple elaboration of the plain band is noted by the addition of a dot line either above or beneath a plain banded group.

Herringbone (Figure 11r)

As previously stated, the herringbone variety resembles the hanging triangle elements observed in other submotifs. However, the herringbone is distinguished by
concentric triangles that either open towards the banded group or angled towards the side of the sherd.

Interrupted (Figure 11s)

This submotif is comprised of two plain banded groups that are interrupted, as the name implies, by a series of vertical dashes.

Fringed (Figure 11t)

The fringed submotif occurs in four varieties that are characterized by the method of application and direction of fringe. These fringes, if incised lines, occur in dashes and should not be confused with Type 6, which can be said to be a type of fringe. Varieties a and c are distinguished by diagonal dashes occurring directly under a plain banded group. Variety b is comprised of vertical dashes perpendicular to the banded group and e by a dash line running parallel to the banded group.

Undetermined

Many sherds exhibited complicated motifs but were so fragmentary in nature they could not be classified. These sherds were grouped into an “undetermined” category. This has been differentiated from those sherds that only had a single line, two lines or three
lines. The sherds with only a few lines were also classified under this designation. No motifs could be identified in all four cases. As analysis progressed, the few line categories and the “undetermineds” were grouped together. The few lines became a sort of submotif of the undetermined category.

Discussion

Due to the detailed analyses produced by Griffith and Custer in Delaware there exists a body of data which bears striking similarities to the stylistic trends of the Chickahominy. While there are instances of minute differences between the Delaware ceramics and those of this study, two notable differences stand out. The first is the absence of curvilinear elements on the Chickahominy sherds. The work presented by both Griffith and Custer do not exhibit these elements, but in his thesis Griffith accounted for curved lines. The other particularly notable difference is the level of complexity. In the Chickahominy collection the greatest level of complexity is observed in the banded group submotifs. Among the Delaware ceramics a certain level of complexity is noted in those motifs that appear similar to the Chickahominy banded group, yet sherds exhibiting the greatest level of complexity are examples of completely different types of motifs. Specifically, the Overpeck sherds and motifs RI5a, RI5b, MI3b, MI5a, MI5b (Figure 14) (Griffith and Custer 1985: 9, 11, 15). Again, the Chickahominy sherds are from only three sites and examples of the more complex designs observed in Delaware may yet be noted. What appears to be absent in the Chickahominy style language is the combination of different elemental treatments in close sequentiation, as seen in the RI3a. It is notable
that the greatest complexity for the Chickahominy appears to reside in this one group, attesting to its significance as socially important motif among the Chickahominy people.

The differences aside, many similarities are noted between the Delaware and Chickahominy ceramics. These ceramic traditions have been linked, as shown through the genesis of Mid-Atlantic ceramic analysis, through their general appearance in the Townsend Ware. Yet the repetition of motifs attests to an even closer tie between those peoples in southern Virginia and Delaware. The similarities are nearly all from incised sherds, with one notable exception. These similar motifs are comprised of the more frequent elements observed in the Chickahominy collection, specifically triangles, dash lines and the banded group. Griffith and Custer’s motif RI7a from the Rappahannock Incised (Figure 15) group appears to have a direct correspondence with the banded zig-zag motif (Figure 7b). The Minguannan Incised motifs 2 and 3a and Rappahannock 2 have direct correspondence to the fringed banded group varieties (Figure 11t). The most striking similarities appear in the banded group varieties. The Rappahannock Incised group boasts a plain variety (RI1) as well as those exhibiting the “hanging” triangle element (RI4b, RI8a) as well as the Minguannan 4b. The Delaware “hanging” triangles
most closely resemble the herringbone and Types 9 and 10, although the herringbone is on a grander size scale than the Delaware counterparts. The MI4b and RI4b do not exhibit any elemental elaboration of the banded section, as in the Chickahominy Type 9. However, RI8a contains both the “hanging” triangle as well as the dash lines observed in the Chickahominy Type 4.

The similarities observed among the Chickahominy motifs and the Delaware motifs suggest a shared stylistic grammar, whose “dialects” are differentiated only in subtle nuances. The sherds observed by Griffith and Custer were recovered from only Late Woodland contexts, whereas the Chickahominy were dated to both the Middle and Late Woodland components, as well as the Proto-Historic. The Delaware propensity for greater complexity is perhaps the greatest difference. The observed similarities indicate that there was a relationship between these groups of people that went beyond ceramic technology, a connection which is perfectly conceivable when considering the cultural,
linguistic and technological similarities. The presence of motifs in a large area that contained many disparate communities and social groups implies that the motifs exhibited by the Chickahominy ceramics are not just markers of social identity. The communicative elements were therefore not designed to signal social boundaries. However, the differences observed between the two stylistic trends may be these ethnic markers; minute changes in common motifs to indicate a group’s signature.

This is not to suggest that the proposed stylistic grammar is indicative of a universal mental template that is being shared in this culture region. It is as Custer and Hodder state: these motifs do not define ethnic boundaries but rather social interaction spheres. Therefore, these are not subconscious expressions of cultural rules of identity, they are evidence of group interaction. The next stage in this line of inquiry would be to compare the contexts and suspected vessel functions and the motifs across the region to elucidate the employment of these motifs in social contexts. However, without additional data from the Chickahominy collection and from coastal Maryland and northern Virginia this cannot be pursued. This is therefore put forth as a preliminary effort to define and classify the stylistic behavior of the Chickahominy people.

