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Site Survey and Land-Records Research: A Comparison of Two Methods for Locating and Characterizing Historic Period Sites on the Tombigbee National Forest, Mississippi

Evan Peacock and Alanna J. Patrick

Relatively recent historical sites often are treated as redundant archaeological phenomena, and it has been suggested that archival research alone is sufficient to locate, document, and evaluate such sites. A comparison of land acquisition records with archaeological survey data from the Tombigbee National Forest, north Mississippi, shows that significant differences exist in the types of evidence and quality of information retrievable from the two sources. The land records reveal internal site characteristics not observable at the Phase I level of archaeological survey. Conversely, the field survey provides contextual information related to site duration that is largely lacking in the acquisition records. Additionally, earlier historical sites and cemeteries are very poorly represented in the land records examined for this study. The results strongly indicate that the two sources of information are complementary, not redundant. The variability inherent in the historical remains is discussed, along with implications for pursuing different theoretical approaches to the understanding of historic period settlement in the central hill belts of Mississippi.

Introduction

Historical archaeology's singular and unique strength among the social sciences is its simultaneous access to multiple categories of evidence bearing upon the same processes or events in past human behaviour (Deagan 1988:7).

In today's shrinking world, land managers face difficult decisions concerning the allocation of time and resources. The struggle to balance different management needs—i.e., the use, development, maintenance, enhancement, avoidance, or mitigation of particular resources or resource classes—is a continual one, and the difficulties can only grow as more and more demands are made upon the same land base. Land managers are increasingly dependent upon the input of specialists in the various fields associated with each resource class: biologists study and make recommendations concerning threatened and endangered plant and animal species, soil scientists analyze the probabilities that earth-moving
have a special opportunity to fulfill that obligation. Federal land tracts
can be conceived of as large field laboratories where, during the course
of compliance-driven surveys, excavations, and site protection/stabiliza-
tion projects, we can apply different methods and techniques and adjust
our management strategies in light of what we learn (Peacock 1996a).
The results obtained from such comparative studies have direct implica-
tions for how states regulate the practice of archaeology as a profession.

The purpose of this paper is to present the results of a study carried
out on the Tombigbee National Forest in Mississippi. It is a compari-
on of two methods used for locating and characterizing Historic period
sites: intensive field survey and land records research. The methods are
compared in terms of the number of sites found and how those sites can
be characterized in terms of age, layout and scale, and function. The
implications of the results for land management strategies are then
discussed.

Study Area

The Ackerman Unit of the Tombigbee National Forest is located
within Winston, Choctaw and Oktibbeha Counties, north Missis-
issippi (Figure 1). It lies almost entirely within the North Central Hills
physiographic province, characterized by highly dissected ridge systems
and a dendritic drainage pattern. Sandy and silty clay loams typically top
dense, red clay subsoils in the area (McMullen 1986). Geology is domi-
nated by sands, sandstones, clay shales, clays, lignite, and low grade

Figure 1a. Location of Ackerman Unit, Tombig-
bee National Forest (adapted from Peacock
1995a).
iron ore (Mellen 1939; Paulson 1974). The Ackerman Sandstone is a prominent geological outcrop along many bluff lines on the unit, and this rock was commonly used as a chimney and/or building pier material by Euroamerican and Afroamerican settlers. Based on a cursory reading of the original General Land Office survey notes, a hardwood-dominated mixed forest cloaked the ridge systems in the early nineteenth century, while the bottomlands supported mixed hardwoods and cane. The largest waterway is the Noxubee River, a major tributary of the Tombigbee River lying many miles to the east. The headwaters of the Noxubee form in the northwest corner of the Ackerman Unit, from whence the river makes a broad southern bend through the central portion of the forest. Its major tributaries, the Little Noxubee River and Mill Creek, flow generally northward through the area.

Historic settlement in the area began early in the 1800s. An important early post route, the Robinson Road, ran through what is now the southeast corner of the Ackerman Unit. The road was constructed in the 1820s and saw heavy use thereafter (Blitz 1984; Phelps, 1950; Rafferty 1979); major portions of it have been incorporated into present-day gravel and paved roads. The area was ceded by the Choctaw Indians via the Treaty of Dancing Rabbit Creek in 1830, after which the pace of Euroand Afroamerican settlement rapidly increased. By the time of acquisition by the Soil Conservation Service (SCS) in the 1930s and 40s, generations of subsistence and tenant farmers had raised small homesteads and scratched a living from the relatively thin soils of the hills. Cotton and corn were the two major crops, the first being raised primarily to cover tenancy payments and the second to feed livestock, especially pigs (Moore 1988). Other than farming, logging became an economic mainstay of the region (Adkins 1979) with the building of railroads in the hill counties around the turn of the century (e.g., Carroll 1983; Coleman 1973:171-176). By the mid-1930s, land degradation and the Great Depression led many land owners to sell their properties to the government. The area was administered by the SCS until November 27, 1959, when control passed to the USDA Forest Service and the Tombigbee National Forest was established.

Methods

This study is based on findings produced during a resurvey of several quarter-section quadrats that were originally surveyed by John Blitz (Blitz 1984). The resurvey was designed to test the effects of screening on shovel-test survey results (Peacock 1995a, 1996b). Field methods included the use of an approximate 30 meter testing interval on ridgetops, benches, saddles, terraces, and other level, elevated areas, with random testing on slopes and in active floodplains. Additional shovel tests were dug within the 30 meter intervals on an intuitive basis (see Peacock 1995a for details). Not surprisingly, the use of screens resulted in a greatly increased number of recorded sites (an almost 300 percent increase—Peacock 1994a, 1995a, 1996b). Included among the sites recorded by Blitz and during the resurvey are numerous Historic period components, such as late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century house sites, sawmills, spring boxes and cemeteries. Portions of the quadrats were covered in separate surveys using similar methods (Peacock 1992a, 1992b, 1994b).

When sites were located, shovel testing was done at approximate ten meter intervals on perpendicular transects in order to delimit boundaries, to provide information on soils and site integrity, and to obtain artifact samples. All visible features (e.g., chimney piles, cistern depressions, foundation piers, ornamental flowers, etc.) were recorded in terms of size and relative location. Artifacts were later washed and analyzed with an eye toward establishing site ages and functions. Ages were established using diagnostic artifacts. This presents some problems in the study area, since the Historic period diagnostics usually recovered have fairly broad temporal spans. For example, plain earthenware and stoneware ceramics are overwhelmingly predominant in the ceramic assemblages; datable
decorated types such as shell-edge and transfer prints are seldom represented, probably due to the low socioeconomic status of the inhabitants of the hills and the relatively late date of many of the sites. Decorated ceramics (Price 1979) served mainly to identify the few early to mid-nineteenth-century components found during the survey. The more generally-useful diagnostics were nails and glass (Lorrain 1968; Nelson 1968). Cut nails were used to assign a nineteenth-century component to sites, while wire nails were used to indicate twentieth-century use. Amethyst glass was used as a nineteenth-century diagnostic. Tin can and bottle morphology (Busch 1981; Newman 1970) were also examined. It is recognized that this use of diagnostics is crude, and that the artifacts used actually were produced on either side of the nineteenth/twentieth century divide; however, the method allows assemblages to be rapidly and consistently categorized for the sake of reporting, and usually can be applied to the small assemblages typically derived from shovel-test surveys. An evaluation of the method via comparison with documentary records is an additional aim of this paper.

One potential source of chronological information is brick size. Bricks tended to be made smaller and less variable in size through time (South 1964). Metric data from bricks in standing buildings of known age can be used to establish a brick index for any particular area, against which archaeological brick data can be compared. Atkinson and Elliott (1978), for example, established a brick index for the nineteenth-century Nance’s Ferry site in Pickens County, Alabama, and Elliott (1978) established a twentieth-century index using dated structures on the campus of Mississippi State University. While brick sizes were recorded for the sites discussed herein, no index has yet been published for the study area, and the utility of this method for sites in the North Central Hills remains unknown.

