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Figure 1: Dry red/brown clay, Dogon culture, Mali, Africa.

Figure 2: Dried ochre clay, Dogon culture, Mali, Africa.

Figure 3: Dried blackish clay, Dogon culture, Mali, Africa.

Figure 4: A potter’s stick, Dogon culture, Mali, Africa.

Figure 5: Press mold, Dogon culture, Mali, Africa.

Figure 6: Stone for smoothing, Dogon culture, Mali, Africa.

Figure 7: Incised and punctated bowl, Luba peoples, Congo, 1900.

Figure 8: Incised and fire-marked bowl, undetermined peoples, Liberia, late 20th century.

Figure 9: Burnished, reduction fired bowl, with added clay decoration, Nguni peoples, South Africa, mid-twentieth century.

Figure 10: Burnished, oxidation fired bowl, slip covered, sgraffito decoration, undetermined peoples, Cameroon, early-mid 20th century.

Figure 11: Dry cow dung, a fuel source, Dogon culture, Mali, Africa.

Figure 12: Low-walled kiln area, Dogon culture, Mali, Africa.

Figure 13: Shard, c 1715, 38DR15 site, South Carolina, interior burnished and slipped rim.

Figure 14: Shard, c 1715, 38DR15 site, South Carolina, exterior, with check stamp impressions, fire markings, and clearly compressed edge.

Figure 15: Rimmed jar shards, reassembled, 38BK160 site, South Carolina, side view, inverse.

Figure 16: Rimmed jar shards, reassembled, 38BK160 site, South Carolina, view from base.

Figure 17: Complete jug, side view, 38CN7 site, South Carolina, whole artifact.

Figure 18: Detail, handle and rim, 38CN7 site, South Carolina, whole artifact.

Figure 19: Bowl shard, interior view, 38CN7 site, South Carolina, whole artifact.
Figure 20: Bowl shard, incised cross shape in base, 38CN7 site, South Carolina, whole artifact.

Figures 21, 22 and 23: Three (3) views of oxidized bowl, 38CN7 site, South Carolina, whole artifact.

Figures 24, 25 and 26: Cup Shard, three (3) views, 38BK62 site, South Carolina, whole shard.

Figures 27 and 28: Bowl shard with pinched foot and notched rim, 38BK62 site, South Carolina, two (2) views.

Figures 29 and 30: Bowl shard with applied foot and notched rim, 38BK62 site, South Carolina, two (2) views.

Figures 31 and 32: Bowl fragment showing evidence of a pulled foot, 38BK62 site, South Carolina, two (2) views.

Figures 33, 34 and 35: Bowl fragment showing evidence of a pulled foot, 38BK62 site, South Carolina, three (3) views.

Figures 36, 37 and 38: Teapot, three (3) views, 38BK62 site, South Carolina, three (3) views.

Figure 39: First bottle form, replication tests.

Figure 40: First storage vessel form, replication tests.

Figure 41: Coil with flared rim, water vessel, replication tests.

Figure 42: Punch and pull method, storage jar, replication tests.

Figure 43: Convex mold with pinched foot, serving bowl, replication tests.