This reframes of Wobst’s concepts of social markers that showed differences between groups to the communicative markers of information exchange among groups, similar to what Griffith and Custer suggest. This also refashions Wobst’s ideas so that they are more applicable for this region of Virginia. This manifestation of the information-exchange model is therefore more inclusive, in that these motifs, or communicative elements, were used by a wide range of social groups in potentially similar ways. The key concept in this is fluidity and conceptualizing this stylistic
grammar as in a state of flux in which motifs and components are being exchanged, absorbed and manipulated among peoples existing in similar coastal environments.

In qualitative comparing Chickahominy ceramics to those of prehistoric Delaware peoples, a preliminary evaluation of the extent and nature of intergroup social networks has been made. What remains to be seen is how these motifs were employed within the Chickahominy communities. In looking at the context types and the presence, absence, and frequencies of the motifs contained therein, preliminary conclusions can be reached with regard to motifs and their relationships to social contexts.
CHAPTER 5

QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS OF MOTIFS AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXTS

The examination of both intersite and intrasite variation can elucidate the relationships among stylistic motifs and archaeological contexts. In looking at these contexts one can gain insight into the activities potentially associated with particular motifs. Archaeological contexts can be sorted according to feature type, such as mortuary and non-mortuary contexts. Highlighting these specialized contexts will better illustrate the relationships of motif, activity and social relationships. Looking at intersite variation can also shed light on varying community structures and possible temporal patterns. The statistical analysis conducted using chi-square tests for independence. This statistical test utilizes nominal scale data of two or more categories and evaluates the dependency among the variables. If they are determined to be independent then there the correlation between the variables is determined to be random. What is most hoped for here are dependent relationships that will link motif groups to archaeological context types and hence activities and intragroup social relations.

The vast majority of the sherds from the collection originated from site CC43, comprising of 54.3% of the entire collection. This site also has the greatest diversity of motifs with twelve. The sheer size of the sample and its diversity suggests that CC43 was
not an insignificant swath of land. The remaining portion of the sample was split between the Edgehill site (44CC29) and the A component of the Buck Farm site (44CC37), each representing approximately 20%. It is suspected that the presence of the banded group motifs and its numerous permutations are related to the specialized and extraordinary contexts, specifically such as those identified at CC43.

The banded group motif represented the majority of decorated sherds at all of the sites, comprising of 51.5% of all decorated sherds (n=786). The second most frequent was the fringed lip motif at 11.5% followed by cross-hatching at 4.7%. Counted in these percentages are all sherds in the undetermined category, which together totaled 26.1% of the sherds with decoration (Table 1). The four undetermined categories were filtered from all subsequent statistical analysis in order to avoid distraction from the identified motifs, but their presence in the overall assemblage should be noted. From these initial percentiles it is clear that special significance or special aesthetic value was placed upon the banded group motif. This is emphasized by the significant difference in percentages to the next most frequent motif.
Table 1
Frequencies of motifs in Fields Two and Three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>banded group</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>banded zig-zag</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concentric rectangles</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cross-hatching</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dash line</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dashes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dot</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dot line</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dotted chevrons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>filled chevron</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fringed lip</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>herringbone</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incised net</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pcord</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>random</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rectangle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single line</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three lines</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two lines</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>84.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDETERMINED</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each sherd was arbitrarily assigned a case number according to the order in which it was analyzed. In addition to the attributes of the sherd itself the recorded context identifications were also included. Sherds with no provenience indicated were labeled as “not applicable” for that attribute. Similarly, many observed context markings on sherds were not found on the context evaluation lists. This is most likely the result of worn or damaged markings on sherds. These were listed as “not recorded.” Sherds from component B for the Buck Farm site were nearly entirely unlabeled. Those that did exhibit context information were most likely from plow zone contexts. No records for these contexts were located. These sherds were included in initial frequencies and percentages of observed motifs and rim analysis but were excluded from inter-site and context analysis. Sherds labeled only CC37 were also excluded from statistical analysis due to the lack of site component and provenience identification.
The remaining context labels included palisade trenches, mortuary contexts, various pit features and numerous strata named by color. In order to proceed with statistical analysis these many contexts were grouped into greater macro-contexts. All those contexts identified by strata color, the plow zone, and sub plow zone were grouped in a “matrix” category. The inner and outer palisade trenches from Buck Farm A were placed together under the “palisade” description. All undifferentiated pit features, unelaborated features, burned contexts and hearths were pulled into a “pit features” category. The remaining feature types consisted of burial contexts. These were separated into dog burials and human mortuary contexts, the latter of which comprised of ossuary and unelaborated burial features. It should be noted that those sherds occurring in contexts of unexplicated historic features were also omitted from this macro-context category but were included in the general frequencies and percentages of motifs at both an inter-site and intra-site level of analysis.

An examination of contexts represented by the decorated sherds and undecorated rims revealed two groups: mortuary and non-mortuary related contexts. Due to the importance often ascribed to mortuary contexts, this distinction presents the opportunity to identify those motifs that were seen as having special significance for the pre- and post-Contact Chickahomininy people. Included in the mortuary super-context category were dog burials and human interments. Dog burials and human interments were included in the mortuary super-context category while all other macro-contexts were grouped as “non-mortuary.” The mortuary super-context was further broken down into animal and human burial as an additional axis of variation for more tightly controlled research questions. The B component for Buck Farm was excluded from an inter-site
mortuary/non-mortuary analyses due to lack of identified mortuary contexts there. It was, however, included in other intra-site analyses.