Ordinarily, land records on file at the Tombigbee Ranger District are consulted so that the locations of at least some Historic period sites will be known prior to ground survey. In this case, since the resurvey was conducted as a “blind test” of the shovel-test methods being used (Peacock 1995a, 1996b), the records were not consulted until after the fieldwork was completed. Thus, a comparison can be made between the survey results and the land records without consideration of the positive bias that might arise from the application of a combination systematic/intuitive method (Peacock 1995a, 1996b) where former house locations are known prior to field survey.

The records on file at the Tombigbee and other USDA Forest Service ranger districts typically consist of numerous documents related to land acquisition, such as quit claim deeds, warranty deeds, affidavits, condemnation proceedings, correspondence related to title work, etc. The deeds themselves are of limited value to archaeologists for two reasons: 1) only the deeds needed to clear title to the land were incorporated into the acquisition records, so that there usually is not a full chain of deeds back to the original land grant, and 2) the recording of land value on deeds is not a legal requirement in Mississippi, so the construction of improvements (structures, outbuildings, wells, fences, pasture, etc.) cannot be postulated based on marked changes from deed to deed in land value. While there are some interesting asides in the records (e.g., the occasional goading letter written to the President of the United States by an irate landowner who wished to sell before taxes came due), the documents of most immediate value for archaeologists are those contained within the “acquisition folder.” They include an appraisal of the land with descriptions of improvements and a tract map which sometimes shows the locations of structures, cropland, pastures, fences, and other

Figure 2. Example of a tract map from a land acquisition folder. Circled numbers outside tract are section numbers.
cultural features. These maps can be very precise and the records very detailed. It is not uncommon to see three or four structures shown on a tract map, keyed as to function (e.g., house, barn—see Fig. 2), while the appraisal record lists every structure and other improvement that was present on the tract at the time of acquisition, often with a general esti-

Figure 3. Appraisal record for land tract shown in Figure 2.

Figure 4. Appraisal summary sheet for land tract shown in Figure 2.
Another source of documentary records consulted was the original USDA soil maps for Choctaw and Winston counties, the former of which dates to 1920 (Anderson, Jones and Jabine 1923) and the latter to 1912 (Crabb and Hightower 1913). These maps are quite useful for locating early twentieth-century structures, as they depict individual house locations as well as the locations of churches, schools, and other cultural features (Fig. 5). This is especially important where Forest Service lands are concerned, since a standard clause in the acquisition contracts was that all structures would be removed prior to government purchase; standing structures are thus extremely rare on the National Forests. An implication is that one source of information, architectural recording, cannot be carried out on Forest Service lands proper, although several turn-of-the-century folk houses still stand on private inholdings within the Forest boundaries and an effort has recently been begun to record such structures before they are lost.

Some oral history was obtained for sites related to the Hamill Springs/Gus Boyd Sawmill complex in Winston County (Peacock 1992a). This information was obtained from Mr. Lee Hamill, whose family owned some of the land prior to government acquisition. Dates for the majority of these sites were obtained from artifact analyses prior to conversations with Mr. Hamill, who then provided useful information concerning functional aspects of this complex of habitation and small-scale industrial locales centered around a perennial fresh-water spring (Peacock 1992a).

Finally, copies of the original 1833–1834 land survey maps were consulted. Unfortunately, there are very few cultural features shown on these maps. A few fields and roads are depicted, but with the exception of the Robinson Road, which ran through one of the survey quadrats (Section 33, Township 16N, Range 13E), no improvements or features of any kind are shown in the quarter-sections examined in this study. Field investigations suggest that the location of Robinson Road as shown on the original survey maps is approximate at best.

Results

Number of Sites Recorded

A total of 36 historic components was recorded by field survey in the quadrats. Of these, only nine could be identified with certainty in the acquisition records, while another five were tentatively identified. The tentative identifications arose from situations where houses or other improvements listed in the acquisition records matched the features found in the field but were not shown on the acquisition maps, and thus could not be unequivocally linked to the archaeological remains. Six of the sites found in the surveys were depicted on the original soil maps; of these, three were located in a tract for which we were unable to locate the acquisition records, and two were not mentioned in the acquisition records, suggesting that they had been dismantled prior to the mid-1930s. Eighteen (50 percent) of the sites discovered in the survey were not identified in any of the historical records consulted for this project.

The fact that so many sites were not identified in the acquisition records does not necessarily mean that they were not described in those records. Typically, numerous structures and other improvements were listed on the appraisal sheet for any particular land tract (e.g., Figure 3), far more overall than we found during the ground survey. It is difficult to reconcile these data sets for two reasons: 1) the tracts are usually much larger than the survey quadrats that fell within them, meaning that the described improvements could very well have been located outside of the surveyed areas; and 2) as noted above, the acquisition maps fre-
quent fail to show the locations of improvements listed for the tracts. If features such as stock ponds, wells, or other improvements were described that matched what we found in the field, we could tentatively link the historical to the archaeological record even though the improvement locations were not graphically depicted. In many cases this could not be done, due to a lack of detailed description in the records, the altered state of some archaeological sites, or a redundancy of improvement types for any particular tract. To illustrate the latter problem, suppose that a 160-acre survey quadrat fell within the boundaries of a large land tract of several hundred acres. The appraisal sheet lists five “cabins” of various ages and conditions, but none are depicted on the acquisition map; thus, all we know is that the cabins were located somewhere within the tract. A single house site found in the survey quadrat could be any of the five listed on the appraisal sheet, or it might be one that was not recorded in the acquisition records. Conversely, it might be that all five cabins fell within the survey quadrat, but only one of them was found in the field.

There is no doubt that some sites were missed during the survey: the sites of six houses depicted on the acquisition maps and two depicted on the original soil maps were not discovered in the field. Given that not all the maps showed the locations of structures, there is no doubt that others were missed as well. This failure to locate sites was probably due to a number of factors, including the dismantling of buildings and subsequent salvaging and removal of bricks and other materials, the obliteration of sites by later logging, road building, etc., the effects of vegetation on surface visibility (Peacock 1995a, 1996b), and the capriciousness of shovel-test survey as a method for finding sites. Still, in terms of the number of sites recorded and the accuracy of location, field survey proved more productive overall than did the historical records.

**Chronology**

The dates assigned to sites based on artifact analysis and the historical records are shown in Table 1. The acquisition record data were compiled by taking the oldest age for a structure listed on the appraisal sheet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site #</th>
<th>Dates Assigned by Artifacts</th>
<th>Dates Assigned by Acquisition Records</th>
<th>Dates Assigned by Soil Maps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22-Wi-575</td>
<td>L19/E20</td>
<td>ca. 1915–1935*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Wi-576</td>
<td>M19/E20</td>
<td>ca. 1915–1935*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Wi-577</td>
<td>L19/E20</td>
<td>ca. 1915–1935*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Wi-578</td>
<td>E19–M19</td>
<td>ca. 1915–1935*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Wi-580</td>
<td>E19–M19</td>
<td>ca. 1915–1935*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Wi-581</td>
<td>U19</td>
<td>ca. 1915–1935*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK-S4-1</td>
<td>E20</td>
<td>ca. 1884–1934</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK-S4-2</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>ca. 1934</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK-92-49-5</td>
<td>L19/E20</td>
<td>ca. 1884–1934</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK-92-49-6</td>
<td>L19/E20</td>
<td>ca. 1884–1934</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK-S13-1</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>ca. 1884–1934</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK-S13-4</td>
<td>E20</td>
<td>ca. 1915–1935*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Wi-525</td>
<td>L19/E20</td>
<td>ca. 1913–1934</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Wi-586</td>
<td>U19</td>
<td>ca. 1904–1934*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Wi-590</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>ca. 1913–1934</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Wi-591</td>
<td>U19</td>
<td>ca. 1913–1934</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK-S21-1</td>
<td>E20</td>
<td>records not found</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK-S21-4</td>
<td>E20</td>
<td>records not found</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK-S21-8</td>
<td>collection lost</td>
<td>records not found</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Ch-564</td>
<td>L19/E20</td>
<td>records not found</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Ch-566</td>
<td>E19/M19</td>
<td>records not found</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Ch-567</td>
<td>U19</td>
<td>records not found</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Wi-597</td>
<td>L19/E20</td>
<td>ca. 1925–1935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK-S29-3</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>ca. 1925–1935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK-S29-4</td>
<td>E20</td>
<td>ca. 1925–1935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK-S32-1</td>
<td>E20</td>
<td>ca. 1905–1935*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Wi-598</td>
<td>ca. 1871–1914</td>
<td>ca. 1911–1935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Wi-600</td>
<td>L19/E20</td>
<td>ca. 1894–1935*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM-S9-8</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>ca. 1894–1935*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK-S35N-1</td>
<td>E20</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Wi-603</td>
<td>L19/E20</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1, Key.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Century</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E19</td>
<td>early 19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L19</td>
<td>late 19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E20</td>
<td>early 20th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M19</td>
<td>mid-19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U19</td>
<td>undifferentiated 19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Identification in acquisition records probable, not certain.

