COMMENTS FROM THE EDITOR
Patricia Galloway

Members of the MAA who have been following state and national events pertaining to archaeology and preservation in general, whether through the Newsletter or other sources, will perhaps have noticed that all the concern that is being expressed on this subject seems to be having a good effect, at least in Mississippi and at least among the constituency concerned with archaeology in the state. Threats to antiquities which must be met increasingly by state and even local regulatory mechanisms in the absence of a national leadership or commitment; threats to the anthropology programs at our state universities; threats to the State Historic Preservation Officer program—all these have, and I believe not coincidentally, brought forth within the MAA a new level of interest and cooperation; interest and participation among amateur members, cooperation and solidarity among professional members, especial-
by those associated with institutional/governmental entities. Perhaps in many instances it does take a threat to galvanize action and to make people see the value of making common cause together, and perhaps this is no bad thing. And even if only small gains are made—and the passage of the new antiquities legislation this past legislative session is no small gain—in the present economic atmosphere they must be put into perspective and seen for the really large gains that they are. With fewer resources, sacrifices made just to stay even may be great.

During the present year we can anticipate seeing the number of our chapters double if not triple, and I hope that the number of our members may increase significantly as well, but it is the united solidarity of the members of our chapters that can make for more effective activities and programs, even without substantial membership increase. This year also, as I have described in the Newsletter, we have decided to begin a public buildings program on a sound and self-financing footing. Such a step will not be completed in one year, or even perhaps in five, but a beginning is being made. I do not wish to point out my own contributions. It is obvious that the editors of the MAA aree satisfied with the efforts that are being made to improve the quality and the content of the publications. But such improvements cost money, even when undertaken with care, and the MAA is looking for a new source of income, the enthusiasm of its new president, that past presidents have taught that such growth might be temporary—and, in short, that we need to plan for the future when the number of years may threaten the publications once again. It is my feeling that quality publications like this one at the heart of this issue that the society of members is interested in giving to the Society for the Advancement of Archaeological Research, and through programs to which the work that is going on in the state can be made known and its results shared to the benefit of the knowledge of all. So while I may ask you to consider this or to take action on that, let me also ask you to consider the Association with your ideas for strengthening the Publication Fund.

Increased participation by amateurs is obvious in this issue of MAA. We have two excellent articles authored by amateurs in this issue. Graduate student participation is exemplified by another article, while professionals from inside the state and from more distant climes have also provided contributions. There is a level of quality that we can maintain, so that each issue has something for everyone, no matter what their interest. We have tried to cut the cost of publication to the bone while still producing a good-looking journal, but our success in obtaining good numbers of worthy articles has led to another cost: the increased cost of mailing a journal whose availableness is, to say the least, showing growth. At some point in the near future, should this desirable trend continue, we may have to consider increasing our number of issues of MAA.

Each specimen recovered was thoroughly examined microscopically (15X magnification) to discern how they may have been used. Full descriptions of observations follow. Measurements of each specimen are listed in Table 1, and the artifacts are illustrated in Figure 2.

Figure 1. Site location.

### Waller Hafted Scraper Knives from Southeast Mississippi

**Waller Hafted Scaper Knives from Southeast Mississippi**

**Carey L. Giger and Ted Brown**

**Abstract**

Waller knives (Purdy 1981:31-32) have been recovered in the excavation of the Senatobia (Grant Co., Mississippi). This site was in the Wolf River floodplain, which has been the focus of attention by the authors and the Mississippi Department of Archaeology and History since 1974. Since these knives were recovered in excavation, considerable information on their use and cultural affiliation has been obtained. This report is a preliminary discussion of this information.

### General Description

The Waller Knife is a hafted unifacial tool with one to three working zones. Hafting is facilitated by side notches at the base of the tool. Knife lengths found during excavation were of three basic types:

- **Type I** has three distinct working zones: the primary zone along the entire left blade edge when viewing the dorsal surface from the base; the secondary zone along the right edge; and the distal end. The primary zone is steeply chipped. Edge angles range from 60 to 80 degrees, and this zone is inaccurately defined. The secondary zone is unifacially chipped at an edge angle of approximately 30 degrees, and this zone is inaccurately defined. The distal end is also unifacially chipped to form an acute tip. Three specimens were recovered.

- **Type II** has only one working zone, which extends along the entire left blade edge and is steeply chipped at an edge angle of 80 degrees. Neither the tip nor the opposite edge were utilized. One specimen was recovered.

- **Type III** is on a thin, fragile blade of which could not be steeply chipped. It has two working zones, one along each blade edge. One specimen was recovered.

### Individual Description

Each specimen recovered was thoroughly examined macroscopically and microscopically (25X magnification) to discern how they may have been used. Full descriptions of observations follow. Measurements of each specimen are listed in Table 1, and the artifacts are illustrated in Figure 2.

- **Figure 1:** Waller Knife, Type I.

  **Parent preform** was a primary decorative blank of light blond chert. It was not heat-treated.

  **Facing of working zone** is smooth, and the dorsal surface is unworked except that notches were formed by bifacial flaking.
The primary working zone was steeply chipped. Small, nibbling fracture scars exist along the leading edge of this zone. A high gloss polish covers most of the working zone. One 5 mm area near the center of the zone has four resharpening flake scars. Two of these resulted in hinge fractures. Polish is absent in this area. The primary zone extends 4 mm onto the dorsal surface with the fracture scars extending less than 1 mm from the leading edge.

The secondary working zone is crudely flaked. Two areas approximately 1 mm wide have cortex showing to the blade edge. Not much polish is present but the leading edge does exhibit some rounding and polishing. An 8 mm fracture is present near the center of this zone.

The distal end is acute. It is formed by narrow flakes up to 5 mm long. Small (less than 1 mm) fracture scars exist on both blade edges at the distal end. A bright polish appears in this zone. Rotary wear is not apparent.

The hafting area was prepared by thinning and narrowing the base of the parent flake. This was done unifacially on the dorsal face. Notches were formed by the removal of three to five flakes from the dorsal and ventral surface. The base was thinned bifacially by pressure flaking two to three flakes from each face. Both notch cavities are lightly ground. The notch opposite the primary working zone exhibits crushing but the other notch does not. This specimen is illustrated in Figure 2.

Figure 2. Waller hafted scraper knives, Beaumont Gravel Pit site.
Parent preform was a blank flake from a gray chert cobble. Unifacial flaking was again used except for the notches.

The primary working zone was steeply chipped. Small fracture scars less than 1 mm high occur along the entire working zone which extends to the tip of the distal end. Very little polish is visible in the working zone, but the shoulders exhibit some polish.

The secondary working zone is very carefully pressure-flaked along the entire right edge except for a 5 mm fracture scar that occurs 8 mm from the distal end. Light wear polish is apparent in this zone.

The distal end is very acute and is formed by narrow, long flakes extending up onto the dorsal face. The distal end is highly polished. Polarity is not present.

Hafting was accomplished by bifacial flaking. Both notches were lightly ground. Again the notch opposite the primary working zone has been heavily crushing, while the other notch has only a small amount of crushing. The base is bifacially thinned. This specimen is not illustrated.

Parent preform was a primary decortication flake from a strongly heat-treated brown chert cobble. Most of the dorsal surface is covered with cortex.

The primary zone, the only working zone on this type, is steeply chipped. Flaking of this zone is different in that it occurs on the ventral as well as the dorsal surface. The dorsal flaking extends 27 mm from the distal end, while the ventral flaking extends 10 mm from the shoulder. This results in a 3 mm high x 27 mm wide x 10 mm deep notch along the dorsal edge when trouble was encountered in pressure flaking the remainder of the edge. The tool was then flaked on the ventral surface to form a sharp edge along the entire side.

Small, nibbling fracture scars less than 1 mm high do exist on the dorsal face of the leading edge. There are no fracture scars on the ventral side of the leading edge of the zone, which has a high degree of polish, and none in true of all the ventral and ventral surfaces of the zone. The ridges of the fracture scars are also polished. A possible scenario explaining such wear is that initially the tool was used for scraping a hard material such as bone or wood and at this time only the dorsal flaking had occurred. After this initial use, flaking was continued on the ventral surface; the tool was then used as a cutting implement for a soft material such as meat.

Hafting was accomplished by bifacial formation of side notches. Both notches are bifacially formed by an obtuse angle.

The primary working zone is the only deliberately flaked working zone. It is along the left side. It was not steeply chipped but was sheared chipped with the flake scars less than 1 mm long. This flaking resulted in an uneven, jagged cutting edge. The leading edge and ridges of the zone exhibit a high degree of polish.

The secondary working zone is on the right edge of the tool. It was not deliberately flaked but shows wear chipping which is the result of use of the sharp edge. Polish is present in this zone also.

No use is apparent for the distal end, which is blunt. Bifacially formed notches were lightly ground. Crushing occurred in the notch opposite the primary working zone on the only. The base was not thinned, but the parent blade was already very thin. The corners are rounded by gentle pressure flaking.

**Probable Use of Waller Knives**

The primary working zone of Type I knives would have served well for scraping wood or bone. Physical evidence indicates its most probable use was for separating meat from bone. The secondary zone was a cutting or light scraping implement. Wear polish indicates it was used for cutting meat or cleaning hides. The distal end served as a perforator and was occasionally forced into a hard surface or a crack in such a surface; cutting of bone joints could easily be one possible explanation. This is further evidenced by the large fracture scar present on all three specimens in the secondary working zone. This fracture occurred when force was applied to a tough, unyielding material such as ligament.

The Type II knife found seems to have been used initially in the same manner as the primary working zone of Type I knives. It was then probably used for cutting a soft substance—most likely in butchering.

The single Type III knife found was crafted as a cutting implement, and wear polish indicates that this was its main function. It would have served very efficiently for cutting meat or for skinning.