**A Consideration of the Major Motifs**

![Figure 16 Major motifs at each site](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motif 1</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banded group</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-hatching</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dash line</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dot line</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringed lip</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herringbone</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incised net</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Figure 17 Major Motif percentages according to context type](image)

Those motifs that occurred with greatest frequency, the major motifs, were as follows: banded group, cross-hatching, dash line, dot line, fringed lip, herringbone and incised net (Figure 16). Each of these motifs occurred more than four times across the three sites. However, there were cases in which a motif was not present at a particular site. All but the herringbone and dash line motifs had observable submotifs, testifying to their intricacy.

As previously stated, site CC43 contained the greatest number and greatest diversity of decorated sherd with a richness value of twelve. After the filtering of the minor motifs, CC43 seven of the major motifs, the most diverse of the three sites. When all contexts

---

1 Those motifs that occurred only once in the entire sample were: dotted chevron, dashes, filled chevron, pseudo-cord and rectangle. These were filtered out of the statistical analysis to avoid distraction in the statistical analysis. The dot and banded zig-zag motif had only two cases for each and the random and concentric rectangles four and three respectively. Their inclusion in statistical analysis made many analyses invalid and would have resulted with inaccurate tests and results.
were examined all macro-contexts exhibited a 60% or more frequency of the banded group motif (Figure 17). The palisade macro-context exhibited the least diversity of decorative motifs at only four. Matrix, mortuary and pit features all had richness values of six and dog burials five. The second most frequent motif in all contexts, save mortuary, was the fringed lip motif, reflecting the overall trend. The mortuary contexts showed an equal percentage of the cross-hatched sherds and fringed lip motif. The high percentages of banded group sherds in each context attests to its widespread use and significance as a motif.

**Edgehill**

The most frequently observed motif on the decorated sherds from this site was the banded group at 65% of the sherds, followed by the fringed lip (Figure 18). Also observed on this site were cross-hatching and the incised net motifs. The other major motifs were not present at this site. This site had the lowest richness value in terms of major motifs at four. Buck Farm A, with a similar sample of decorated sherds, had five, and CC43 seven.
The matrix contexts of this site contained the highest diversity of motifs present demonstrating examples of all four motifs noted at this site (Figure 19). Pit features did not exhibit the cross-hatching motif and contained 67% banded group examples. The mortuary contexts contained only the banded group and fringed lip motifs, at 60% and 40% respectively. The presence of motifs with multiple permutations attests to both the importance of those two motifs as well as the intricacy associated with specialized contexts. A chi-square test for independence indicated that these major motifs were independent of the contexts in which they were excavated ($X^2=.924 \text{ df}=2, p=.630, n=45$). While there is a greater percent chance of obtaining a banded group example than any other motif at Edgehill, this is independent of the context examined. Therefore, at Edgehill there was no special consideration placed upon the major motifs according to activity area based upon the sample collected.

*Buck Farm B*

Unlike the other sites, the banded group motif is not the most frequently observed, rather, the fringed lip occurs in 40% of all decorated sherds at this site component. The banded group is represented on 33% of the sherds. Because of the lack of recorded contexts from this component of Buck Farm nothing can be said about the relationship between context type and the major decorative motifs.
Approximately half the sherds from this site component exhibited some form of the banded group motif (Figure 20). This site also reflects the wider trend of the fringed lip motif as the second most frequent motif observed. Also present at this site were cross-hatching, dot line and herringbone motifs. No mortuary contexts were listed to have occurred at this site. Pit features excavated at this site contained the least diverse frequency of motifs having only the banded group and fringed lip motifs (Figure 21). The palisade and matrix contexts each exhibited a richness of four motif types. However, the dot line was observed only in matrix contexts while herringbone only in the palisade trenches. In both pit and palisade contexts the banded group motif was the most prevalent followed by the fringed lip. A chi-square indicated that there is a statistically significant relationship between motif and context ($X^2=13.747$, df=8, $p=.089$, n=64).
This site contained two palisade features, an inner and outer trench (Figure 22). Carbon-14 dates from selected contexts date the outer trench to 690 ± 90 B.P. (Beta-102676, wood charcoal) with a calibrated range of A.D. 1163-1174 and the inner at 265 ± 80 B.P. (Beta-102676, wood charcoal) with a calibrated range of A.D. 1448-1699 (Stuiver et al 1998a). This quite possibly reflects the change in social dynamics resulting from the incursion of Europeans into the areas and subsequent political differences and conflicts with the Powhatan chiefdom. The inner palisade trench contained only two motifs, the banded group and fringed lip, while the outer trench also contained cross-hatching and herringbone for a richness value of four. A majority of banded group sherds occurred in both palisade contexts.

*Site CC43*
The banded group is represented by the vast majority of the sherds from this site at 78% (Figure 23). While the dash line, dot line, herringbone and incised net motifs occur more often than those minor motifs that had been filtered, their numbers are still remarkably low in comparison to the banded group motif. The second most frequently major motif was the fringed lip group at 12%.

The greatest diversity of context types was exhibited at this site, notably by the addition of dog burial contexts (Figure 24). All context types at CC43 demonstrated a high percentage of banded motif sherds, all at 65% or greater. This site also had the greatest diversity of major motifs present, exhibiting at least one example from each one. Matrix contexts and pit features were dominated by the banded group with both exhibiting a 20% representation of the fringed lip. Other observed motifs occur in small percentages. The dash line motif was only present in matrix contexts while the herringbone only in pit features. Mortuary and dog burial contexts contained an overwhelming majority of banded group sherds, but in contrast to the pit features and
matrix contexts exhibited very low frequencies of the fringed lip motif. Both were shown to have only a 7% representation of this motif. In the mortuary context the second most frequent motif was the cross-hatching variety at 9%. The mortuary contexts yielded the only examples of the incised net motif at the site. It is clear that the banded group motif is in the overwhelming majority regardless of context type.