for any particular site; this age was subtracted from the appraisal date to establish the lower limit of the date range, while the date of the appraisal record itself was used to establish the upper limit. The ages listed for structures appear to have been rounded to the nearest five or ten year increment and thus are not precise. Any site depicted on one of the original soil maps was simply assigned the date of the map itself.

As can be seen in Table 1, the dates provided by the diagnostic artifacts appear to be quite accurate. One item of note is the attributing of some nineteenth-century occupation to sites which appear from the acquisition records to belong to the early twentieth century. There are a number of possible explanations for this phenomenon. On sites of relatively long duration, it is likely that older buildings once existed but had been removed or abandoned prior to the appraisals; artifacts from these earlier structures would still be available for collection. The emplacement of buildings at a particular locale following an occupational hiatus—i.e., site reoccupation—would produce the same result. It is also possible that landowners consciously or unconsciously reported improvements as being younger than they actually were, in the hopes of increasing the appraised value of the land. Of course, some disparity may arise from the types of diagnostics used due to the broad range of manufacturing dates discussed above.

One major weakness of the historical records consulted was the lack of representation of the earliest sites in the area. Of the six sites for which early to mid-nineteenth-century dates were assigned based on diagnostic artifacts, only one was identified in the acquisition records and none were shown on the soil maps.

Site Function and Layout

Site functions, as determined by artifact analysis and the nature of any visible features, are usually quite general. Most of the sites recorded were classified as house sites, based on the presence of multiple domestic artifact types such as fine and coarse ceramic wares, glass, nails, marbles, fragments of wood stove, etc., and features such as chimney piles, cisterns, and ornamental flowers (Peacock 1995a). Some were thought to be possible outbuildings due to light artifact density, low artifact variability, and a lack of visible features. Industrial sites were identified by the presence of features such as sawdust piles or millponds. The one cemetery recorded fortunately had a fairly high degree of visibility, due to a few standing headstones; some found elsewhere on the Tombigbee and Holly Springs National Forests have been extremely difficult to identify in the field (e.g., Peacock 1993, 1995b).

Table 2 shows a comparison of site functions as determined by artifacts and features with determinations made via the historical records (those not found in the historical records are not listed). Although they appear to be in general accord, there are some difficulties in meshing the two data sets. An examination of the appraisal records (e.g., Figure 3) shows that numerous outbuildings such as smokehouses, corn cribs, chicken houses, and sheds were commonly present on the tracts, and almost certainly these were clustered around the dwellings. Weaver and Doster (1982:Figs. 14-19) show the layouts of several “Upland South” farmsteads in the upper Tombigbee River drainage area dating to the late nineteenth-early twentieth century. While they do not provide scales, it is evident from their figures that certain types of outbuildings were erected very near the houses:

Outbuildings are oriented so as to face the dwelling from the rear, sides and sometimes from the front. Usually the smaller structures, including storage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site #</th>
<th>Function as assigned via artifacts and features</th>
<th>Function as assigned via historical records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22-Wi-575</td>
<td>house site</td>
<td>cabin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK-S4-1</td>
<td>house site</td>
<td>cabin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK-S4-2</td>
<td>industrial site</td>
<td>sawmill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK-92-49-5</td>
<td>house site</td>
<td>cabin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK-92-49-6</td>
<td>house site</td>
<td>uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK-S13-4</td>
<td>unknown—shop or barn?</td>
<td>uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Wi-586</td>
<td>house site</td>
<td>house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Wi-590</td>
<td>probably house site</td>
<td>uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK-S21-1</td>
<td>house site</td>
<td>house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Wi-594</td>
<td>house site</td>
<td>house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Wi-597</td>
<td>house site</td>
<td>dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK-S21-8</td>
<td>house site</td>
<td>house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Ch-567</td>
<td>probably house site</td>
<td>house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK-S29-3</td>
<td>possible outbuilding</td>
<td>uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK-S29-4</td>
<td>house site</td>
<td>dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK-S32-1</td>
<td>possible outbuilding</td>
<td>probable outbuilding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Wi-598</td>
<td>cemetery</td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Wi-599</td>
<td>house site</td>
<td>house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Wi-600</td>
<td>house site</td>
<td>uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK-35N-1</td>
<td>house site</td>
<td>house</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sheds, well, smokehouse, and small animal pens, were closer to the house than farm equipment storage, corn crib, or barn. Occasionally the barn or crib may be opposite, across the road, but most often the larger structures are to the rear or at one side of the dwelling at a greater distance than most of the small structures. These locations suggest that the most necessary domestic functions are represented by structures near the dwelling. Some of these were also those usually performed by women—obtaining water, storing canned vegetables, feeding chickens and the like. Farm equipment maintenance, vehicles, plows, livery, as well as feed, fodder and animal storage, are normally non-domestic household activities performed by men. These structures are more distant and access to them is commonly around rather than through the immediate house yard (Weaver and Doster 1982:64).

Although plans of existing farmsteads in the North Central Hills have not, to our knowledge, been similarly reported, personal observation of farms in the area indicates that the layouts and scale are similar to those reported by Weaver and Doster. It is obvious that a great deal of intrasite variability is being masked when historic sites are recorded in shovel test surveys. What are being classified as “house sites” undoubtedly contain the material remains of numerous small outbuildings as well. Interestingly, those few sites thought to be possible barns or other outbuildings are indeed well removed from the recorded house sites, again suggesting that the examples of farm plans provided by Weaver and Doster are generally applicable in the study area.

As noted above, one cemetery, site 22-Wi-598, was found during the survey. Small family cemeteries are of common occurrence in the National Forests of north Mississippi. For example, at least six can be found within the western half of the proclamation boundaries of the Ackerman Unit. Many contain graves that are unmarked except for unshaped pieces of locally available sandstone; they often contain unmarked grave depressions as well. Some cemeteries are composed entirely of unmarked graves. Curiously, these family cemeteries fail to appear in the acquisition records, except in a very few instances where plots were set aside as exceptions to the acquired tract. The cemetery in question was not mentioned, nor was it shown on the original soil survey map. The general lack of reference to such cemeteries is a major blind spot in the historical records examined for this study.

Discussion

It is evident from the above comparisons that the two sources of information, field survey and land-records research, are complementary but by no means redundant in the kinds of data they produce (cf. Morin 1991). Field survey provided excellent locational data, very good chronological estimates, and descriptions of each site’s current state of preservation, something which is unobtainable from the historical records. It also yielded information on early to mid-nineteenth-century components and a cemetery which were almost completely unrepresented in the historical records consulted. The historical records revealed something of the internal complexity of historic sites, which can be expected to contain numerous functionally distinct loci rarely discernible in shovel-test surveys. They also showed the locations of some sites that were not found in the field. This emphasizes the importance of consulting land records before field work is carried out; i.e., their use as a planning tool (cf. Crimmins 1978; Smith 1990; Wilson 1990). Most important, perhaps, is the information on the number of tenant families occupying each land tract and the detailed descriptions of structures complete with ages, sizes, conditions and values; such information could be used to compile detailed demographic data for the area at a precise point in time. Combining these data with cemetery dates would allow the investigation of population dynamics, social displacement, health and social stress during what was one of the most turbulent periods in the history of the Mississippi hill country (Adkins 1979; Stone 1975).