**Cultural Affiliation**

Fortunately, the Waller Knives were found in excavation and thus can be evaluated chronologically also. Although the site is very shallow, less than two feet, and was occupied from the Early Archaic through the Middle Woodland periods, most of the Middle Woodland material is limited to the upper level of the site. Nor does the site yield a significant amount of identifiable Late Archaic artifacts.

The evaluation of cultural relationships was accomplished by plotting the location of the Waller Knives on a grid map and then determining which artifacts within an arbitrary twelve-foot radius might have been associated with them. One of the Waller Knives, #40-1, was found at some distance from the others, while four were found in the same area of the site. This afforded two areas in which to concentrate our study. Table 2 lists artifacts found in the vicinity of the #40-1 Waller Knife, while Table 3 lists those found near the other four knives.

**Side-Notched Projectile Point/Knives**

This class of artifacts probably saw more use as knives than as projectile points (Goodyear 1974:32; House 1975:60), and would thus be an integral part of a butchering toolkit. A total of 18 of these was found with the Waller Knives. Representative drawings of the side-notched types are shown in Figure 3.

Seven San Patrice, Dr. Leaf River points (Geiger 1980:16-17) were found with the Waller Knives. One was found 1/2 from Waller Knife #40-1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact</th>
<th>Artifacts/LB.</th>
<th>Depth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nailer Knife, Type I</td>
<td>477-1</td>
<td>559-000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>495-3</td>
<td>570-000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>414-5</td>
<td>505-000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>499-4</td>
<td>559-000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>404-5</td>
<td>505-000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>544-5</td>
<td>559-000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>410-4</td>
<td>505-000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 1. WALLER HAFTEO SCRAPER-KNIFE STATISTICS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact</th>
<th>Artifacts/LB.</th>
<th>Depth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nailer Knife, Type II</td>
<td>477-1</td>
<td>559-000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>495-3</td>
<td>570-000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>414-5</td>
<td>505-000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>499-4</td>
<td>559-000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>404-5</td>
<td>505-000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>544-5</td>
<td>559-000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>410-4</td>
<td>505-000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 2. WALLER HAFTEO SCRAPER-KNIFE ASSOCIATION.**
and 0.2' above. Five San Patrice points were found with the other knives. This is a very light relationship. The Leaf River variety of San Patrice has some characteristics of the St. Johns variety found at the John Pierce site in northeastern Louisiana (Webb, Shiner, and Roberts 1971:13-15) and resembles the San Patrice discussed by Gagliano (1963:112-113) from south Louisiana and south Mississippi.

Six points found with the Waller Knives were originally identified as Lost Lake points (Geiger 1980:18) from the floodplain, but further study has more closely related them to the Bolen point of Florida (Purdy 1981:24-26); Waller knives were also recorded from early 'kill' sites near the Santa Fe River of north central Florida. One of the Bolen points had both blades struck off to form burins and was used in bone working (House 1973:65).

Two Palmer points were found. This point type was named by Joffre Cow (1966) on the basis of examples from Stanly County, North Carolina. Palmer point #51-1 was associated with a fire pit.

One projectile point closely resembles the Taylor point of South Carolina (Michie 1966:123-124) and is identified tentatively as such in Table 2 and Figure 3. Another point may be of the same type but is identified as a Big Sandy (Knott 1956:25) in Table 3. This latter point has been repeatedly resharpened and is only 22 mm long.

An unidentified corner-notched point was found with the four grouped Waller knives. The only other projectile points found near the Waller knives were two Adena Narrow Stemmed points found on the northern extremity of the excavated area along with the Waller Knives, arrow points, and a Clovis point from the Woodland zone of the site.

It is difficult to determine which of the side-notched types, if not all of them, are associated with the Waller Knives. The closest association appears to be with San Patrice points. The John Pierce site also contained a tool similar to the Waller Knife. It was identified as a concave scraper, Albany type (Webb, Shiner, and Roberts 1971:30-33).

Further research is needed to evaluate the relationship, if any, between the two tools. The Bolen point also has a strong association with the Waller Knife at the site. It is important to note that the Waller Knives are closely associated with Early Archaic side-notched projectile point/knives at the site. Thus the Waller Knives at the Beavon Mount Gravel Pit site can be attributed to that cultural period.

Other Artifacts

Table 4 lists other tools and features found with the knives and the probable use of these materials. Note the number and variety of tools that would have been used for animal processing purposes. It is also apparent what the function of the fire pits would have been in this regard.

Other Sites in Mississippi

The authors have conducted considerable investigation and surveys of other sites in the Leaf River floodplain, but have only recovered Waller Knives from the Beavon Mount Gravel Pit site. Waller Knives have been recovered from the Pearl River area of south Mississippi and these sites have been reported to the Mississippi Department of Archives and History archaeologists by residents of that area. They are possibly in collections of artifacts from other Mississippi sites. One purpose of this report is to encourage their owners to report these artifacts to

Figure 3. Projectile Point/Knives. A-B, San Patrice, var. Leaf River (E, D resharpened); C, E, Taylor; F-G, Palmer; H-I, Bolen.
professional archaeologists in the state.

Conclusions

Waller Hafted Scrapers have been recovered in excavation from the Beaumont Gravel Pit site. These Waller Knives are closely associated with the Early Archaic side-notched projectile points. The Waller Knife is an integral part of the animal processing toolkit and it would have served well in cutting, butchering, bone working, and hide processing. Therefore the Waller Knife is a marker of Early Archaic animal processing sites. As such, it is a good indicator of the purpose and cultural affiliation of other sites where it is found.

Carey Geiger is a member of the Gulf Coast chapter of the Mississippi Archaeological Association and serves the MAA as its Southern Vice President.
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PLACOUMIN CULTURE HOUSES IN THE NATCHES BLUFFS REGION, MISSISSIPPI:

EXCAVATIONS AT THE LOOKOUT SITE

Ian W. Brown

Abstract

This paper is a preliminary report of the excavations undertaken by Harvard University at the Lookout site, Jefferson County, in 1961 and 1962. The emphasis is on house remains. Lookout being the first non-mound village site in the Natchez Bluffs region to yield Placoumin culture structural information.

Introduction

During the past two years the Lower Mississippi Survey (LMS) of Peabody Museum, Harvard University, has conducted extensive excavations in the Natchez Bluffs region. This region comprises a narrow strip of land following the bluff line from the latitude of Vicksburg south to the Mississippi-Louisiana border. It is composed of both steep and rolling hills, talus slopes which lie adjacent to the Mississippi alluvial floodplain, and floodplains of secondary streams which flow through the hills. Considerable prehistoric and historic research has been conducted in the Natchez Bluffs region in the past (summarized in Brain et al. n.d.). But the current project has had the historic Natchez Indians as its primary research focus (Brown 1982a). Topics such as aboriginal-European relations and the Natchez practice of adopting small remnant groups from the north are being addressed in our research. Nine sites have been excavated since the fall of 1981 (Brown and Williams 1982). The analysis of the 1982 investigations is only partially completed and will be the subject of a forthcoming volume. However, there were some exciting finds which deserve airing prior to the final report. Particularly important, and thus the topic of this paper, was the discovery of a series of structures (probably houses) at the Lookout site (Figure 1). These are the first structures recorded on a non-mound site in the Natchez Bluffs region.

Background

The Lookout site is located around 30 km northeast of the city of Natchez. It is situated on the edge of a high bluff overlooking the Mississippi alluvial floodplain. Coles Creek emerges from the hills about 1 km north of the site. Lookout was discovered by Robert Prospere, a local amateur, in the spring of 1980. The area to the west of the large heavy undergrowth patches illustrated in Figure 2 was covered by forest prior to 1980, and in the process of clearing this area a number of burials came to light. Fragments of seven or eight pots were found in the area marked Loca.. The large number of burials encountered is not known. Two pots in the collection of the landowners are of the type Coleman Incised, var. Impressed (Figure 3a). One is a fairly large beaker while the other is a small "toy" jar. Var. Coleman itself dates to the Anna phase (AD 1200-1350) (Brain et al. n.d.), but these two vessels may date earlier. A very crude sandstone effigy pipe, bearing a serpentine design, was found by Prospere in the same area associated with one of the aforementioned burials (Figure 3b). This object was particularly exciting as it represented a clear deviation of the elaborate Emerald site pipes (Brown 1926: Figures 218-216; Phillips and Brown 1978:204-205). The possibility of uncovering a historic Natchez Indian village and cemetery site at Lookout seemed reasonably good.

Cultural Sequence

Lookout is a multi-component site. A location at the interface of two ecological zones was obviously quite appealing to Indians throughout the ages. Indeed, it would have been curious not to find evidence for a series of occupations on this blufftop. Late Paleo-Indian use of the site is revealed by a Dalton, var. San Patrice point in the Prospere collection, an artifact deposited on the site over 10,000 years ago. It was found, along with a number of Mississippian projectile points, on the northern slope of the site. A Jasper bead, dating to either Mississippian or Archaic times (5000-500 BC), was also found by Prospere along the gravel road on the eastern periphery of the site. There is a thin scattering of Tehuacan period pottery (500 BC-AD 1), but the next significant Mississippian occupation did not occur until late Coles Creek times (AD 1000-1200). Intermittent occupation continued up to and including the historic period.

LMS Investigations at Lookout

For the purposes of our research objectives, we were interested primarily in the protohistoric-historic component at Lookout. In our first visit to the site in the late spring of 1980, a sizable amount of lithic debitage was collected in the northwestern and central portions of the site, areas that also yielded a considerable quantity of Natchez pottery. This late occupation was apparently quite extensive, since Joe Frank, another local amateur, had also found early eighteenth-century European ceramics along the southern periphery of the site.