![Figure 25](image)

**Figure 25**

CC43 motif percentages according to mortuary or non-mortuary features

**Mortuary and Non-Mortuary Contexts**

Only the Edgehill and CC43 (n=340) sites contained mortuary contexts. Those features at both sites contained an overwhelming majority of the banded group motif at 81%. But this was also the situation in non-mortuary contexts (74%). However, these contexts were shown to consist of 20% fringed lip motif sherds whereas the mortuary contexts had only 8%, therefore indicating that the fringed lip occurs more frequently in non-mortuary contexts. The other major motifs represented in these two sites occurred with very low percentages. The relationship between major motifs and mortuary/non-mortuary contexts was shown to be dependent ($X^2=16.867$, df=6, $p=.010$, n=340),
showing that the fringed lip group was associated more significantly with non-mortuary features.

This same trend was observed at site CC43 (Figure 25). The mortuary features here were also noted to have a greater diversity of motifs represented with a richness of seven. A chi-square test for independence showed that motifs were dependent on the mortuary status of feature ($X^2=17.722$, df=6, $p=.007$, n=323). When the mortuary contexts from site CC43 were separated into human and dog burials (Figure 26) (n=213) the observed percentages of the major motifs do not appear to differ significantly between the two context types. Human burials contained examples of incised net and dash line motifs while the dog burials did not. Human contexts also had a higher percentage of cross-hatched sherds compared to animal contexts. The relationship was determined to be independent, thereby showing that the difference between human and dog burial contexts to be slight ($X^2=9.541$, df=6, $p=.145$, n=213).

At Edgehill non-mortuary features were observed to have a greater diversity of

At Edgehill non-mortuary features were observed to have a greater diversity of

than mortuary contexts with richness values of three and two respectively. However, only three motifs were observed at this site: banded group, fringed lip and incised net.
Mortuary features were shown to have a greater percentage of banded group sherds at 60% to the fringed lip motif, but only seventeen sherds met the criteria for this particular question. Despite the fact that these were shown to be independent ($X^2 = .711$, df=1, p=.701, n=17), the small number of decorated sherds recovered from mortuary contexts at this site inflates this conclusion.

The Banded Group

This motif is the most frequent of all motifs at each and at all of the sites combined. It also consists of twenty-four submotifs and an undetermined category (Figure 27). The most frequent of these submotifs, when all sites are combined, is the plain. At Buck Farm B only plain and Type 1 submotifs were recorded with plain being the vast majority. Both Edgehill and Buck Farm A had a richness of seven submotifs represented and again, plain was the most frequent submotif observed. Site CC43 exhibited seventeen different submotifs, attesting to the complex nature of that particular site. Five submotifs (Type 10, Type 11 and herringbone) were omitted from statistical analysis because they appeared on only one sherd each.

Edgehill’s (Figure 28) examples of the plain submotif were spread across the three context types. The matrix contexts contained the greatest variety with four of the submotifs and the pit features contained only bordered and plain examples. Mortuary contexts were equally split among plain and Type 3 sherds. Only six submotifs were present at this site: plain, fringed b, bordered, Type 3, Type 6 and Type 9. Unfortunately, these numbers are deceptive due to the extremely low counts of banded group sherds at this site (n=23). This also rendered statistical testing invalid; mortuary contexts yielded a total of two sherds and pit features a total of three.
The situation was similar at Buck Farm A (Figure 29), whose contexts yielded little else but the plain submotif (n=28). Observed at this site were: dotted, fringed b, fringed c, plain, Type 1, Type 1 dotted and Type 6. All but the plain submotif had only one example in the recorded contexts of the site. Matrix and palisade features were shown to have the most variety of submotifs with richness values of three and four, but these figures are colored by the fact that there is only one example of each submotif that is not plain.
As previously noted, CC43 was the most stylistically diverse site in the sample and contained the greatest number of banded group submotifs, exhibiting seventeen. The plain variety was the most populous and the remaining sixteen submotifs occurring at far lower frequencies, many only once or twice. Dog burial contexts contained mostly plain sherds but also had a few cases of Types 3, 6 and 8 as well as two fringed examples. Matrix contents also had an overwhelming majority of plain banded groups but also exhibited five other submotifs. The degree of diversity at mortuary and pit features was far higher; mortuary contexts yielded all but the Type 12 submotif and pit features contained thirteen out of the seventeen varieties.

An examination of mortuary and non-mortuary features showed there was no notable difference in the varieties expressed in the two types of features. Edgehill had too small a sherd count (n=5) thereby preventing a discernable conclusion between mortuary and non-mortuary features. However, site CC43 contained sufficient sherds (n=141) to show the most variety of submotifs. An initial examination shows that both mortuary and non-mortuary features have a high percentage of plain banded groups (Figure 30). Mortuary features appear to have a greater diversity of banded groups but these are almost entirely comprised of submotifs that occur once or twice. When these submotifs are filtered out a different pattern emerges. Animal and human burials demonstrate a dependent relationship with submotif ($X^2=17.211$, df=6, p=.009, n=130). Both human and dog burials yielded a majority of plain banded group sherds. Human burials were more diverse with a richness of seven.