The results of this study have implications for how historic remains should be treated by archaeologists and land managers. There are two frames of reference for approaching such remains: scientific and humanistic (Dunnell 1984). On a scientific front, Historic sites can be characterized as one element of a non-renewable resource base, each element of which “makes a unique contribution, as a research subject” (Dunnell 1984:64). Given that late Historic period sites have only recently begun to be of interest to archaeologists, this particular element of the archaeological record is currently underrepresented in state databases (Lees and Noble 1990:11; Peacock 1994c). In order to fully understand the way of life that produced these sites, it is necessary to build a broader context within which they can be fit (Smith 1990). This context can be built entirely with field research, one project at a time (Peacock 1994c; cf. McManamon 1990), or entirely through archival/oral history research (Holland 1990; Stiles 1977). It seems clear, though, that unless both approaches are used in conjunction, no complete contextual framework can ever be achieved (cf. Morrin 1991; Smith 1990).

We also are obligated to try, to the greatest extent possible, to preserve a representative sample of all elements of the archaeological record for future researchers (Dunnell 1984; Dyer and Bass 1994; Peacock 1994d, 1996a; Sharrock and Grayson 1979). As demonstrated to a small degree by the references cited below, there is a burgeoning interest in the archaeology of late Historic period farmsteads and related sites (cf. papers in Schroeder 1991a), and this interest will surely continue to grow as the discipline evolves, as the sites become further removed from the present,
and as theoretical orientations such as landscape archaeology develop. We can meet many of these needs simply by recording sites in place, obtaining representative artifact samples from them, and setting aside a representative sample of sites of all types and ages for future work (Peacock 1994c, 1994d, 1996a). The relative degree of contextual integrity (which can only be assessed by field work) can be used to decide which sites are the most suitable for preservation (Glasgow 1977; Lynott 1980; Peacock 1994c, 1994d, 1996a; Wilson 1990:29). The information provided by field recording is amenable to manipulation via GIS, which then becomes a powerful research tool for context-building (e.g., Briuer et al. 1990; cf. Schroeder 1991b for the use of GIS with land records).

The precise location of sites, the field recording of features and soil characteristics, the acquisition of excavation data and detailed temporal and functional analyses of artifact assemblages are important if we are to move beyond gross oversimplification of the archaeological record of the late Historic period. Relatively recent sites are often characterized as “redundant” or “ubiquitous”; such characterizations mask variability related to social status, historical process, and the success or failure of particular family groups over time. Even among tenant farmers, who occupied the lower rung of the late nineteenth-/early twentieth-century social ladder, there were significant differences, often based on race, in social status, land-use rights, house locations, and material possessions (Stine 1990). Who were the nameless “tenant families” so casually mentioned as “living on the tract” at the time when land owners were selling their properties to the government? Where did they go when their way of life was radically changed in a transaction that was entirely beyond their control? Who are the faceless people resting in abandoned cemeteries, consecrated ground marked only by clumps of volunteer ornamental flowers and unshaped pieces of raw rock? It is obvious that the historical records, even those relatively mundane forms and documents relating to the government purchase of land, are biased in their recognition of individuals (see Wagner 1991 regarding the invisibility of “squatters” in government land records). Careful artifact analysis will allow the placement of sites into a more fine-grained temporal sequence; soils and feature data, combined with artifact analysis, will allow estimations of occupational duration. Information on site size and the number and functions of different outbuildings, coupled with comparative analysis of artifact assemblages, will allow estimates of relative wealth to be made. When combined with historical data, this information will raise intriguing possibilities for studying cultural change from processual, landscape, neo-Darwinian or Marxist perspectives (cf. Orser 1991). We have an obligation to recover information on all past social groups, regardless of the relative grandiosity or mundanity of the material remains they left behind. History may, at times, tread blindly upon the masses of the world; it would be regrettable if archaeology were as careless in its step.

From a humanistic perspective, late Historic period house sites have a public constituency that perhaps no other site type can match, due to the fact that they provide a physical connection to the past for so many people today. They are tangible reminders of a less complex era; they are “home places” to which our elderly relatives can point and reminisce and about which stories are told to our children. They provide the “continuities in human experience and symbolization” (Elliott 1994) which serve to anchor us more firmly in the present by establishing our roots in the past. In states such as Mississippi, which are still predominantly rural in nature, they are yet the heritage of the majority; as such, they are ideal candidates for interpretive development within some sort of thematic context. It is difficult to translate such perceptions, which are inherently subjective and value-laden, into strategies for resource management. Indeed, the conceptualization of Historic sites as “resources” is a prime example of how scientific endeavour is divorced from the humanistic perspective. Yet if we do not “manage” these particular remains, they will disappear and the material links to our own immediate past will be severed. This dilemma is perhaps not so daunting as it might appear. We would argue that a preservation strategy defensible in scientific terms—that of the representative sample—is equally defensible in humanistic terms—“let’s save some of everything that’s out there.” Arguments for the preservation or dismissal of any particular site can (and doubtless will) still be made from either the scientific or humanistic perspective, or both. This does not mean that the general strategy of preserving a representative sample of material remains is faulty. It is an insurance policy against the scientific and humanistic futures, both of which are impossible to predict (Peacock 1996a).

A comment made recently at a professional meeting was that, if archaeologists really considered late Historic period sites to be important, they would quit recording those that are entirely contained within archaeological contexts and spend their time recording examples of folk houses and other buildings that are still standing. While we fully agree that there is a pressing need to record such structures, we would disagree that archaeologists should quit worrying about sites and start worrying solely about standing buildings, for several reasons: 1) while archaeologists are qualified to locate, record, and evaluate archaeological sites, most lack the requisite training for adequate architectural recording, and resources for such extra endeavours are rarely available; 2) archaeological data are not the same as architectural data; as with historical records, architectural data are complementary to, but do not replace, information obtained from archaeological contexts; 3) we encounter Historic sites on
a daily basis in our fieldwork, many of which are in excellent states of preservation; before they are ever encountered again they could very easily be destroyed; ergo, we must take the time to record and evaluate them, at least in some preliminary manner, now; 3) there are large areas of the country where very little folk housing exists; for example, the National Forests of Mississippi, where virtually all such structures were removed prior to government acquisition. There may be scattered examples left on private holdings interspersed with National Forest lands, but can we be sure that these are entirely representative of the spectrum of rural lifeways that existed in the hill and pine belts of Mississippi? Why is it that they have persisted where the great majority of such structures have not? Small-scale industrial complexes such as sawmills and grist mills are rarely extant, and the same holds true for even smaller-scale special-purpose localities such as sorghum cookers and groundhog stills. Perhaps architectural historians should consider collecting artifact samples from the standing structures they record, so that a richer context can be provided for the far more numerous archaeological assemblages that exist in the world. One thing we can at least be sure of via field survey is that a representative sample of late Historic period archaeological sites can be located and preserved. This will remain part of the ongoing mission of Heritage Resource Management on the National Forests of Mississippi.
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Shell-Edge Decorated Ceramics
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Shell-edge decorated ceramics were one of the most commonly used tablewares during the nineteenth century, and they therefore provide a very useful tool in the dating of late eighteenth-century sites. The shell-edge pattern went through a series of style changes between 1790 and 1870. These changes in style provide a chronology that can help date historic sites where shell-edge decorated ceramics are found.