I returned to the site with a crew of three in the fall of 1981. Our objectives were to determine the size of the occupation area and to assess how much was still intact. A total of four days was spent digging...
FIGURE 1. Selected Plaquemine Culture Sites in the Natchez Bluffs Region, Mississippi.
FIGURE 3. Lookout Artifacts.  a, Coleman Inc., U. Toy Jar in the Matheny Collection;  b, Sandstone Effigy Pipe (Prospere Collection, PM cat. no. 980-14-10/58238);  b', clarification of motif.
fifty shovel tests and a couple of 0.5 m wide test trenches (Figure 2). It was clear that a sizable part of the site was still relatively undisturbed, especially the area south of the N00 line. A few of the recovered objects are shown in Figure 4. Most interesting was the appearance of typical Natchez Indian pottery (see Neitzel 1965) on shell-tempered ware, rather than on the usual grog-tempered vessels. Lookout marks the southern limit of Cracker Road Incised, var. Cracker Road, the shell-tempered equivalent of Fatherland Incised, var. Fatherland. Cracker Road, so common in the Yazoo Bluffs region to the north (Brown 1977; Brown 1979:647-651) and on historic sites in the Tensas Basin (Williams 1967:9), had not been recognized in the Natchez Bluffs prior to our work at Lookout. This was exactly what we were looking for as regards the adoption of Indian groups by the Natchez: a northern pottery ware combined with a southern (Natchezan) type of decoration. On the basis of such small excavations, we could not determine whether the northerly relations were due to trade or situ-unit intrusions. To help resolve this problem, Lookout was slated for excavation in the summer of 1982.

I returned to the site in June with a crew of nine students and a month of excavation time. A new series of shovel tests was laid out in the southwestern portion of the site—43 in all—and test pits were placed in three locales (Figure 2). Block excavations were conducted in two additional locales to follow up leads concerning burials. Locale III, the general location of the effigy pipe (Figure 3b), failed to produce additional graves, but the discovery of several pieces of French faience pottery which had apparently been associated with the disturbed burials supports our belief that the pipe is the product of historic Indians.

A 1 x 6 m trench was laid out in Locale IV over an area where a possible burial was partially exposed two years earlier. The burial never did come to light, but in expanding our excavations we found something of equal if not greater interest: the remains of four complete or near-complete structures (Figure 5). It should be noted that the area designated Locale IV had formerly been written off as totally disturbed (Brown and Williams 1982:Figure 4). Although it is true that the plow zone continues from the present surface to the subsoil, to turn our backs on the area would have been a grave mistake. Intact cultural features can still be picked up against the subsoil once the overlying deposits are removed. The plow zone was not merely stripped and discarded. As patterns reflective of cultural activities can still be picked up in plow zone deposits (Brown 1978; O'Brien and Lewarch 1981; Roper 1976), we sifted the soil in Locale IV by 2 m square units.

The most complete pattern observed was a circular building (Structure 1). It was also the earliest of the four structures, having been built in either the Gordon (AD 1000-1200) or possibly Anna (AD 1200-1350) phases. Three rectangular wall trench buildings were erected much later in either protohistoric or possibly historic times. Structures 2 and 4 were contemporary with one another and built before Structure 3. The site must have supported a sizable village at this time, as portions of a number of buildings having the same orientation as Structures 2 and 4 were found in Locale V. These were arranged stratigraphically below buildings aligned along cardinal directions, like Structure 3.
The circular structure in Locality IV had a diameter of 9.3 m, a rather sizable building. It was formed of individually set posts spaced between 40 cm and 51 cm apart, with an average spacing of about 45 cm. Approximately 60 posts originally comprised the walls. Repair work was minimal, suggesting that the period of use of the building was rather short by modern standards (about 20 years). The postholes had an average diameter of 13.9 cm, the posts themselves ranging between 8.5 cm and 9 cm. The entry probably was situated along the southwestern portion of the wall where a gap occurred. There were no large support posts in the interior of this structure, but there was a circular arrangement of wide-spaced posts which may have provided support for the roof. This interior ring of posts was off-centered. Trash pits and hearths were lacking, having no doubt been destroyed by recent plowing. The specific function of this circular structure is not known. Its location on a non-mound site does not argue for a high-status edifice, but if it was a domicile, it certainly would have sheltered a very large family.

Structures 2 through 4, all rectangular wall trench buildings, were considerably smaller than Structure 1. Structures 3 and 4 were probably square. The distance between opposing walls was 4.25 m for the former and 3.8 m for the latter. All three of these buildings had a single post-mold in at least one of their corners. Wall trenches averaged about 15 cm wide and posts set within the trenches ranged between 6 cm and 16.5 cm, with an average of 9 cm. Distances between posts ranged between 20 cm and 72 cm, with most having been between 35 cm and 65 cm apart. No other features were found in association with these buildings. It is believed, but not proven, that they were small domiciles.

The Locality IV structures at Lookout are similar to some buildings encountered at the nearby Gordon site (Figure 6). Gordon is located on the south fork of Colen Creek in Jefferson County, approximately 5 km southeast of Lookout. It was excavated in 1950 as part of the Natchez Trace Parkway Project (Cotter 1952), and it has also been the subject of more recent work (Johnson 1982; McElwain and Walker 1981). The site originally consisted of a village area and two dome-shaped mounds that were separated by a 67.5 m long plaza. A number of structures were associated with Mound B, those in the lower levels bearing striking parallels to the Lookout buildings, both in shape and in basic orientation. The only significant difference is that the Lookout structures were smaller renditions of those found at Gordon. The circular structure at Gordon was 15.9 cm in diameter, while the rectangular wall trench structures were 8.1 m long and averaged 6.3 m wide (Cotter 1952). The circular structure at Gordon probably was built during the Gordon phase (AD 1000-AD 1200), but it could have been erected during the Anna phase (AD 1200-AD 1350). The later rectangular wall trench buildings at Gordon had to have been of Foster phase age (AD 1350-1500) or later.

Conclusions

The Lookout site certainly deserves a lot more work. Although it has experienced a considerable amount of occupation over the centuries, there is not the complexity that one normally associates with major village sites. Deep stratigraphic deposits, so important in building cultural sequences, are lacking at Lookout. However, our knowledge of the
prehistoric development of the region is already well established (Brain et al. n.d.). The value of village or small site excavation is that the community patterns often can be dated tightly and there is less of a tendency for overlapping occupations (e.g. Smith 1978). What Lookout provides is a relatively synchronistic picture of two (possibly three) communities that were relatively short-lived. On the basis of preliminary analysis, one of the occupations occurred at some time between AD 1000 and AD 1200 (possibly as late as AD 1350), and the other between AD 1350 and AD 1730. When the study is completed, it is hoped that the actual dating can be narrowed down even further.

Perhaps of greater importance, Lookout provides another aspect of the Plaquemine culture settlement system. At least 38 complete or partial Plaquemine structures have now been recorded for the Natchez Bluffs region from a total of six sites (Brown 1982b:Table 2). Of these six sites, Lookout is the only one that lacks mounds. It, therefore, provides a view of Plaquemine life apart from the ceremonial centers, an aspect of the cultural system which certainly requires further attention.

Acknowledgements

Without the enthusiasm and untiring efforts of Robert Prospero and Joseph V. Frank III, the Lookout site would still be unknown. I would also like to thank the landowners, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Lehmann and Mr. and Mrs. Bert Matheny, for permitting excavations at this very important site. The following granting agencies supported our research in the Natchez Bluffs region: National Geographic Society (Grant Nos. 2300-81 and 2487-82) and the National Endowment for the Humanities (Grant No. RO-20816-82). Finally, I would like to thank Jeffrey P. Brain and Stephen Williams for their comments on an earlier draft of this paper.

Jan Brown is a Research Associate at the Peabody Museum, Harvard University.

REFERENCES


A BRIEF OUTLINE AND BIBLIOGRAPHY OF SOUTHEASTERN MISSISSIPPI PREHISTORY:

PART II
John H. Blitz

Abstract

This paper concludes the survey and bibliography of southeastern Mississippi prehistory begun in the last issue, covering the Woodland period and ending with a general summary.

Woodland Period

The Woodland Period was a time of increased social complexity, as reflected by the ceramic diversity in southeastern Mississippi. The clay-tempered ceramics of the earlier Tchefuncte peoples influenced the new Marksville types (Toth 1979:194). This long-term ceramic development in the Lower Mississippi Valley is known as the Gulf Tradition (Caldwell 1950). This indigenous tradition was further influenced by cultural stimulus from Middle Woodland societies in Illinois and Ohio (Griffin 1979:271-272). Marksville was one of a number of regional Woodland societies that traded in copper, mica, conch shell, and other exotic raw materials. Artifacts were deposited as grave goods accompanying elaborate burials. Necessitated burial mounds continued to be used, but with less evidence of exotic and elaborate artifacts. Projectile points became smaller through time. Some investigators have interpreted this reduction in size as an indication of the introduction of the bow and arrow. Large storage pits for the storage of hickory nuts are the most common features on sites of this time period. Apparently the population density increased significantly, for Baytown sites are numerous and widespread in the northern and eastern portions of the state. The social, chronological, and geographical extent of groups using the Baytown ceramic complexes in southeastern Mississippi is unknown. Although not particularly abundant, plain and cord-marked clay-tempered Baytown sherds have been found in the Leaf River area.

Some time between AD 500 and 1000, the late Woodland societies in the Mobile Bay area began to participate in the broad regional cultural pattern known as Woodland Island. The ceramic complexes of this pattern consist of utilitarian plain, check-stamped, and complicated-stamped vessels; exotic incised, painted, and imaginative vessel forms were used in an elaborate burial mound ceremonialism (Willey 1945; Sears 1973). Only three published references to these ceramic types occurring in southeastern Mississippi could be found. Sears (1977:167), in discussing his 1957-1960 central Gulf Coastal Plain survey states:

...from virtually the Mississippi border to the Pearl River delta, there is no trace of eastern influence. Pre-Mississippian specimens do occur regularly, but in small quantities. They include plain ware and decorated types of the Marksville, Troyville, and Coles Creek complexes, excluding Coles Creek Incised and its relatives. All of the data say that the area is part of the Mississippi Valley until the local cultures are replaced by the Pensacola culture.

in southeastern Mississippi, but no diagnostic artifacts have been reported. However, Marksville and Porter ceramic differences might at first be difficult to distinguish without an adequate sample of sherds.