When all of the decorated sherds are considered from all of the sites, the banded group sherds and non-banded group sherds occur at approximately the same proportions.
Figure 31
Non-banded vs. banded group percentiles for all sites

Figure 32
Non-banded vs. banded group percentiles for all sites sorted by context

Edgehill, Buck Farm A and Buck Farm B all exhibited a majority of non-banded sherds. This was not the case at site CC43 which had 10% more banded sherds than non-banded. This relationship was found to be dependent ($X^2 = 81.283$, df=4, $p<.001$, n=859). Clearly, the selection of banded group sherds is dependent upon site, with a smaller chance at Edgehill and both components of Buck Farm but far more likely at CC43. An evaluation of the context types at all four sites (Figure 32) showed that in palisade and matrix contexts the non-banded decorated sherds greatly outnumber those that were decorated. Pit features were observed to have an almost equal percentage of banded and non-banded decorated sherds. Mortuary and dog burial contexts were shown to exhibit the opposite trends than the palisade and matrix contexts; each had 60% or more banded sherds, and were shown to be dependent ($X^2 = 31.095$, df=4, $p<.001$, n=715). Clearly this indicates
that the observed percentiles and frequencies are demonstrative of a dependent relationship for mortuary contexts.

The Edgehill and Buck Farm A sites both exhibited a majority of non-banded sherds to banded sherds in all contexts. The mortuary contexts present at Edgehill also demonstrated this trend. The relationship at this site was shown to be independent ($X^2 = .425$, df=2, $p = .809$, n=98). Contrastingly, at Buck Farm A the relationship between context type and banded group sherds was indicated to be dependent ($X^2 = 4.683$, df=2, $p = .096$, n=115). While the percentiles at both sites appear to be the same, the actual counts of sherds according to context differ between these two sites, thus producing the differing results. It is from site CC43 that the majority of the banded sherds originate. Matrix contexts at CC43 did not show a significant difference in this ratio. However, mortuary, pit and dog burial features all exhibited a greater amount of banded decorated sherds. This was shown to be an independent relationship ($X^2 = 4.832$, df=3, $p = .184$, n=502). Therefore, it appears that only at Buck Farm A do the context type and the presence of banded group sherds have a dependent relationship. Tests conducted on mortuary and non-mortuary features revealed only independent relationships. At Edgehill ($X^2 = .177$, df=1, $p = .674$) there were only 35 sherds, whereas at CC43 ($X^2 = 1.241$, df=1, $p = .265$) 429 sherds were present. However, an overall trend of more samples of the banded group motif in mortuary contexts is evident. While not statistically dependent, this relationship is also seen at CC43 in all but matrix contexts. The banded group motif is therefore shown to be a special form of decoration reserved for special contexts such as human or dog burial. At site CC43 the importance of this motif is great, demonstrating a presence in all features. This indicates significant action occurring at site CC43.
A Consideration of Major Motifs in Field One

Those motifs that occurred on the lip of the sherd were included in this category. The incised lip was the most frequently observed lip motif followed by the punctated lip in much the same way the banded group and fringed lip occurred in the rim and body motifs (Figure 33). The pseudo-cord lip had only one example at site Buck Farm A and was filtered out of all statistical analysis. Buck Farm B only contained the incised lip motif and was not considered in any contextual-based consideration. Edgehill, Buck Farm A and CC43 all were noted to have similar percentile representations of the three major motifs: crenellation, incised lip and punctated lip. However, CC43 had a higher percentage of the punctated lip motif than the other two sites. In looking at the relationship with context types, the palisades were observed to only have incised and punctated lip motifs and dog burials only incised (Figure 34). Mortuary contexts had a nearly even representation of the two motifs with a low percentage of crenellation. Similarly, pit features observed the same trend with a slightly higher representation of the incised motif.
The incised lip motif was the most frequently observed in all context types at Edgehill. This relationship was shown to be independent ($X^2 = .465$, df=4, $p = .977$, n=23). The observed percentiles for incised and punctated lip motifs were not noticeably different. However, crenellation occurred in only matrix and pit contexts. Because of the low count of sherds exhibiting lip motifs (n=23), the results of the chi-square could be misleading. Buck Farm A similarly contained a relatively low sherd count for these motifs and was also shown to have an independent relationship ($X^2 = 2.111$, df=2, $p = .348$, n=33). Unlike previous considerations, CC43 was not noted to have a significantly higher number of representative sherds than the other sites (n=31). No statistical dependency for this second group of major motifs was discerned for this site ($X^2 = 2.148$, df=3, $p = .542$, n=27). Dog burial contexts at this site contained only incised lip examples, but low counts of sherds inflate these percentiles and created misleading results. As shown by the various statistical analyses conducted at an intra-site level, at all sites no dependent relationships were discerned between the fringed lip submotifs and context types, instead only a random pattern is statistically indicated.

A similar trend was observed in looking at mortuary and non-mortuary features at Edgehill and CC43. Both types of features had higher percentages of incised lip sherds than the punctated lip type. Intrisite feature analyses for both Edgehill ($X^2 = .381$, df=2, $p = .827$, n=12) and CC43 ($X^2 = 1.350$, df=2, $p = .509$, n=27) showed that feature type and motif to be independent. This was also observed when the sites were examined together ($X^2 = 2.250$, df=3, $p = .522$, n=59). Statistical analysis has shown that there is no dependent relationship between the presence of lip motif and context type. This is observed for all
sites when considered as a single group and at the inter-site level. An independent relationship was also noted in mortuary and non-mortuary sites at Edgehill and CC43. This is most likely reflective of the small number of sherds, especially when compared to the amount of motifs observed on the rim and neck regions, of motifs in field one with identified provenience.