One of the most useful ceramic patterns, for the purpose of dating Historic sites, is shell-edge. As used here, “edge decorated” refers to a ceramic vessel, usually a flatware, which has a molded (impressed or embossed) decoration around its rim, although some lack embossing. Of all edge decorated ceramics, shell-edge is the most common. It was a molded, closely spaced grooved decoration around the rim of a vessel. Later the shell-edge was simply painted on. This decoration normally is painted in blue or green underglaze, though on occasion it may be found uncolored or in black, brown, wine, reddish pink, yellow, or red. After ca. 1840 colors other than blue are rare (Miller 1991). The earliest reference found for shell-edge in the United States was for green and blue edged ware “in the New York Daily Advertiser for Jan. 1, 1791” (Noel Hume 1978b). In the Tombigbee River valley green edge plates were being sold by 1804 and blue edge plates by 1805 (Choctaw Trading House 1960). Shell-edge and related edge decorations were in use from ca. 1755 through 1900. Just as clothing styles changed over time, the styles of edged decorations, including shell-edge, changed (Figures 1 and 2). These changes in style provide a very important tool for dating nineteenth-century ceramics.

The first recorded usages of shell-edge were by Bow and Wedgwood in 1755 (Noel Hume 1969; Miller 1991). Early shell-edge examples also appear on tin-glazed earthenware and creamware ceramics which were produced in England and on late eighteenth-century Chinese export porcelain (Hunter and Miller 1994). Although creamware was developed during the 1740s, the earliest known creamware shell-edge decoration occurred on a Wedgwood plate commemorating the marriage of the Prince and Princess of Orange in 1767 (Noel Hume 1969). Josiah Wedgwood’s 1770 pattern book illustrates, as pattern no. 83 in 1772, a black or
Figure 1. Edge decorated pearlware. All examples except for asymmetrical scallop and minimal bud were found at a house site in Columbus, MS, that was occupied between 1822–1836. The asymmetrical scallop is on a plate in the author’s collection, and the minimal bud was found on a ca. 1830 Choctaw site near Columbus.

Figure 2. Shell-edge decorated whiteware found on nineteenth-century Mississippi sites.

Embossed blue edge decorated: a. Is similar to a design used by Ralph and James Clews, Enoch Wood, and possibly other English potters, ca. 1820s–1830s; b. Dot and leaf, ca. 1820s–1830s.

Even scalloped bud type shell-edge decorated: Impressed decoration with scalloped rim, ca. 1820s–1840s.

Unscalloped bud type shell-edge decorated: Impressed decoration with plain, not scalloped, rim, ca. 1840s–1850s.

Unscalloped type blue shell-edge decorated: Impressed decoration, ca. 1850s–1860s.

Unscalloped painted blue shell-edge decorated: Decoration is painted not impressed, ca. 1860s–1900.
green shell-edge border for cream-colored ware (Hughes n.d.). By 1774 both blue and green shell-edge creamware was being sold (Noel Hume 1969). Hartley, Green & Co. of Leeds, England, was marketing shell-edge creamware in 1783 (Noel Hume 1969). In 1796 the Castleford Pottery Pattern Book, Castleford, England, illustrated shell-edge soup ladles, gravy boats, tureens, and plates (Gilchrist 1981). Although the Castleford book shows a wide assortment of shell-edge vessels it is unusual to find shell-edge on vessels other than plates. Shell-edge decorations never reached the great popularity on porcelain or creamware that it would later achieve on pearlware. Creamware itself was declining in popularity during the early nineteenth century, and by 1820 it was no longer commonly sold except for larger vessels such as wash bowls or chamber pots (Ward 1983).

About 1779 the shell-edge decoration began to be used on pearlware, an earthenware developed in England during the 1770s (Noel Hume 1969). This was a whiter earthenware than creamware and was popularized by Josiah Wedgwood in 1779 (Noel Hume 1969). Wedgwood described pearlware as:

- a white earthenware body containing a greater percentage of flint and white clay than cream-coloured earthenware. A small amount of cobalt added to the glaze increased the whitening effect (Hughes n.d.:126).

Pearlware may be distinguished from creamware as it has a slight bluish tint, while creamware has a slight greenish or yellowish tint. This is most visible in crevices or puddles of glaze on the ceramics (Noel Hume 1969). Unlike later shell-edge, which usually bore no other decoration, early shell-edge pearlware sometimes contained decorations in the center of the plates, such as the Chinese house pattern, the American eagle, peacocks, or various transfer prints (Table 1). On pearlware, shell-edge occurs almost exclusively on plates. During the early 1820s white-ware gained acceptance. By the early 1830s, pearlware was replaced by various whitewares, both hard and soft fired (Ward 1983). Edge-decorated vessels, however, continued to be made in pearlware.

Although many English potters produced shell-edge and embossed edge decorated ceramics, several firms were noted both for their use of edge decoration and for a large American trade. These firms were Herculanean (1793–1841), Phillips of Longport (1822–1834), Davenport (1793–1887), Clews (1818–1834), Thomas Mayer (1826–1838), and Enoch Wood (1784–1846) (Noel Hume 1969; Godden 1964; Miller 1991). Makers marks of Clews have been recovered from an 1822–1836 house site in Columbus, Mississippi, and a Wood mark was recovered from a historic Choctaw site (ca. 1830) near Columbus (Ward 1983). In addition, the author has in his collection shell-edge plates marked: Guest (ca. 1802), Wedgwood & Co. (ca. 1860s), W. Adams & Co. (1880s–1890s), and James Broadhurst (ca. 1890s). Examples of these marks are shown in Figure 3.

Edge-decorated wares are not only useful for dating purposes but also serve as an indicator of economic scale. In “Classification and Economic Scaling of 19th Century Ceramics,” George Miller examined the cost of various earthenwares at different times (Miller 1991). Miller compared the cost in pence of transfer printed Blue Willow, other transfer printed, edge-decorated and cream-colored, or undecorated. Table 2 displays data based on Miller (Miller 1980). According to Miller, embossed, edge-decorated plates sold for slightly more than traditional shell-edge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Popular decorations found in the center of edge decorated plates.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Handpainted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle (Hume 1969:133; Larsen 1975:242)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese house (Hume 1969:129; Author’s collection)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit or flowers (Hunter and Miller 1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balloon (Hunter and Miller 1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coat of arms (Hunter and Miller 1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfer Printed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portraits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. Brown (Larsen 1975:228)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Decatur (Larsen 1975:228)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. W. H. Harrison (Larsen 1975:228)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Gen. Jackson Hero of New Orleans” (Larsen 1975:229)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Capt. Jones of the Macedonian” (Larsen 1975:229)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Capt. Hull of the Constitution” (Larsen 1975:229)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette (Moore, 1903:90; Larsen 1975:230)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette and Washington (Larsen 1975:231)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. James Lawrence (Larsen 1975:232)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver Hazard Perry (Larsen 1975:232)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zebulon Pike (Larsen 1975:232–33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington (Larsen 1975:232)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Adelaide (Hunter and Miller 1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gothic church with lines of verse by Thomas Moore (Hume 1978:49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arms of the United States (Larsen 1975:240)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral (Hunter and Miller 1994)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
during the 1820s (Miller 1980). The low price of edge decorated ceramics indicates that they were used at the lower end of the economic scale or as “every day dishes.”

A major problem with the development of an edge decorated chronology is the confusion over the names and descriptions of the various styles. The most common error is referring to “shell-edge” as “feather edge.” Feather edge is an embossed and usually uncolored design around the rims of mostly salt glaze or creamware plates (Figure 4), popular from the 1760s to the 1780s (Noel Hume 1969). Feather edge and shell-edge were considered two different patterns. In 1774 Wedgwood listed the names of the borders of plates on which Guy Green was applying transfer prints. (Green with John Sadler had developed transfer printing in 1752.) In his list of borders Wedgwood listed feather edge and blue and green shell-edge as separate patterns (Moore 1903).

The confusion over the proper name of shell-edge, which has mistakenly been called feather edge by some archaeologists or Leeds by some antique dealers, is mild compared to the confusion of the different names given the substyles of shell-edge. In attempting to make some sense out

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1796</th>
<th>1814</th>
<th>1833</th>
<th>1846</th>
<th>1855</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willow</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer printed</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edged</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.C.</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Cost of table plate in pence.