Southeastern Mississippi lies in a central geographic location between dynamic cultural developments in surrounding areas. To the east, in the Mobile Bay area, the early Porter groups and the later Woodland Island societies may have influenced local development on the Mississippi coast. To the west, from AD 300-600, many of the same ceramic decorative modes of the Marksville and Issaquena phases, such as incising, punctation, and rocker stamping, continue to be incorporated into the local "Troyville" phases, with cord marking as a minor decorative treatment. New, exotic and often painted vessel forms appear as minority types. These vessels are probably non-utilitarian and were associated with burial mound ceremonials which were broadly similar to patterns both in the lower Mississippi Valley and northern Florida (Belmont and Williams 1981). The general impression is that southeastern Mississippi Woodland ceramic complexes show primarily an east-west interaction.

At some time during the early centuries AD, a new ceramic tradition appeared in the lower Mississippi Valley, northern Mississippi, and western Alabama. This pottery consisted of fabric-marked and cord-marked wares with a northern origin (Jennings 1941; Caldwell 1958). By about AD 500 these new wares had developed into a regional complex known as Baytown. Conical earthen burial mounds continued to be used, but with less evidence of exotic and elaborate artifacts. Projectile points became smaller through time. Some investigators have interpreted this reduction in size as an indication of the introduction of the bow and arrow. Large storage pits for the storage of hickory nuts are the most common features on sites of this time period. Apparently the population density increased significantly, for Baytown sites are numerous and widespread in the northern and western portions of the state. The social, chronological, and geographical extent of groups using the Baytown ceramic complexes in southeastern Mississippi is unknown. Although not particularly abundant, plain and cord-marked clay-tempered Baytown sherds have been found in the Leaf River area.

Some time between AD 500 and 1000, the late Woodland societies in the Mobile Bay area began to participate in the broad regional cultural pattern known as Woodland Island. The ceramic complexes of this pattern consist of utilitarian plain, check-stamped, and complicated-stamped vessels; exotic incised, painted, and imaginative vessel forms were used in an elaborate burial mound ceremonialism (Willey 1945; Sears 1973). Only three published references to these ceramic types occurring in southeastern Mississippi could be found. Sears (1977:167), in discussing his 1957-1960 central Gulf Coastal Plain survey states:

...from virtually the Mississippi border to the Pearl River delta, there is no trace of eastern influence. Pre-Mississippian specimens do occur regularly, but in small quantities. They include plain ware and decorated types of the Marksville, Troyville, and Coles Creek complexes, excluding Coles Creek Incised and its relatives. All of the data say that the area is part of the Mississippi Valley until the local cultures are replaced by the Pensacola culture.
Previously, however, Sears had shown the distribution of Weeden Island pottery and the type Waukia Creek-stamped extending along the Mississippi Gulf Coast to the mouth of the Pascagoula River (1973:35, Figure 1). Grisham (1973:58) mentions that "Weeden Island II" is present on the coast.

Probably beginning a little later than the Mobile Bay Weeden Island groups, the Coles Creek culture began to expand east from the Lower Mississippi Valley, where it is estimated to have existed from AD 600 to 1100 (Phillips 1970:958-60). It is believed that this society organized its larger villages in a mound/plaza arrangement and was roughly contemporary with the nascent Middle Mississippian societies in the American Bottoms area of Illinois. The social and economic aspects of Coles Creek are poorly known, but apparently represent departures from the earlier Middle Woodland patterns. It seems probable that horticultural activity was greatly intensified and far more important than in previous times. There have been few excavations to substantiate these suppositions.

The Coles Creek potters made clay-tempered ceramics decorated with multiple incised lines parallel to the rim on the upper portion of the vessel. The ceramic evidence for this culture is very much present on the Gulf Coast and on the Pearl River. Further inland, away from these rich environments, the Coles Creek ceramics have not been reported. The available survey evidence suggests that populations continued to manufacture plain and cord-marked pottery types.

Richard Marshall, in the only recently published synthesis of Mississippian prehistory, briefly sums up what little information is available:

West of the Tombigbee basin, in the Lower Coastal Region, there was apparently a vandling or succession of the local Baytown Period cultures, still Troyville-like, and Coles Creek Culture. The typical Baytown clay-tempered pottery, sometimes heavily cord-marked, dropped out and was replaced by a ceramic which, though also clay-tempered, appears to be more like the paste of the Coles Creek ceramics. It was also more often fired to a reddish color. It is difficult to make positive sounding statements regarding the archaeology of this region because so little research has been conducted. Not even the basic surface surveys have been carried out! There is the feeling, however, that the small sites which contain admixtures of the more typical Baytown-like pottery, including a fair amount of Mulberry Creek Cord-marked, and some of the Coles Creek-like ceramics, are the smaller and perhaps earlier sites of this period (1973:59).

Late Prehistoric and Historic Periods

Some time around AD 700 in the Middle Mississippi Valley, large horticultural chiefdoms built fortified towns composed of huge earthen mounds arranged around open plazas. These people were very skilled ceramic craftsmen who manufactured shell-tempered pottery in an incredible variety of forms. Like their Woodland predecessors, these "Middle Mississippian" societies relied heavily on hunting and collecting wild foods.

Unlike the earlier groups, the Mississipians were dependent on crops of corn, beans, and squash. By farming the fertile floodplain soils of the major southeastern river systems, it was possible for the population densities of these societies to grow, and social organization became more hierarchically ordered. It has been argued that the large regional centers were the seats of powerful hereditary chieftains (Peabody 1974).

The Middle Mississippian horticultural lifestyle was accompanied by a strong religious ceremonialism organized in a distinctive iconography known as the Southeastern Ceremonial Complex (Brown 1976). Extensive trade networks were organized which involved the exchange of copper, conch shell, mica, greenstone, and other materials to be fashioned into ornaments bearing these recurring symbols. This ceremonial expression is found, with local variation, from Oklahoma to Florida. There is evidence that the Middle Mississippian cultural pattern spread by direct population movements as well as by the diffusion of ideas to less technologically advanced groups. New innovations were combined with local cultural traditions and adapted to different environments to form unique regional expressions.

Mound/plaza architecture and floodplain horticulture were also characteristic of the Piaumine societies in the Lower Mississippi Valley. The Piaumine culture succeeded Coles Creek by AD 1200 in what was apparently the continuation of a long-term indigenous development that culminated in the societies of the Natchez and other Lower Mississippi Valley historic Indian groups. Although Piaumine potters continued to use their traditional clay-tempered pot sherds, they largely adopted many of the Middle Mississippian styles (Phillips 1970; Steponaitis 1981).

The late prehistoric cultural development in southeastern Mississippi is almost completely unknown, but what little evidence is available shows both Middle Mississippian and Piaumine influences. Sears notes that the shell-tempered Fort Walton-related Pensacola ceramic complex is found all along the Mississippi Gulf Coast (1973:177). In the Mobile Bay area, the Pensacola ceramic complex is known to have been used by historic Indian societies and has been found in direct association with early Spanish artifacts (Moore 1901; Willey 1946:197-200; DeGraaff 1976). Pensacola vessels are often incised with motifs that originated in the Southeastern Ceremonial Complex and bear a strong resemblance to Mississippian ceramic complexes in the western Alabama region. There is reason to believe that social groupings with similar cultural patterns were found along the Gulf Coast and in the Mississippi Valley. These societies were often isolated from the rest of the Southeast, and their history is poorly known.

To me the most interesting outcome from this study is the possibility role of the Bayou Petre phase as mediator between Natchez and the Fort Walton culture of the western Gulf coast. If the latter in turn derived from moundville, as...
commonly assumed, we have all the necessary elements for a grand hypothesis. Mississippian expansion blocked by a very strong and effective presence in the area between Natchez and Vicksburg finds another route via the Black Warrior-Tombigbee-Alabama system to the Gulf, westward to the Delta, and up the Mississippi to Natchez and beyond (Phillips 1970:954).

It should be noted that the appearance of these Middle Mississippian ceramics in the Gulf Coast area does not represent direct or even secondary migrations of Middle Mississippian peoples into the area. Recent investigations of the closely related Fort Walton societies in northwest Florida provide new evidence that Late Woodland groups using Weedon Island ceramic complexes evolved into Fort Walton by adopting Mississippian innovations (Milanich and Fairbanks 1980:194). Whether or not this is the case in southeastern Mississippi is not known.

Inland cultural developments during this time are poorly understood. In 1925, Henry B. Collins of the Smithsonian Institution investigated a number of archaeological sites in southeastern Mississippi. He was particularly interested in the relationship between the historic Choctaw and the late prehistoric cultures of the area. During visits to several historic Choctaw sites located by 18th and 19th century documents, Collins found a recurring ceramic type, Chickasaw Combed (Collins 1927). In Clarke County Collins excavated eight small mounds containing numerous articulated burials and evidence of cremation. A similar group of mounds was examined in Wayne County near the possible site of Yokand, an 18th century Choctaw village that was frequently mentioned in early French documents. Excavations at the McAlpine Mound in Lauderdale County revealed various stages of construction, copper and flint artifacts, but no human interments. The final site investigated by Collins was the historic Choctaw village of Pontiac where several graves dating from the 1840s were located. These sites were interpreted as representative of three distinct time periods in the cultural development of the Choctaw: the McAlpine Mound as prehistoric proto-Chocat, the small burial mounds as early 18th century, and the Pontiac cemetery as middle 19th century Choctaw (Collins 1927).

Collins was a true archaeological pioneer who accomplished a great deal without benefit of the general chronological framework presently available in the Southeast. It is quite possible that a re-examination of his mound excavation data would align some of these materials with the Woodland and Mississippian Periods.