*Ceramic Rim Analysis*

While the major focus of this study was the development and analysis of a stylistic language as it is manifest at these three sites, a great number of undecorated rims were also noted. Of all of the rim sherds 58% percent did not exhibit decoration. The undecorated rims were more frequent at Edgehill and both components of Buck Farm (Figure 35). However, CC43 exhibited a 50% split between undecorated and decorated sherds. Of the five context types present at these sites, all but the matrix types were shown to have no more than an eight percent difference in undecorated and decorated rim sherds (Figure 36). Matrix contexts consisted of 68% undecorated rim sherds. This is not surprising that the majority of matrix contexts were from the plow zone, in which the greatest disturbance has occurred, therefore, the chances of a rim being separated from decoration on the rim or body of the pots is more likely.
The contexts at Edgehill produced notably different results. Matrix and mortuary contexts exhibited almost three times as many undecorated rim sherds than decorated. This is not surprising for general matrix contexts, for reasons previously stated, but the absence of decorated rims in mortuary contexts is notable. Presumably, the more intricately decorated pots would have been placed in a mortuary context because of their highly valued nature. The majority of undecorated rims indicates that this is not occurring at Edgehill (Figure 37). Conversely, pit contexts showed only an 8% difference in number of undecorated and decorated rims. This was shown to be a dependent relationship ($X^2=7.042$, df=2, $p=.030$, n=125). When non-mortuary features were grouped together it became clear that while mortuary contexts exhibited almost three times the undecorated sherds compared to decorated, all other features continued the 8% difference noted in the pit features (Figure 38). This was also seen to be dependent ($X^2=3.259$, df=1, $p=.071$, n=40). At Edgehill, therefore, the overwhelming presence of undecorated rims demonstrates the opposite of expected trends.
The dominance of decorated rims in pit contexts at Edgehill was not shown at Buck Farm A (Figure 39). Pit contexts here were observed to contain three times as many undecorated rims than decorated. Matrix and palisade contexts also showed a majority of undecorated rims, though in palisade contexts the difference was only by 8%. This relationship was independent at Buck Farm A ($X^2=3.875$, df=2, $p=.144$, n=163).

Site CC43 did not show any significant difference between the occurrence of decorated and undecorated rims in all context types. The only notable difference was in matrix contexts, which exhibited a 43% presence of undecorated rims. It is therefore not surprising that the relationship was independent ($X^2=1.294$, df=3, $p=.731$, n=322). This is somewhat surprising considering that this site contained the greatest diversity of decorative motifs and sherds. It is presumed that burial and ossuary contexts would exhibit more decorated sherds, but at CC43, they are equal to the undecorated sherds.
This trend of a very slight difference was also exhibited in mortuary and non-mortuary features from Edgehill and CC43. When considered together the relationship was determined to be independent ($X^2 = .543$, df=1, p=.461, n=404). This same trend was observed at site CC43, in which almost no difference was noted between mortuary and non-mortuary features. No discernable difference was also noted between dog and human mortuary features.

**Temporal Analysis**

Due to the lack of overall site analysis, many of the individual features and site components have not been dated. Therefore, only a few carbon-14 dates are available to examine the patterns of the major motifs over time. Of those contexts with available dates, represented by pit features, the two palisades and mortuary contexts, three periods were manifest at the three sites in question: Middle Woodland, Late Woodland and the Proto-Historic, Proto-Historic defined as the initial contact phases of Europeans and native inhabitants. Examining the dated contexts eliminates almost half of the rim and
decorated sherds, many from significant mortuary contexts. However, the sample remaining is sufficient enough to draw conclusions.

When considering only the major motifs on the rim and body of the sherds, no significant difference is noticed in the percentages of motifs presence in the Middle and Late Woodland periods (Figure 40). The banded group motif is, as previously found, to represent the majority of the sherds by an overwhelming percentage. This is followed by the fringed lip group and then by cross-hatching. Both of these periods exhibit all of the major motifs, save for the incised net which occurs only in the Late Woodland. The Proto-Historic period demonstrates the least variety of motifs, exhibiting only the two most frequent. It should be noted that this period contains the least amount of sherds and represents a very small portion of the datable contexts. While this is unfortunate, it is suspected that with further analysis of the three sites that other contexts will be dated to this period and therefore add to the sherds included in this analysis. Despite the fact that there is a paucity of sherds from this period, the overall trend is perpetuated,
demonstrating either the popularity or the importance of the banded group and fringed lip motifs.

The banded group continues its domination in human mortuary contexts as well (Figure 41). In those dated human burials in the Middle and Late Woodland, the banded group represented over 75% of the sherds in those contexts. The only motif not represented in burial contexts was the herringbone design. In the Middle Woodland period the cross-hatching motif represented 16% of the total decorated sherds, while fell in numbers by the Late Woodland. In the decline of the cross-hatching, the fringed lip motif became the second most represented and the incised net was introduced as a motif. While these conclusions are subject to change upon further evaluation of the three sites, the dominance of the banded group motif throughout all periods does not appear to change.

In both the Middle Woodland and Proto-Historic periods over half of the rim sherds are not decorated (Figure 42). This is not so in the Late Woodland, which shows an almost even split between decorated and nondecorated. Both the Middle and Late Woodland exhibit mortuary and non-mortuary contexts in similar proportions. This appears strange when compared to the available dated contexts for the Proto-Historic, which contained only palisade and pit features. When the Late Woodland is broken down by context type (Figure 43), it is apparent that all contexts save for the human burial exhibit a relative evenness of decorated and nondecorated sherds. The human burial contexts show a slightly higher percentage of decorated sherds. This attests to the significant nature of burial contexts and the association of these contexts with more elaborate vessels. Clearly, events and social situations of the Late Woodland period
resulted in the greater proliferation of stylistic expression. This is quite possibly linked to
the rise of social inequality in the region, which resulted in the need for more
symbolically prestigious goods. This stands in direct contrast to the Proto-Historic period,
the data here reflecting previous conclusions about the decline of stylistic expression at
the close of the Late Woodland.