Figure 4. Feather edge and bead and reel decorations. Feather edge and bead and reel were popular edge decorations on English creamware and salt glazed ceramic plates from the 1760s through the 1780s (Noel Hume 1969). These decorations were usually uncolored.
of the confusion, I have reviewed available literature and examined hundreds of edge-decorated sherds representing about 25 different patterns. I have found that some of the commonly used names do fit certain styles.

Molded edge decorations may be broken down into two main divisions, impressed and embossed. The shell-edge design is usually impressed except for a mid- to late-nineteenth-century effort to paint the design rather than mold it. The embossed design includes raised decorations around the rim, which have names such as dot and leaf after their appearance.

I have found that shell-edge ceramics can be divided into four main rim types: scalloped, octagon, unscalloped, and unscalloped painted but not impressed. The use of these distinctions along with whether the vessel is pearlware or whiteware creates a useful tool for dating.

Shell-edge is molded or painted with straight grooves extending inward perpendicular to the rim. The earlier shell-edge will usually have carefully molded grooves, be carefully painted and thinly potted. Post-1840 shell-edge will usually have shallow, indistinct grooves, exhibit little detail in its painting, and be more thickly potted. Late shell-edge (post-1870) will usually have a painted not impressed edge. These are only general rules for shell-edge, as some early examples are poorly executed, while some later examples exhibit careful molding and painting.

The best indicators of the age of a shell-edge vessel is whether the ceramic is pearlware or whiteware, whether the rim is octagon, scalloped or unscalloped, whether the design is impressed molded or painted, and the quality of manufacture.

George Miller and Robert Hunter trace shell-edge evolution through four main styles:
1. asymmetrical, undulating, scallop with impressed curved lines (1750-1812)
2. even scalloped rim (1800-1850)
3. unscalloped rim with impressed lines (1840-1870)
4. unscalloped rim with painted lines (1860-1900)
5. octagonal shape (1800-1815, 1850-1860) (Hunter and Miller 1994).

The asymmetrical style was in common use from the 1750s to 1812. It was developed from the rococo style which was popular at that time. The even scalloped rim followed, beginning about 1800 (Hunter and Miller 1994). Both the asymmetrical and the even scallop often have a distinct bud or bulb impression with grooves coming out from the sides of the bud. Usually on the asymmetrical style the scalloped rim appears to merge into or fold over to form the bud. The even scallop continued in use through the 1840s. By the 1840s an unscalloped rim with impressed lines became popular. This style persisted into the 1860s (Hunter and Miller 1994). In the 1860s a painted, not impressed or grooved style, with an unscalloped rim appears. This style continued in use until about 1900. Another style which is not as common is the octagon rim. That shape appeared on plates ca. 1800-1815 and reappeared on geometric shaped platters ca. 1850-1860.

According to Noel Hume, carefully placed brushstrokes applied at a right angle to the rim of a shell-edge plate indicate an early (pre-1830) piece, as does careful molding of the shell-edge grooves (Noel Hume 1978b:45, 46). While those characteristics may be generally true, a ca. 1860s shell-edge plate I have has brushstrokes at a right angle to the rim, and I have observed careful molding of shell-edge grooves on sherd found in a ca. 1849 trash pit. I believe that one of the best dating tools is the rim of an edge-decorated plate. Every edge-decorated rim that I have recovered from a firm pre-1850 context has had a scalloped rim. I have recovered one bud-type blue shell-edge decorated plate sherd with a plain, round, unscalloped rim, that George Miller believed might be as early as the 1840s (Miller 1980). That sherd was recovered from a farm site that had been occupied from ca. 1835 to 1960. On occasion a shell-edge sherd with a straight edge will be found. Octagonal shaped shell-edge plates had appeared by ca. 1800 (Noel Hume 1976). The records of the Choctaw Factory at St. Stephens, Mississippi Territory, list blue and green octagonal plates from 1804 to 1816. Octagonal plates do not appear in the factory records after that date (Choctaw Trading House 1960). An 1822–1837 house site in Columbus, Mississippi, and two pre-1833 Choctaw house sites near Columbus have yielded large quantities of edge decorated ceramics of many patterns, but none have been octagonal in shape (Ward 1986). This along with the St. Stephens Choctaw Factory records would appear to indicate that the sale of octagonal edge-decorated plates ended prior to 1820 in the Tombigbee area. However, large geometric platters again became popular during the 1850s. As these platters are of heavy ironstone, they can be distinguished from the earlier plates.

Atkinson has proposed that unscalloped shell-edge rims postdate 1825 (Atkinson 1987:18). Hunter and Miller (1994) place unscalloped rims as being produced by the 1830s. An examination of a number of sites containing shell-edge ceramics indicates that the transition from unscalloped to scalloped rims occurred between 1831 and 1850 (Table 3). The latest site with only unscalloped rims commenced during the early 1850s. This would indicate that the popularity of unscalloped rims on shell-edge increased during the mid- to late 1840s. This increase in the use of unscalloped rims coincided with an increased use of shell-edge on ironstone or thick earthenwares. A sherd of a scalloped rim blue shell-edge plate was recovered from the wreck of the ship Modern Greece, which was built in 1859 and lost off Fort Fisher, North Carolina, in 1862 (Bright 1977:Fig. 154). While it is probable that an impressed unscalloped
rim on shell-edge is post-1840, scalloped rims continued to be used through the mid-nineteenth century.

Shell-edge decorated ceramics can provide a simple tool to help date late eighteenth-century and nineteenth-century sites. Because those ceramics are among the most common sherds found on nineteenth-century sites, they are particularly useful. The key is to understand the evolution of scalloped and unscalloped rims and the designs that occur on them.

Rufus Ward, Jr., is a lawyer in West Point, Mississippi.

Table 3. The presence of scalloped or unscalloped rims on edge decorated ceramics on nineteenth-century sites. Sites reviewed include Bolls (Atkinson 1987), Chickasaw Agency (Atkinson 1987), Hotana and Yokotubbee (Ward 1983), YMCA (Ward and Kay 1986), West Port Trash Pit (Ward 1982), Pate (Rohrbough et al. 1971), Harveys (Burton 1971), Colbert (Marshall 1988), West Port (Ward and Kay 1986), Mims (Ward 1985), and Bottoms (Journey 1990).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period of Occupation</th>
<th>Bolls</th>
<th>Chic-Agen.</th>
<th>Hot. &amp; Yok.</th>
<th>YMCA</th>
<th>WP Pit</th>
<th>Colbert</th>
<th>Pate</th>
<th>Harvey</th>
<th>WP Surf</th>
<th>Mims</th>
<th>Bottoms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1805</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1795</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S Only Scalloped Rim  | B Both | U Only Unscalloped
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Decisions, Decisions, Decisions: Archaeological Ethics and Site Significance

Philip J. Carr and Amy L. Young


Today professional archaeologists are faced with a variety of decisions. A major decision concerns priorities. Traditional research projects often bring the most recognized rewards such as grants and publications, but these projects usually leave little time for addressing significant dilemmas facing the discipline, such as the looting of archaeological sites. Another important decision made by contemporary archaeologists is assessing the significance of a cultural resource. Determining that one archaeological site is significant and another not is rarely an easy task because of the myriad complex issues that must be taken into account. Making poor decisions can mean the destruction of unrecognized significant sites. Considering these difficulties faced by archaeologists in the 1990s, discussions of archaeological ethics and site significance should be center stage, because decisions in these areas will determine the future of the discipline. This will aid in prioritizing our efforts.

Important decisions that will have an effect on the future of archaeology will also be made by collectors, looters, students, teachers, amateur archaeologists, government officials, and landowners, to name a few. Will the choices made by these people reflect an awareness of the importance of preserving our shared cultural heritage? The decisions made by these individuals are as critical to the survival of the archaeological record as those faced by archaeologists. Informed decisions, such as can be gained from the two volumes discussed here, will go far in preserving the archaeological record and our cultural heritage.