In the 1970s archaeologists of the Mississippi Department of Archives and History located several historic Choctaw sites in Newton, Clarke, and Jasper counties (Penman 1977). Another site in the proposed Tallahala Reservoir area in Jasper County by archaeologists from Mississippi State University also revealed small Choctaw sites. All of these sites contained Collins’ Chickasaw Combed ceramics and reaffirmed his contention that it is an historic Choctaw type. However, the full temporal and spatial range of this type is unknown. Chickasaw Combed is decorated with curvilinear and rectilinear multiple lines so uniformly spaced that application with a toothed instrument is implied. Some sherds show hand decoration, as a minority variant (Naag 1953; Phillips 1970:65-66). Also occurring on the surface of these sites is a coarser, shell-tempered Mississippian tradition ceramic type known as Mississippi Plain.
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This type varies considerably in the amount of sand present in the paste. Both Chickasaw Combed and Mississippi Plain ceramic types are known to be contemporary on Choctaw sites in Oklahoma, occupied after the Choctaw Removal following the Treaty of Dancing Rabbit Creek in 1830 (Williams 1981). Given the considerable temporal length of Mississippi Plain and the fact that each survey yields new varieties of Chickasaw Combed, as well as undescribed pottery types, the understanding of the prehistoric protohistoric/Choctaw cultural relationship remains elusive.

A problem limiting interpretation is that most samples come from surface collections. Most known Choctaw sites are completely disturbed by agriculture and erosion. Hopefully, new investigations begun in Kemper County by University of Southern Mississippi archaeologists and in Lauderdale County by Mississippi State University archaeologists will provide additional data on the nature of late prehistoric/early historic Choctaw cultural relationships, artifact assemblages, and settlement patterns.

There were a number of other historic tribes in southeastern Mississippi, none of which have been investigated archaeologically. These groups were part of two broad linguistic families: Muskogean and Siouan. The Choctaw and the closely related Choctaw-speaking Accolatpissa, Pascagoula, and Pennarcal were a part of the Muskogean family (Swanton 1946), but the Siouan-speaking Illini are something of an enigma. Apparently they left the northern Siouan homeland during the remote past and moved south to the Pascagoula River where Iberville found them in 1699 (McWilliams 1981). Any attempt to correlate artifacts and sites with historic Indian groups in Mississippi faces some formidable problems, but such problems are not insurmountable given a broader base of data than we now have.

Summary

From the foregoing discussion it should be clear that there is little substantive information available from the southeastern Mississippi prehistory. This paper has been an attempt to synthesize available information, provide a tentative outline of prehistoric human activities in the region. It is important that such an attempt be made, since archaeological investigation in the region will probably expand in the near future.

The current status of archaeological investigation in southeastern Mississippi has changed little since Marshall made his observation nine years ago:

South of Meridian, Mississippi, in the Lower Coastal Regions, through the headwaters of the Pascagoula River to the Gulf Coast, there have been no adequate surveys, a lack which might explain the dearth of information. There must be new Mississippian Period sites there as brief surveys have yielded small amounts of shell-tempered pottery. Further, depending upon their time period, will show some interesting archaeology and perhaps provide the key to unraveling some still-puzzling problems in the archaeology of the southeastern United States (1973:167).

Although this discussion has emphasized culture history, most archaeologists do not view chronological frameworks as the ultimate goal of research. Instead, a firm knowledge of the temporal and spatial extent of
prehistoric cultures is a necessary prerequisite for exploring the reasons for culture change and the more elusive anthropological questions concerned with the social implications of the data. One topic that goes beyond artifact typology and chronology is the changing relationship between prehistoric societies and their natural environment. For instance, survey in the longleaf pine belt, believed by some to be too limited in natural resources for prehistoric habitation, has revealed more sites than previously expected (Beleome 1981). Surveys in Delate National Forest found a greater proportion of sites in upland topographic situations than are present in river bottom environments. Beleome (1981:73-75) concludes that the sites reflect hunting and collecting activities rather than horticulture. In a sample survey of the central Leaf River area, Padgett and Heisler (1979:76) found that elevation and topography influenced site location to a greater degree than such factors as distance to water. Further north, in the oak-hickory-pine forests of Jasper and Clarke counties, Choctaw and late prehistoric sites are found in a variety of topographic settings (Atkinson and Blakeman 1975:26; Pennan 1971:306).

These discoveries suggest that subtle changes in elevation result in considerable environmental diversity and that site locations reflect selective exploitation of micro-environments and ecotones. Further research will probably reveal evidence of seasonal subsistence movements among major riverine, upland, and coastal ecosystems, as suggested by early historical documents.

On the coast there is archaeological evidence that refuse middens of marsh clam (Rangia cuneata) and oyster (Crassostrea virginica) created conditions conducive to colonization by plant species found nowhere else in the salt marsh environment. The creation of these refuse midden plant communities may have significantly affected the geological and biological development of salt marshes (Euler G and Otte 1979). Another interesting phenomenon is the reduction in size through time of Rangia specimens present in the middens (Robert Jones, pers. comm.). A similar reduction in size through time has been observed in a Rangia midden on Mobile Bay (Curren 1976:70-73). It is not known if such reductions reflect overexploitation by human populations or are the result of some other environmental stress, but any case study of preindustrial societies making profound alterations in their environment should be of great interest. Archaeological research in southeastern Mississippi has the potential to answer many intriguing questions and to contribute significantly to Southeastern archaeology. There are, however, some difficult obstacles. The region suffers from the same problems that threaten the archaeological record throughout the United States: industrial and urban expansion, agricultural destruction, erosion, and vandalism. With nearly 60% of the land surface in southeastern Mississippi in forest, sites are often not discovered until destroyed by land clearing projects.

Until systematic surveys are conducted that encompass all physiographic and environmental features in the area, the full temporal and spatial distribution of sites will remain unknown. With the knowledge gained from systematic survey work, carefully conducted stratigraphic excavations can provide the chronological and environmental evidence necessary to answer basic social and behavioral questions. Only then will we gain more than limited, shadowy glimpses of the region's ten thousand year record of human achievement.

John B. Dittz is a graduate student in anthropology at the University of Southern Mississippi.
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ENGLISH EARTHENWARES ASSOCIATED WITH EARLY 19TH CENTURY CHOCTAW SITES

Stenius A. Wadl, Jr.

Abstract
Surface collection from three Choctaw Indian sites in Lee County, Mississippi, which were excavated during the summer of 1930, have produced a large quantity of English pearlware and salt-glazed stoneware. The glass and the decoration that occur on these sherds provide a means of identifying English ceramic wares that would have been in use in Mississippi in the early 19th century.

Surface collections from three Locust Fork County sites (22-Le-71), one recorded site near 22-Le-71) reveal historic Choctaw Indian occupations with a variety of early 19th century English earthenwares, trade goods, and aboriginal made artifacts including Chickasaw Combed ceramics. Research indicates that these sites had been occupied by the Choctaw Indian families of Hocana and Yolkahbee (Yard n.d.).
Under the provisions of the Treaty of Dancing Rabbit Creek, the Choctaw families headed by Hotatan and Yokutabee were each reserved 80 acres of land, including their dwelling houses and between ten and twelve acres of land that had ever under cultivation in 1830.

In 1832, these Choctaw families sold their reservations to John Pychalin and Henry Gibson. By 1843 all the land that had once been occupied by these Choctaws was owned by William Mims. Thus local and additional land that had been owned by Mims became part of the T. C. Billups plantation in 1833. When T. C. Billups' son died in 1898, a portion of the Billups plantation was still referred to as the "Mims Place," and it is still owned by members of the Billups family and is still called the "Mims Place."

In 1898 there were 28 tenant houses, a dwelling house, an old gin house, and six barns or similar farm buildings on the Mims Place (Ford n.d.).

The fact that 19th century farmhouses and building sites occur adjacent to the historic period Choctaw sites has resulted in some mixing of artificial material. The Choctaw sites can be distinguished from the 19th century farm sites by the presence of historic period Choctaw ceramics and trade goods in association with early 19th century English earthenwares. By examining the glaze and the design motifs it is often possible to distinguish early 19th century English earthenware ceramics from those dating to the middle or the end of the century.

Three types of English earthenwares have been found on the Choctaw sites at the Mims Place: creamware, pearlware, and whiteware. Each of these types can be important for dating. Cream-colored ware may have been produced in England as early as the 1740s and creamware was being produced in England by Josiah Wedgwood in 1763 (Hume 1798a:25) and has been found on American sites as late as the early 19th century (Hume 1765:125). It was not in common use after 1820 (Minnerly 1980). Creamware is identified not only by its cream color on a white paste, but also by the fact that the glaze puddles yellow or green in crevices (Hume 1765:130). By 1779 Wedgwood was producing a glaze called pearlware (Hume 1765:23). The use of the pearlware was declining by 1820 (Hume 1765:130), and it was not in common use after 1835 (Minnerly 1980). Wedgwood, however, was still making some pearlware in 1865 (Hume 1798b:48). The pearlware has a bluish tint on a white paste and the glaze puddles blue in crevices on the ceramic (Minnerly 1980), resulting from the use of cobalt oxide in the glaze. By the 1830s whiteware was the most popular tableware in use (Minnerly 1980). Whiteware, such as Spode's "Stone china," which was introduced in 1805, can be difficult to date (Hume 1765:131). Ironstone is a good example of this problem. Most of the ironstones that I have collected from sites in Lowndes County are dateable by its style or by maker's mark to between 1850 and 1900. Mason, however, was producing "ironstone china" as early as 1813 (Hume 1765:131). Ironstones are similar in paste to pearlware, but do not generally have its bluish tint. Some soft whitewares, however, may have a slight bluish tint, especially care should be taken in determining whether a small shred is pearlware or whiteware.

When examining whiteware, the style and decoration can be as important as the type of glaze in attempting to date the piece. Although the decorated types will provide the earliest date that the pottery would have been decorated and probably made, it will not necessarily provide a terminal data. Many decorations were popular for a number of years and some of the early decorations are still being reproduced today. Decorations that commonly occur on early 19th century ceramics include: transfer printed, hand painted, edge decorated, embossed but not painted, sponged decorated, and all bands, including flouche.