Discussion

Of all of these sites, site CC43 appears to be the most diverse in terms of the motifs
observed, submotif permutations and dominates the collection in size alone. This site
proved to be the most interesting site of the three, not only in the diversity and number of
motifs observed but in the patterns in which they appear. The major motifs at this
particular site were shown to be dependent upon context type as well as by mortuary
status of feature. An examination of the banded group submotifs also revealed a
dependent relationship between context type and submotif. This relationship was also
expressed when comparing mortuary and non-mortuary features. CC43 also exhibited an
almost equal amount of banded decorated sherds to non-banded decorated sherds. The
relationship between context type and banded/nonbanded sherds proved to be independent, but the vast quantities of banded sherds at site CC43 is notable. All feature types, excluding those contexts characterized as matrix, exhibited a larger amount of banded sherds to non-banded sherds at this site. This highly diverse motif exhibited the most complex variations. If more complexly designed and executed motifs are indicative of greater amounts of effort to produce “fancier” ceramic pieces for special occurrences, then this would indicate that the activities at CC43 were not commonplace. The banded group motif’s dominance is not dependent upon period; it is the most populous sherd for all periods, again attesting to its importance.

Sufficient counts of banded group examples did not exist at Edgehill and Buck Farm A and therefore a context-based relationship could not be established at either of those sites. Contexts at those sites yielded far more non-banded decorated sherds. However, when looking at all contexts together from the three sites, it is clear that the majority of the banded groups are located in mortuary contexts, both human and dog. Despite the fact that a dependent relationship could not be statistically found at just CC43, comparing the presence of banded sherds at site CC43 to the overall context-based trends, the conclusion that the banded group motif is associated with distinguished and exceptional context situations, such as the highly important burial, is upheld.

Relationships between mortuary and non-mortuary features and the motifs expressed therein were also discerned at Edgehill and CC43. This relationship was random at Edgehill, but at CC43 was shown to be statistically dependent, reflecting the aforementioned trends exhibited with solely the banded group motif. Unfortunately, no notable trends other than complete independence were found for motifs expressed on the
lip of rim sherds. In both the Middle Woodland and Late Woodland human mortuary contexts are clearly dominated by the banded group, which has been shown to serve as a base from which permutations are devised with greater intricacy.

Notable differences were also seen at site CC43 when just the rim sherds, both decorated and undecorated, were examined. Edgehill and Buck Farm A exhibited more undecorated rims than decorated. As in the ratio of non-banded to banded decorated sherds was shown to be almost equal at CC43, undecorated to decorated rim sherds also demonstrates this pattern. The dominance of undecorated rims at Edgehill in mortuary contexts was unusual, and similarly, a fairly equal amount of undecorated and decorated rims at CC43 is also interesting. The proportions of nondecorated to decorated sherds does not vary significantly over time. The Late Woodland anomaly is perhaps explained by the fact that the majority of these contexts are from site CC43, whose significant numbers of sherds could be biasing this assessment. This aside, perhaps there was an important surge in the numbers of decorated vessels being produced in the Late Woodland corresponding to the consolidation of groups of people and the emergency of public architecture and elaborate burials of the developing elite class. The return to a dominance of nondecorated sherds in the Proto-Historic period may be explained by the small number of datable contexts available and does not imply a return to a less stratified society. However this trend is particularly though provoking and it is suspected that further research will clarify this.

From these initial explorations, it appears that a certain connection was assigned to the banded group motif permutations among the Chickahominy people. Its extreme dominance over the other motifs at each site, and among the total decorated sherds in the
collection, attests to this. Its domination of mortuary and pit features also connects it with important activities such as mortuary practices and probable serving contexts. Site CC43 also proved to be an interesting location, both in its amount of sherds and in the diversity of the motifs present. The dominance of highly decorated sherds and exceptional contexts demonstrates that the site was significant for the Chickahominy people.
CHAPTER 7
CONCLUSION

Style has been defined as a way of doing something; it is the visual representation of communication and information exchange. In regards to the Chickahominy River I have evaluated stylistic variation in ceramic vessels expressed in decorative motifs. This stylistic variation was employed to shed light on intergroup social networks, with the goal of discerning both shared and disparate characteristics, and intragroup activities in order to evaluate the relationship of motifs to specific contexts, paying particular attention to how those motifs were structured. Using methods developed by previous ceramic analysts and borrowing terminology from evolutionary models, a style language, or system, was discerned from the sherds from three of the sites from the Chickahominy River survey. This new and original system, in addition to being employed within the context of this collection, is intended to be a springboard for further research of Chesapeake Native societies. It is suspected that a study of larger scale will better explicate social dynamics of Chesapeake peoples using this system combined with archaeological, linguistic and historical anthropological research.

In this study I first identified the components involved in designs and described how they were configured on the sherds. These were then grouped into motifs. Where appropriate, these motifs were further elaborated by defining submotifs. These motifs can then be
used within Chickahominy contexts to gain insight into associations with certain activities and activity areas and trace the development of decorative elements over time. The classification of decoration of the ceramics can also be used to elucidate relationships with other social groups and highlight trading networks. A myriad of approaches have been suggested as to how to interpret these stylistic patterns and their correlations with intra-group social relations.

Initial theories of style were heavily criticized because of their overly functional nature. Despite claims by other anthropologists who propose dissimilar approaches, the early functional explanations cannot be entirely dismissed. Instead, they need to be revised in such a way that allows for more dynamic explanations of stylistic behavior. Dietler and Herbich correctly point out that the information-exchange model in its earliest applications was too narrow in focus and that archaeological analyses needed to looked beyond presumed social boundaries; shared stylistic systems were not necessarily indicative of association with the same social group, and nor were differing stylistic systems indicative of multiple social groups. Instead, it is proposed, that for this particular collection that the stylistic language illustrates the spheres of social interaction exhibited by the indigenous peoples of the Chesapeake region.