The volumes Archaeological Ethics, edited by Karen D. Vitelli, and Trends and Patterns in Cultural Resource Significance: An Historical Perspective and Annotated Bibliography, by Frederick L. Briuer and Clay Mathers, appear at first consideration to be unrelated. Both volumes, however, are concerned with the survivorship of the archaeological record and the decisions archaeologists must confront. The archaeological record is a finite, and in many ways a fragile resource, so that our knowledge of the past is dependent in large measure on how this resource base is maintained. While both volumes address maintaining cultural resources, each focuses on different aspects of the survivorship of the archaeological record. A major emphasis of Archaeological Ethics is the looting of archaeological sites, while Trends and Patterns examines issues of managing cultural resources for the future. These volumes are timely, especially for archaeologists in Mississippi, as professionals in the state struggle with developing programs in public education and the issue of site significance. Students of archaeology, avocational archaeologists, and professionals in both cultural resource management and academia can greatly benefit from reading these volumes.

Archaeological Ethics, a collection of articles from Archaeology magazine, is intended to provide a reader for archaeology students. This book is designed to stimulate discussion concerning a variety of philosophical and ethical issues related to archaeology. It is divided into six parts with an introductory chapter and two appendices. Each part is briefly introduced, and each article is summarized as well as followed by a list of discussion questions that could be used by instructors. The articles are well written, as is the editor's Introduction. In the Introduction, Vitelli provides an overview of some ethical issues for archaeologists and provides a case study from her personal experience that illustrates why sites need to be excavated by professional archaeologists. In her case study, "the importance of understanding the context of an artifact as opposed to an interest in the objects alone is highlighted. The Introduction sets the tone for the remainder of the volume. Vitelli concludes with the argument that looters not only rob objects from a site but steal the collective past from everyone.

In Part I, "Looting and Collecting," a number of issues are discussed, but the focus is archaeologists and artifact context as opposed to collectors and looted objects. The relationship between archaeologists and looters/collectors is also explored. The issues are examined from several different perspectives, but some themes are clear. First, looters and collectors (that is, people who only buy artifacts) are inseparable so that one would not exist without the other. Second, a looted object without context is virtually worthless for providing information about the past. Third, education has the potential to be a powerful tool in combating the
looting of archaeological sites. Finally, archaeologists must be careful in their contacts with looters and collectors.

Chase et al. point out that when archaeology was in its infancy the primary concern was in the artifact itself, but this is now an outdated notion. Archaeologists are interested in past cultures and people. Artifacts recovered in context are the means by which archaeologists can address these interests. Context is the vertical and horizontal position of an artifact in an archaeological site as well as associations with other artifacts and features. Looted artifacts lack this context. Fagan vividly makes this point by discussing what was NOT learned from the looted objects at Slack Farm, Kentucky.

A common lament of archaeologists is that looters and collectors are the ones with the complete and unique objects from the past. Archaeologists have a strong desire to examine looted collections. The papers in Part I suggest that this is generally not a good idea. A professional examining a looted collection gives it some legitimacy, which may raise its monetary value. Also, it can be difficult to identify a forgery, of which the antiquities market has many. Further, an archaeologist examining a looted collection ignores the relationship between looter and collector. Too often, the looter is viewed with disdain but the collector is thought to be engaging in a noble activity. Ellia makes a strong case for recognizing the collector as the true looter. Without collectors willing to pay for looted objects, there would be no destruction of archaeological sites for profit.

Part II is entitled “Responses to Looting.” Different means are discussed to stop the looting of archaeological sites. These means range from education to the purchase of sites. Neary provides an interesting look at an aspect of law enforcement that many people probably do not know exists. That is, National Park Service (NPS) agents organizing sting operations involving looted objects. It is suggested that these operations are having an effect on the illegal antiquities market, but the cost prevents such operations from being commonplace. Other means for combating looting are also needed. One such means that does not come with such a high price tag is education. Archaeologists must work to educate people to instill in them the significance of our collective heritage and how artifacts in context provide information about the past. In this way, looting for profit would be abhorrent to the informed public. Harrington discusses the innovative program in our neighbor state of Arkansas where people can earn a certificate in archaeology by working with professionals. This provides a means for lay people interested in the past to be involved and to aid archaeologists.

Another means to stop looting that goes hand-in-hand with education and law enforcement is acquiring, preserving, and managing ar-

chaeological sites. The Archaeological Conservancy, a non-profit organization started in 1980 by archaeologists and private citizens, has saved scores of archaeological sites on private land that are afforded no protection by U.S. antiquities laws. Again, cost is a major concern but the success of the Conservancy illustrates that this method does work.

Clearly, these three means of preventing looting complement one another and should be pursued. Law enforcement and sting operations, public education and involvement programs, and the Archaeological Conservancy and acquisition of sites must be employed simultaneously in order to save archaeological sites and keep costs from being exorbitant.

Issues of cultural heritage and ownership are discussed in Part III with particular regard to times of political unrest and warfare. These articles show that artifacts and a sense of the past have meaning for people today. Ownership of ancient artifacts or cultural treasures can be symbolic of current political situations and battles for power. Today, people who are stripped of their cultural heritage are not viewed in a positive light. The control of another culture’s past through possession and interpretation of looted objects or archaeological remains is a powerful political tool. These points are borne out by “Operation Scroll,” which was a major survey/excavation project carried out by the Israeli Antiquity Authority in the Lower Jordan Valley and western shore of the Dead Sea prior to relinquishing the region. The article clearly shows that if a group could not own the land, stripping it of archaeological resources would be a significant political strategy.

Part IV builds on Part III through a discussion of the peoples affected by archaeology and looting. From the Bering Sea islands to Africa, archaeological sites are being looted, often by indigenous people. Disenfranchised individuals sell the looted objects of their own past for small sums of money to those who eventually make large profits by selling the objects to collectors in other countries. People’s pasts are being swindled and destroyed. Another point in Part IV is that archaeologists have an effect on the people they study. The interpretation of a culture’s past can be as powerful as owning objects of the past. While this is a relatively new issue, McIntosh et al. believe that archaeologists in the future “may transcend the current polemics to reveal the complexity of the human experience without conferring privilege on any particular people or place” (187). Anthropologists conducting ethnographic fieldwork have faced (and largely resolved) this issue. We as archaeologists must follow suit and take responsibility for the consequences of our research.

“Reburial and Repatriation” is the title of Part V. Archaeologists are realizing that they have responsibilities to the descendants of the people they study. Those American archaeologists who do not agree must still
face the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act passed by Congress in 1990 which, among other things, "requires the return, on request, of skeletal remains and burial goods to Native Americans who can prove cultural affiliation with the materials" (209). However, there is still debate concerning under what conditions human remains should be reburied or artifacts repatriated. The general movement appears to be toward compromise and sharing control with those who have an interest.

Part VI is entitled "Professional Behavior." This and the previous two parts illustrate that we archaeologists must continually monitor our own behavior because our work is not conducted in a vacuum and can have far-reaching consequences. In two different chapters, Fagan points a double-barrel cannon at archaeologists in discussing their "arrogant attitude" (242) and "dirty little secret" (247). The arrogant attitude concerns the perspective by professionals that conservation of the archaeological record, ethics, and public education are at best secondary pursuits to traditional archaeological research. Certainly, if the discipline is to move forward, archaeologists must lose this arrogance and embrace non-traditional areas of research that include examination of looters' motives and public education (Fagan 241). The dirty little secret involves the conduct of traditional research, which is excavation failing to produce a written report. Of course, lab work and interpretation take time, but sites continue to be excavated by individuals who have yet to write up fieldwork from previous years. Fagan (247) suggests that "the loss to science is incalculable." As archaeologists, we must clean our proverbial "own house" before we can consider ourselves to be acting as true professionals.