A maker's mark, if found on a ceramic shard, is invaluable for identification, as it can tell where and when a particular object was made. Other marks which may be found on ceramics include English registry marks. A diamond-shaped mark was used from 1842 to 1893 and the letters "D" followed by numbers were used after 1883. Geoffrey Godden's Pencyclopedia of British Pottery and Porcelain Marks (1964) is a good reference work on English maker's marks, as is Ralph and Terry Kovel's Dictionary of Marks: Pottery and Porcelain (1953), which lists marks by shape.

The ceramics from the three Choctaw sites in Lowndes County that I have mentioned provide an example of how English ceramics can be used in dating. Site 22-Lo-731, which is the Yokutabee site, has produced a large quantity of English ceramics. Most of the ceramic sherds from the site are early 19th century, but a few late 19th century fragments are typical of fragments found on a nearby mid-19th to 20th century tenant house site and are probably intrusions caused by the plowing and erosion of that site. They, therefore, are not included in the following analysis. Most of the ceramics that have been recovered from the site can be classified as:

- Bod type blue shell edge, ca. 1820-1840s
- Bod and leaf blue shell edge, ca. 1820-1840s
- Embossed blue shell edge decorated pearlware, ca. early 1820s-early 1840s
- Transfer printed whitewares, ca. 1820-1890
- Transfer printed pearlware, ca. 1780-1835
- Sprigware whitewares, ca. 1830-1860
- Blue monochrome pearlware, ca. 1780-1830
- Blue monochrome whiteware, ca. 1820-1850
- Slipstamped whiteware, ca. 1820-1860

The date ranges on the above ceramics are only the most likely date ranges, as some of the ceramics were in limited use both earlier and later than the given range. One maker's mark from the site is identifiable as Enoch Wood and Sons of England, and would date between 1818 and 1848. A fragment of another maker's mark was found on the site. That mark could have been part of the mark of Stevenson, Cleaves, Mayer, or Adams, all of whom were English and used similar marks between 1808 and 1829. Also the pattern on one blue transfer printed sherd appears to be James Cleaves' 'Landin' from the Museum Lafayette at Castle Garden New York," ca. 1824-1834 (Moore 1937:29).

Although analysis of 236 decorated earthenware sherds from site 22-Lo-731 reveals that the earliest probable date is 1780 and the latest date is into the 20th century, the date range on all but one of the sherds overlaps between 1820-1830, which is very close to the document date of the 1830-1832 occupation of the site by Yokutabee. This is shown in Figure 1, which is a tabulation of the decorated earthenware sherds found on the site in a simple frequency sortion targeting the site's date range graphically. The unusual accuracy of the dating of this site by ceramics
is a result of the fact that many changes in ceramic glaze and decoration were occurring between 1820 and 1840. Such a dating method may not work as accurately for sites from different time periods or sites that had long occupations. A potential danger in the determination of European ceramic dates by typological methods is that some ceramic types were in limited use earlier than the commonly given dates, while ceramic objects might be kept for many years or passed from one generation to another before being broken or disposed off. Therefore a small ceramic sample could be deceptive, and it is advisable to carry out surface collections as exhaustively as possible.

Figure 2 illustrates creamware and pearlware ceramic sherds from the Botana and Yokatubbee Choctaw sites, while Figures 3 and 4 illustrate whiteware ceramic sherds from the sites. These sherds are typical of the decorated whiteware and pearlware ceramics that are found on sites in the Columbus, Mississippi area that date from the first third of the 19th century. The date ranges given on some of the sherds indicate the long range of some whiteware decorations. Figure 3 illustrates the two maker's marks that were found on the Yokatubbee site.

Rufus Ward is an attorney with the firm of Pippen and Ward, West Point, Mississippi.
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Figure 1. Frequency distribution of all the decorated pearlware and whiteware ceramics from site 22-La-731. No creamware ceramics have been found at the site. In the figure each type of decoration is shown with its probable date ranges. Except for two painted edge decorated sherds, all of the sherds shown above have date ranges that overlap between the early 1820s and 1830. The two sherds that do not fall within that time range have a type of decoration that is common on several nearby mid-nineteenth century farm house sites.
Figure 2
A. Undecorated creamware, ca. 1765-1820.
B. Annular or slipped hand formed whiteware with molded linear green glazed design and a marbled design, ca. 1790-1830.
C. Blue monochrome pearlware, ca. 1780-1830.
D. Embossed blue edge-decorated pearlware, ca. 1820s-1840s. This pattern has been found on an 1824-1832 period site in Ohio and was made by Cleves (1818-1829), Enoch Wood (1818-1848), and possibly others (Miller 1980).
E. Polychrome pearlware containing blue flower and brown leaves with large brush strokes, ca. 1815-1830.
F. Blue transfer printed pearlware. The pattern appears to be Cleves’ (1818-1829) "Landing of Lafayette at Castle Garden, New York," ca. 1825. Sherds of this pattern have been found on both the Hotana and Yokatubbne sites.

Figure 3
A. Bud type blue shell edge decorated whiteware, ca. 1820s-1840s.
B. Bud type green shell edge decorated whiteware, ca. 1820s-1840s.
C. Dot and leaf embossed blue shell edge decorated whiteware, ca. 1820s-1840s.
D. Blue monochrome whiteware, ca. 1820-1850.
E. Sprigware whiteware, red, black, and blue flower, ca. 1830-1845.
F. Sprigware whiteware, brown stems and yellow leaves, ca. 1830-1845.
G. Sprigware whiteware, green leaf, black stem, and red flower, ca. 1830-1845.
A. Sprigware whiteware small pattern green leaves and stem with red flower and narrow green line around interior of rim, ca. 1830-1860.
B. Slipbanded molded design whiteware, brown slipbanded with depressed green glazed dot pattern, ca. 1820-1860.
C. Slipbanded whiteware, ca. 1820-1860.
D. Light blue transfer printed whiteware, ca. 1820-1900. The Chinese decoration was most popular during the first half of the 19th century.
E. Brown transfer printed whiteware, ca. 1820-1900. Scalloped rim whiteware was most popular from 1820-1850.

Figure 4

This mark is impressed on the reverse of a brown transfer printed whiteware sherd. The following four English potters used Staffordshire impressed in the same manner within their marks: Andrew Stevensons 1808-1825; James Cleves (1818-1829); Thomas Mayer ca. 1829; and William Adams 1810-1825. This sherd and the one illustrated below were both found on site 22-Le-71.

This mark is impressed on the reverse of an undecorated whiteware sherd. It is the mark of Enoch Wood and Sons of Burslem, England, 1818-1846. Wood was an important producer of shell edge decorated ware. This may account for the sherd's lack of decoration, as often only the rim of a shell edge decorated ware would be decorated.

Figure 5. Maker's marks found on sherds from site 22-Le-71.

Moore, N. Hudson
Borbaugh, Charles L., et al.
Thoms, Wil H.

Manuscript sources:
Lovdeds County Land Deed Records. On file in the Chancery Clerk's office in the Lovdeds County Court House, Columbus, Mississippi.

EVERYMAN'S GUIDE TO PROJECTILE POINTS, PART IV
Samuel O. Brookes

Abstract
In this contribution a discussion of Flint Creek and Pontchartrain points leads to a questioning of the Poverty Point classification of some sites where one of these types is found. It is also suggested that the two types be collapsed into one, for reasons presented in the paper.

This installment deals with the well-known point types—or rather, and this is part of the argument I want to make, one type with two names. The type has a narrow stem, sometimes straight and sometimes expanded, and a narrow serrated blade. It is easy to recognize and is found over most, if not all, of Mississippi. Further, it is a common form and most
collections contain numerous examples. Flint Creek points (Figure 1A) date from prior to 1000 B.C. to 100 B.C. (Ensor 1981:102). Pontchartrain points (Figure 1B) date from 1300 B.C. to 200 B.C. These dates are approximate, and as one can see the dates overlap. So too does the distribution. Ensor (1981:94-95) set up two varieties of the Flint Creek type. One, var. Flint Creek, has barbed shoulders; the second, var. Tombigbee, has horizontal to tapered shoulders. As for the Pontchartrain type, Ford and Webb (1956:54-55) described them under two "headings," typical and corner-notched. The corner-notched specimens have barbed shoulders and expanded stems.

Flint Creek points are associated with the early Woodland Alexander ceramic series (Jolly 1969; Walthall 1980:100; Ensor 1981:93). Pontchartrain points are associated with the early Woodland Tchefuncte ceramic assemblage (Ford and Webb 1956:55). Dates for the points do indicate that they extend back into the late Archaic period, and here an interesting phenomenon occurs. When these points are found in the Yazoo Basin, they are usually placed in a late Archaic time slot and are labelled Poverty Point period.

To find a good example of this malady one need look no further than my projectile point chart on page 31 of Mississippi Archaeology XVI, 2. I placed stemmed serrated points in the late Archaic period. They should be tallied in the Woodland period as well, so put an X under Woodland at the top of the column.

It is often the case that once a site has been placed in the Poverty Point period on the basis of a Pontchartrain point it is plotted on maps showing Poverty Point sites in the Yazoo Basin. If no clay balls, micro-lith industry, or lapidary industry is found, it is further labelled a "Poverty Point special activity area." From such a starting point it is merely a phantom away from regional centers, redistributive economies, chiefdoms, matrilocal residences, warrior classes, Alexander sailors, and all else that is associated with the Poverty Point literature.

But if you read these reports carefully, you can, by looking closely, discover an intriguing fact. A lot of sherds are hidden away in reports of presumed preceramic sites (usually in the back of the report). If we were to match points with sherds, the Poverty Point settlements in the
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Yazoo Basin would suffer a severe population decline.

Since the name Pontchartrain has chronological precedence, let's drop the name Flint Creek. As previously stated, with overlapping dates and distribution plus the fact that the two "types" are not separable, why call them by two names? Further, when these forms are recovered, we should all make a vow to search out any materials that may be associated with them. Let's not discard the sherds in a rush to find clay balls.