Ceramic stylistic variation within the Chickahominy River was evaluated using a descriptive system based upon isolating pieces of motifs in order to classify them into motif groups. Preliminary analysis at all three of the sites indicated that the banded group motif, which was further elaborated into numerous submotifs, was by far the most populous. It was statistically shown that motif and context type were independent of each other, save for at site CC43. This particular site was the most elaborate of the three and
contained numerous mortuary contexts and the most total decorated sherds. However, a dependent relationship only pertained to those motifs that were much less frequently occurring than the banded group. This could possibly indicate that the banded group motif was so general that it could have appeared in any activity context. However, it is more likely that it was reserved for more specialized contexts, such as human burials, as indicated by its dominance over other motifs in those contexts. An analysis of mortuary features indicated that a greater diversity of banded submotifs occurred in these areas. This indicated that these more elaborate submotifs were connected to burial activity. While the banded group occurred in ordinary contexts, it is concluded that its elaborate submotifs was connected in some way to mortuary practice.

This was best illustrated at site CC43. This site was also observed to have an almost even percentage of decorated to nondecorated rims. Mortuary contexts at CC43 exhibited far more decorated rims that those without elaboration. Again, this illustrated that mortuary practice for the Chickahominy people had a special set of motifs associated with them, specifically the banded group. The development of the stylistic language has shown that the plain banded group served as a template, like a music stave, upon which more complex submotifs could be built.

This trend did not change over time, for the banded group appears to have retained its popularity, or importance, throughout the Middle Woodland, Late Woodland and Proto-Historic periods. While the Middle and Late Woodland periods show greater diversity in the numbers of motifs present, the Proto-Historic shows only the two most populous, reflecting the previously determined trend that decoration peters out when approaching the Historic period. Despite its lack of diversity, the Proto-Historic period
shows the same percentage of decorated to nondecorated rims as seen in the Middle Woodland. Where difference is noted is in the Late Woodland. This period shows a near evenness in the percentages of decorated and nondecorated rims, whereas the others show more undecorated. This is suspected to be connected to the emerging social institutions that were developing as a result of population increase and subsistence surpluses. It is therefore suggested that this rising elite would have been utilizing more elaborately decorated vessels in their burial contexts in order to differentiate their status from the lower classes, expressing greater social diversity. In looking at the activity areas in this period, all show a near evenness of decorated to nondecorated, with human mortuary contexts being the exception. So, it is shown that decorated sherds, specifically the banded group, were connected to the more elaborate ritual burials, elucidated in the Late Woodland context of emerging class structure and changing social relationships.

This is particularly interesting within the context of the Chickahominy people, who have been postulated to have exhibited more egalitarian social systems when compared to the Powhatan peoples. However, this conclusion is somewhat speculative and is suspected to be further explicated when the analysis of the entire collection is completed. It is known that the Chickahominy were governed by a council of eight elders, therefore it can be extrapolated that their particular social structure was different than those of the Powhatan. The final analysis of the entire collection is greatly anticipated; the Chickahominy people have been greatly overshadowed by their neighbors in the literature. But, as previously stated, their position in Chesapeake and European politics is not to be underestimated. While not a very populous group, the English considered them valuable trading partners and vied for their friendship. These agreements were entered
into with the understanding that the English would aid them against Powhatan. Taking into consideration previous research regarding the development of the Powhatan chiefdom and the associated social networks, Chickahominy material culture has the potential to contribute significant insight regarding intergroup social networks amongst coastal plain Virginia populations.

If the historic record implies that the Chickahominies desired to distinguish and separate themselves from their Powhatan neighbors, then conceivably they would attempt to distinguish their stylistic expressions as well. In looking at stylistic patterns in areas to north in Delaware, a clear correlation is discerned between the two Algonquian groups. These shared motifs bring to light the spheres of social interaction in the Mid-Atlantic region and demonstrate the social ties between the Chickahominies and their northern neighbors, perhaps illustrating fruitful trading relations or some shared cultural systems. What is missing is an interpretation of the ceramic evidence in between. If two geographically distant groups exhibit very similar stylistic expressions, then conceivable those closer would also share those same trends, especially when considering how many other common traits the Chickahominies and Powhatans share. However, without actually having that analysis it is difficult to arrive at a definite conclusion.

This preliminary assessment and identification of the Chickahominy style system is proposed to be a baseline from which to compare other Chesapeake cultures. It is suspected that further analysis of the Chickahominy collection will identify other datable contexts and will add to those already identified as Proto-Historic. This will, in conjunction with analysis of identified Powhatan sites, will further elucidate the intricacies of Chickahominy-Powhatan diplomatic relations and ethnic identification.
While further research may have the potential to alter many of the conclusions reached in this preliminary study, many of the questions proposed herein may be answered. The minutiae of many of the statistical analysis may be altered or even refuted, but the more prominent trends concerning the banded group and fringed lip motifs will most likely not change.

Therefore, what is needed is a consideration of the ceramic stylistic trends from other coastal plain groups in Virginia and Maryland, with a suggested concentration on the Late Woodland, Proto-Historic and Contact periods. Research into these periods will further advance understanding of the complex social and diplomatic relationships among the various groups and perhaps provide new insight into the changing dynamics associated with the consolidation of the Powhatan chiefdom and the arrival of the Europeans.
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