Finally, pay close attention to broken specimens. Many breaks are in reality deliberate modifications to the tool. Samuel O. McGehee is at present writing an article on this subject, so I won't go into details here except to state a few of the more obvious facts. Serrated blade edges indicate a knife function. Repeated resharpening would distain the size of the blade, so watch for short, worn-out examples. Also, serrations tend to break off when put to hard use, so while they may themselves be gone, the small delicate pressure flake scars will indicate their former presence.

Samuel O. Brookes is an archaeologist with the Mississippi Department of Archives and History's Vicksdale field office.
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IN THE WAY OF A HISTORY OF THE MISSISSIPPI ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

Richard A. Marshall

Abstract
A brief history of the Mississippi Archaeological Association is sketched, from its beginnings in the sixties until the present.

Where the ideas and interests of the many individuals involved in the formation of the MAA came from is difficult to assess. It should not be a surprise that ideas crystallized into the MAA contemporary with a real nationwide interest in archaeology, which paralleled the develop
interest, local collectors were contacted and brought into the organization. This was the origin of the Winterville chapter.

If I may be allowed to use some names at the risk of slighting others, I would like to indicate that one person whom I remember involved in the restoration of the Winterville Mound was Georgia Fisher. Though as far as I can remember she was never a member of the MAA. Others involved in this revival through the Winterville chapter were Bob and Helen Turtz, Dr. and Mrs. Yarbrough, Jack Mill, Donkey Barnes, Dr. and Mrs. Robert Norris, the Pruet family, Clarence Walls, and many others, including Jack Lancaster, Bill Chipman, L.B. Jones, Robert Stancil, Robert Hollman—still others whose names I cannot now recall also deserve equal credit. Many of the people who were not members of the Winterville chapter were later members of the North Delta, Greenwood, and Grenada chapters, with some members at large. I am uncertain how the Grenada chapter came about. As I can recall an interest group of persons in the Montgomery County Historical Society had either purchased or received property on which there was a small building now used as a museum. Several persons in this organization were interested in Indian artifacts and had contacts with the professionals working in the Yazoo Basin. Some were Glen Johnson, George Williams, and Barbara Dugger, the later long-time secretary of the MAA. Also, Grenada Reservoir was then new, and much material was being collected from the eroding shoreline. Downstream a short distance from the Grenada Dam was the Great White Mound, which interested the Grenada people to the point of digging. Not far to the north of the Grenada Reservoir was the Womack site. The University of Mississippi, under the direction of the late Dr. Thomas Koehler and including Bob Thorne, John Conaway, perhaps Sam McGuire, and others, became involved in these excavations. The interest created here by these excavations pulled in people from the Delta fringe, people acquainted with some of the Harvard surveys.

The Marksville Period vessels from the Great White Mound, plus some vessels found by Johnson and Williams at the LeFlore site, reinforced the interests of the Grenada people, and there were frequent contacts made across the Delta too, with Winterville.

At the same time, early to mid 1960s, the National Park Service was concluding a series of archaeological excavations along the Natchez Trace—places like the Boyd Mound near Jackson, Emerald Mound near Natchez, and the Pharr Mounds in Prentiss County. Stuart Neitzel had also just completed his Fatherland dig at Natchez. These "hill country" sites attracted attention and stimulated interest on the MAA. An inspiring science teacher at Starkville, Mrs. John Lusk, with a group of high school students, became interested in the Lyon's Bluff site near Starkville. This site so interested the students that after entering Mississippi State University their demand for courses caused an opening for an archaeologist on staff, which position I filled. Likewise, a growing body of interested persons on the Gulf Coast, centering around R.C. Lowry, Mr. and Mrs. Stachfield, Owen Heitzmann, Beryl Downing, and others, formed the Gulf Coast chapter.

The first meeting of people interested in an organized state archaeological society was held at the University of Mississippi in the fall of 1965, with Thomas Koehler chairing. Organization was effected at this
first meeting, committee appointed for writing a constitution and by-
laws, and other duties. The first Annual Meeting of the MAA was scheduled
for 1966. Here we see the union of the state's amateur and professional
archaeologists coming together to work for a common interest. A working
relationship began at that time that has continued into the present.

At that first fall meeting of the Association in 1966, the actual
name of the organization was agreed upon. The MAA, rather than the
Mississippi Archaeological Society, was chosen since there had been such
a society, then defunct, at some time in the past. At the conclusion of
the meeting, the Association counted five chapters: Winterville, Grenada,
Oktibbeha, Gulf Coast, and Montgomery County. Several groups of interest-
ed persons present indicated a desire for the organization of chapters
at Oxford, Jackson, Brooksville, Canton, and Natchez. Some of these were
indeed organized.

By the second Annual Meeting of the MAA in 1967, the Winterville,
Grenada, Oktibbeha, Gulf Coast, North Delta, and Picayune chapters were
reported. I do not recall what happened, but apparently Oxford and Brook-
sville did not organize; however, interested people from those areas were
active in the Association and were present at large meetings.

In the next few years the Panola, Pearl River, Sunflower, Greenwood-
Leflore, and Jackson/Capitol chapters were organized. The McComb chapter
joined in 1972, along with the newly-formed Natchez chapter, the core of
which was largely made up of the same members as the former chapter.

After this remarkable growth, the following year, 1973, saw the disband-
ing of four chapters: Oktibbeha, Montgomery County, McComb, and Picayune.
Most of the students in the Oktibbeha chapter graduated, removing the most
active membership. The Montgomery County chapter was absorbed by the
Grenada chapter. The first rumblings of a decaying economy were felt
that year, and travel funds at the institutions were reduced. This made
it difficult for the professionals to visit and provide programs for the
chapters. The McComb and Picayune chapters were literally abandoned.
The more active members of those chapters joined the Gulf Coast chapter.

By 1978, seven more chapters had disbanded. Today, only the Gulf
Coast, Winterville [now defunct--ed.], and North Delta chapters remain.
Though the membership is sparsely scattered, still exists statewide, only the
Gulf Coast and North Delta chapters are active. North Delta is blessed
by the presence of an office of the Mississippi Archaeological Survey.
No activity for the Winterville chapter is now reported.

As with any organism, the MAA is made up of a complex whole of dif-
frent organs and systems. Let us recall one definition of life: "a
series of complicated processes which are never in equilibrium." Essential
to survival is diversity! This Association, as any organism, has been
and is constantly beset by problems in its individual parts while
at the same time being obliged to respond to external stimuli! This
Association is not dying, nor is it ill. It is a healthy, viable organiza-
tion, beset by both internal and external problems, many of which are
not altogether our fault.

Some of the Ups and Downs--Internal

1. Publications: The MAA has never been quite large enough to generate
the kind of money needed to support a steady and good bulletin in
addition to the Newsletter. The present publication Mississippi
Archaeology came to us as a result of several trials and compromises.
Mississippi Archaeology is the best publication series we have had.
Our thanks go not only to the present editor, Pat Galloway, and to
the institutional support of MOAR, but to all of those who previously
have tried and failed to bring steady, quality, interesting publications
within the means of the membership. Mary Neusler and others have
steadfastly endured in their efforts to bring us a decent newsletter of
activities, chapter reports, meeting schedules, and current archae-
ological news. We must indeed give them our sincerest appreciation for
their accomplishments and persistence.

2. Too few members in the Association: We need a larger membership.
Numbers generate activity and interest. The present low in Asso-
ciation membership is not totally due to a lack of interest in either
Mississippi archaeology or Association membership. It is a condition
of the times. By comparison, the Missouri Archaeological Society,
having over 2,000 members at the time of our organization and growth,
is now down under 600 members. The Arkansas Archaeological Society,
having over 1,500 members at the time of our growth, is now under
1,000 members. Alabama has experienced a similar decline in member-
ship, and other archaeological associations have also. We are too few in a large state. Communication is difficult, particularly on a
face-to-face basis. It is difficult to get good attendance at Annual
Meetings because of distances.

3. Have we failed? The amateur has looked to the professional for iden-
tification of artifacts, meeting programs, input into the problems
and activities of the Association; for news, research results, and
leadership in the big issues affecting archaeology, both in-state and
regionally as well as nationally, if not to some extent interna-
tionally. It has been a harmonious relationship, with the profes-
sionals asking the amateurs for support on current issues affecting
the status of professional archaeology, while the amateurs have
looked to the professionals for issues to get involved with, the
hobbies of archaeology, and for publications. It has been, as it
must be, a symbiotic relationship.

The professionals may feel that the amateurs, with the informa-
tion asked for and freely given in hand, have failed to see and to
find research problems that they, with the professionals' advice,
guidance, and encouragement, could bring to some acceptable conclu-
sion. Few of the amateurs have ventured so boldly. Have the profes-
sionals then failed? No--there have been some admirable results.

Geiger's work on the fluted point complex has been one which
shows positively that amateurs can contribute in an exemplary way to the archaeology of Mississippi. The Capitol chapter's
Alligator village site excavation to a published conclusion. The
Greenwood-Leflore chapter, with Cottonlandia Museum, saw the successful
conclusion of a mastodon excavation. The Gulf Coast chapter has
presented a number of highly successful public exhibits resulting in
new memberships and much interest in Mississippi archaeology. I do
not think any in-state professional will use Clarence Webb, a pediat-
rician from Shreveport, of Poverty Point fame and national recognition, as
the yardstick with which to measure all MAA members and their ac-

45
vities. He is miles ahead of many professionals.

Last we forget, members of the MAA, with professionals from the state, approached the Mississippi Legislature for a state-sponsored archaeological survey in 1969. The result was initially a $20,000 appropriation for the Department of Archives and History. This money went to support only the survey, but saw a near 100% increase in the number of professional archaeologists, from three (Tom Koehler and Bob Thorne at Ole Miss, and myself at MSU) to five, as MDAH took two in-state graduates in archaeology from Ole Miss for the survey.

Not a bad record for the first try of a young organization.

In addition, members of the MAA turned out in letter writing, resolutions, and other lobbying efforts to insure the Mississippi congressional support in Washington for the protection of archaeological resources endangered by federally-supported construction.

It was the mostly amateur Association that helped obtain the funds Archives and History received for both the Initial assessment and survey of the Mississippi portion of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, reported by Marshall and Thorne in 1970. This effort was supported at first by funds from the Tombigbee River Valley Water Management District and later by state funds. McGahey's report on this later work was published by MDAH, but another report by Lewis and Caldwell languished for the lack of in-house editors with archaeological knowledge. Thus, some of the Initial Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway work is only properly acknowledged and referenced in a few reports.

On the other hand, the professionals have encouraged the amateurs to assist in some of the most important work of archaeology: locating sites. MDAH now reports over 8000 sites recorded in the official site file. They concentrate in two areas, the Yazoo Basin and the Tenn-Tom area, with heavy increments in about ten other localities where there have been concentrated surveys. But there is also a broad scatter of sites statewide, most in areas where professional survey has never been carried out, and for many of these members of the MAA can take credit.

Site report cards have changed several times in the past decade and remain rather formidable-looking. They are relatively simple to fill out, especially now that they are back in plain English again, but they do require a certain time to complete. If completed regularly, however, as sites are found, they are not that difficult. One does need an accurate and detailed map. Most local surveying or engineering firms will have relevant maps, and the accuracy of locations may be checked with them. The cost of good topographic maps has increased like everything else, but USGS topographic maps still remain cheap, considering the amount of information on them. There is enough area represented on any one of these maps to keep anyone in the field busy exploring and locating sites for years.

It goes without saying that the landowners' permission should be obtained first.

This information is sorely needed in assessing the impact of new developments on the environment. Archaeological sites are one of the elements of that environment that is seriously affected by development, even initial activity preceding development. The amateur's participation in this one activity is still one of his most important contributions to Mississippi archaeology. I encourage every MAA member

---that includes professionals on hunting or fishing trips! to report sites regularly. Unusual items found, as well as assemblages of more ordinary materials, make excellent reports for the Newsletter and Mississippi Archaeology. Professionals are ready and willing to offer assistance in writing up items or collections. The efforts and input of amateurs are warmly welcomed.

External

1. The expansion of archaeological programs at the universities: with the expansion of numbers of archaeologists, there have been numbers of amateurs who have worked closely with these professionals. There is no doubt that the increase in research the professional archaeologists have at times lost sight of and contact with the needs of the amateur. Publication pressures and costs meant that publication of technical reports was done in numbers too small for no-cost or low-cost distribution to members of the MAA. The University of Mississippi is the only university that has distributed significant technical reports of any kind through the MAA.

2. The failure of MDAH to publish early reports and to make them available to members of the MAA, as originally hoped, did not help, but we can all understand that they are costly to publish. And recently publication from MDAH has become relatively regular: the same has been the case with the other active research institutions in the state. In addition, these publications have been brought to the attention of members through announcements in the Newsletter and in Mississippi Archaeology.

3. There has been a change in attitude at Ole Miss regarding working closely with amateurs; this is, I feel, unfortunate and I hope merely an impression rather than a policy.

4. The awarding of the Cobb Endowment for the Cobb Institute of Archaeology was hailed as a great boon to Mississippi archaeology. It was at first not managed in such a way as to yield such returns, and my own involvement with the Cobb Institute in its initial stage in the early 1970s cut heavily into both my research and the maintenance of amateur contacts. Now that the Institute has been reorganized, it is expected that in the future new opportunities beneficial to the MAA will come about.

In summary, let me make the following remarks. Let us not despise what we are. We are a union of both lay people interested in archaeology and professional archaeologists, all working toward a common interest. We should not dwell on how few our members are, or what we were at some time in the past. We must look forward, guided by our knowledge of what we have accomplished in the past and what we are today, let the current problems challenge us, so we may meet the goals of our common interests.

Richard Marshall is an archaeologist with the Cobb Institute of Archaeology, Mississippi State University. This paper is a revision of a presentation given at the MAA Annual Meeting last fall. Members who have been following the efforts of the MAA president in organizing new
chapters and revisiting old ones will find this contribution pleasantly prophetic.--ed.

NOTES AND QUERIES

Some comments on the new format for the Newsletter and the planned standardization of the Mississippi Archaeology format:

Readers will, I hope, have noticed that the MAA has a new logo and the Newsletter a new format. First, credit where credit is due: the new logo is a combination of two drawings, the projectile point by Sam Brookes and the Natchez pet by Richard Marshall; the two drawings were put together and the typography designed by Cawt Taff, the State Historical Museum's exhibits designer. The Newsletter's size has been standardized to four sheets plus cover, the four sheets printed both sides and single-spaced. This has been done for two reasons: to allow more substantial communications within the MAA during the year, and to save on postage. The savings on postage comes from the elimination of the necessity of sending out back copies of the Newsletter to members who join during the year in a separate mailing; if all copies of all issues are the same size and weight, then those back copies can be included in the next bulk mailing of the Newsletter. If you are a new member, please take note of this; you will receive your back issues in July along with the July issue of the Newsletter. The savings is substantial, since the bulk mailing costs only about $5 per piece, whereas first class mailing is at the ordinary first class rate.

Similarly, I have decided (paper submissions willing!) to standardize the size of Mississippi Archaeology for the same reason, to save postage by using bulk mailings exclusively for mailing new members' back issues. I also feel—perhaps optimistically—that the scale of archaeological activity in the state, both amateur and professional, warrants this increased size of the publication. Certainly it was not at all difficult to obtain enough material to fill this and the preceding issue, and as we go to press with this issue I have enough commitments in hand to almost fill the next. I am trying to work with this kind of lead time, so those of you who are interested in submitting papers for Mississippi Archaeology should please take note of the fact that the copy for the journal is prepared a good two to three months before it appears, and thus the earlier I receive a manuscript, the better. Along the line of "notes for authors", I am preparing a more detailed list of these, but beyond using the present issue as a model for the preparation of your papers, please note that the expense of quality reproduction of photographs almost rules out entirely their use, and that line drawings should be prepared in ink without labels; the desired labels should be written in legibly on a photocopy of the drawing so that they can be added in the type face of the rest of the journal. Tables are a misfortune to retyping and an even worse misfortune to proofread, which is why you will see that Geiger's original tables were used as prepared in this issue, but I would prefer to receive them if possible in the same type style as is used for the body of the journal, that is, IBM Selectric Elite 72 at 12 pitch (this is not an ad for IBM; the type style is available from other manufacturers and was simply standardized first by IBM). In that way the poor author can make sure that his tables are as accurate as he himself can make them, without the interference of the gremlins that seem to haunt editorial offices.

The following publications of interest to Mississippi archaeology have appeared recently:

Connaway, John
1981 The Keenan Road Cache: Lawrence County, Mississippi. Louisiana Archaeology 8: 57-71.

With reference to this item, Connaway would like to have interested readers take note of the fact that the illustrations published with this article have not been reproduced at full size, as he had intended when he wrote the captions, but have been reduced by about 20%.

Lauro, James T.

Readers of Geiger's article in this issue will be interested in tracking down this one, which extends the range of occurrence of the tool type.

Thorne, R. H., H. K. Curry, et al.

O'Hear, John, et al.

With any luck, the second and final volume of Robert Stuart Neitzel's work on the Fatherland site, entitled The Grand Village of the Natchez Revisited, will be appearing in late summer or early fall as MAA Archaeological Report 12. Members of the MAA will be notified of a special pre-publication price offer in the July Newsletter. This particular Archaeological Report will be typewritten in the same format as the first volume, which was published by the American Museum of Natural History.
To the MAA chapters: On Programs

One of the most common complaints of chapter officers and members is the continuing difficulty of organizing programs to sustain the interest of members throughout the year. This is one need that the MAA central office should take an initiative in helping to fill. After a brainstorming session, I have come up with the following list of general suggestions. Comments from the chapters would be helpful in determining which of these ideas they would find most useful to them, so that MAA central office can get down to work on one or more of them.

1) An annotated list of available films and slide sets, including subject, level of presentation, and rental or purchase price.

2) A type collection of projectile points that could be loaned to chapters; the projectile points would be reproduced in plastic from authentic museum-quality specimens and the whole packet could include a guide booklet to the use of the collection for point type Identification.

3) There has been some strong interest expressed by some members in the development of a program of amateur certification similar to those in effect in Arkansas and Louisiana. This would be a long-term project and would obviously need to be submitted to much careful study and planning, but it is certainly something we should consider for the future. For the time being, however, there is an alternative possibility for any chapter that might be interested enough in having the actual experience of excavation under professional leadership. It does not depend upon there being a professionally-directed project nearby where amateurs could sign on as volunteers, but it would depend upon the willingness of a chapter to help handle the logistics of a well-conducted excavation. The idea is this: "hire-an-archaeologist". The fact is, as many are aware, that there are at any given moment many more professionally-trained archaeologists than there are jobs for them. There are also many more threatened sites than existing state institutions can hope to save. A chapter could undertake the excavation of a local site and the post-excavation analysis of its artifacts under the guidance of a professional archaeologist hired at a nominal rate but furnished with food and lodging by chapter members. At times when chapter members were unavailable to excavate, the archaeologist could undertake to carry on survey of the area in accordance with the goals of the State Plan for Archaeology. MDAH could take responsibility for reviewing the credentials of the archaeologist for the chapter, and other chapters willing to contribute to the cooperative effort could participate in the excavations and analysis as well.

4) As we all know, the Computer Age is upon us. The writer has some expertise in this area for members who would be interested in the development of a booklet on the subject: "Cataloguing archaeological collections with your home computer."

Any and all comments on these suggestions by MAA members are welcome. The MAA exists to serve its members, and in spite of an understandable bias in favor of quality publications, I do feel that there are many other services that can be offered or coordinated by the central office.

---ed.