Archaeological Ethics is a remarkable collection of papers because it provides a convenient means to prompt thinking about a number of topics that are usually left unexamined. The volume is designed as a textbook and is needed because too often students do not grapple with issues of looting or professional behavior. The coverage of the many aspects of ethics and the diverse viewpoints included make the volume appealing for academic archaeologists. For North American archaeologists, most of us being rather provincial, the volume allows us to put our own views of ethics in a global context which should further our thinking on the topic. Professionals in cultural resource management (CRM) should find this book inspiring. The larger picture of archaeological ethics is often lost in the day-to-day activities of CRM archaeology, and this volume can provide fresh perspective on those activities. The avocational archaeologist will find this volume highly readable and of use for understanding some of the many aspects of archaeology.

In Trends and Patterns in Cultural Resource Significance, a non-random sample of literature pertaining to the subject of archaeological significance published from 1972 to 1994 is examined. The purpose of this examination is to identify historical trends as well as major patterns in the manner that the concept of significance has been discussed and evaluated. The volume is the first part in a series of publications sponsored by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers which is supported by the Evaluation of Environmental Investments Research Program established by the Department of Defense. The overall goal of the series is to "develop more efficient, objective, and holistic approaches to the assessment of cultural resources" (1). The 600 printed copies of Trends and Patterns have all been sent out (150 to foreign countries), but the book is available for download from the World Wide Web. The volume is divided into four major sections (Introduction, Annotated Bibliography, Interpretations and Analysis, New Directions) with appendices.

This volume and the planned series might be fruitfully viewed as an exercise in paradigm formation. A paradigm is generally discussed from two different perspectives. First, a paradigm encompasses the goals, methods, and theories that are utilized by members of a scientific community. Second, a paradigm is an exemplar of how those goals, methods, and theories are put into practice. In our view, the authors' historical review in Trends and Patterns is an attempt to identify past archaeological paradigms pertaining to significance. The interpretations and suggestions of new directions are first steps in forming a paradigm for determining the significance of cultural resources. The other volumes in the series have the potential to provide the exemplar.

In the "Introduction," the aims of this specific volume are outlined. These aims are to examine the diversity of ideas and approaches to significance generated by archaeologists in the United States and to find areas of agreement and contention between these approaches. The authors state that an effort was made to "highlight" aspects of significance "that have received less attention" (2). With this approach, any previous paradigms as well as any weaknesses would be identified. Further, a foundation is built for developing a new paradigm which could overcome the inadequacies of previous ones.

The second section of this volume is a discussion of the annotated bibliography. The majority of the items in the bibliography are from peer-reviewed journals. As such, it is hard to support the authors' claim that these sources are "often quite difficult to obtain" (3). The annotation of each item is contained in Appendix 5 in a standardized format. Cross references and a variety of indexes make the Annotated Bibliography easy to use and a handy tool. The major problems with the bibliography, which the authors acknowledge, are that it only contains 83 items, it
lacks sources from outside the United States, and it makes very limited use of cultural resource management reports (gray literature).

In the “Interpretations and Analyses” section, the search for trends and patterns in the literature contained in the annotated bibliography is discussed. While the authors are not specifically looking for past paradigms, their statement that “the degree of consensus and convergence concerning the concept of archaeological significance has been limited, leaving the theoretical and methodological workshops strewn with an untidy collection of valuable, but often unassembled pieces” (6) suggests that such paradigms do not exist. This means that the authors are left with the task of examining these past pieces and assembling a new paradigm.

In their review of the significance literature, the authors identify 21 specific concepts that they suggest have had the greatest impact on the way archaeologists conceptualize the topic. These concepts will play an important role in forming the new paradigm for determining archaeological significance. Each concept is placed in historical perspective and a brief overview is presented. The 21 concepts are interrelated, and in recognition of this the authors place each in one of the following 8 groupings: definitional/evaluation criteria, representativeness and redundancy, CRM research designs, proactive management strategies, public involvement, use and development of new analytical approaches, field procedures, and federal legislation. We will discuss each of these 8 groupings with a selective examination of the 21 concepts.

Two key ideas form the basis of the “definitional/evaluation criteria” grouping. The first is that significance is dynamic and relative. The second is that more explicit significance criteria are needed. At first consideration, these two concepts appear opposed. Can significance criteria be both dynamic and explicit? Yes, but such criteria have yet to be devised. Further, as pointed out by the authors, “there are very few examples of explicit evaluation schemes in the bibliography that have been field tested” (12; emphasis added). The problems are to be explicit without being rigid and to be dynamic without allowing “anything goes.” These are formidable tasks, which make the formation of a new paradigm for significance determination more difficult.

The “representativeness and redundancy” grouping focuses on the importance of managing a representative sample of sites for future investigations. Also, the question of how many sites are needed before reaching redundancy is discussed. For site representativeness, the authors point out that there has been little effort to operationalize this concept. With regard to redundancy, it is suggested that such determinations are best made in the context of a research design.

Over the past twenty years, there has been some consensus regarding CRM research designs. Regional research designs with specific problem orientations are thought to be the best approach for determining significance. However, the authors warn against becoming too complacent with this approach. “Even the best executable problem-oriented research design can deal only with a finite set of research questions. Explicit research designs are a necessary prerequisite but by themselves are inadequate” (16). Drawing on the annotated literature, the authors suggest that archaeologists supplement research designs with such things as greater public participation and more interdisciplinary collaborations.

The grouping “proactive management strategies” includes a discussion of archaeological conservancies and planning. A paradigm includes not only theoretical issues, but methods as well. In developing a paradigm regarding archaeological significance, methods must also be discussed for preserving significant cultural resources. The authors suggest that while archaeological conservancies have been sporadically discussed and always in a positive light, there have been no clear operational examples of archaeological preserves and the criteria for establishing them. While both of these conditions may not have been met, we believe archaeologists can be positive about the work of the Archaeological Conservancy which, as previously mentioned, has saved a small but significant number of archaeological sites across the United States. In terms of planning, the authors suggest that evaluations of archaeological significance tend to be reactive in nature and not proactive. They suggest greater use of analytical tools such as geographic information systems to avoid the "crisis and surprise style" of cultural resource management (10).

The grouping “public involvement” includes two concepts: public education/involvement in CRM, and ethnic significance. The authors note that in the reviewed literature there were several articles in the mid- to late 1970s that pertained to CRM and public education/involvement, but more recently there has been less published on these issues. We feel that this does not reflect a lack of interest in this topic but rather an emphasis on practice. The Society for American Archaeology Public Education Committee is very active, with a number of projects ranging from state coordinators for education to children’s books involving archaeology. Another example of public education/involvement is the outstanding Passports in Time Project sponsored by the U.S. Forest Service, which provides opportunities for the public to participate in a wide array of cultural resource projects including archaeological excavations. Also in this section, the authors suggest that the concept of ethnic significance grew out of public education/involvement and that "the concept of a social or public value for cultural resources was extended to include a consideration of ethnicity and Native American concerns” (20). While
archaeologists are rightly concerned with Native American opinions regarding significance, they must also seek out other minority groups. Continued public education/involvement and reaching out to minority groups in general should help ensure that archaeologists do not adopt a "professionals know best" attitude and that CRM is accomplished in an inclusive rather than exclusive manner.

The groupings "use and development of new analytical approaches" and "field procedures" both concern innovation in CRM and significance determinations. Again, these would relate to the methods of the new paradigm. The authors warn against "cookbook procedures." GIS and exploratory data analysis are suggested as new tools for examining sites as part of a regional database. Non-intrusive field methods such as remote sensing and photogrammetry are recommended as essential elements for promoting the conservation ethic of CRM. These new techniques and tools have the potential to radically alter the practice of CRM, and archaeologists should embrace their use. However, new tools and approaches should not be viewed as the saviors for conducting CRM and making significance determinations. As outlined in this volume, there are many complex issues involved that must be addressed for managing and conserving the archaeological record. Understanding that these new methods are only one part of a paradigm for determining significance should help avoid the notion that technology will be more than a quick fix.

The final grouping is "federal legislation," which focuses on the concept of the "adequacy and value of National Register criteria." This issue has been hotly debated by archaeologists. Questions of explicitness and flexibility are keys to this debate. We feel that the argument that the criteria are useful is valid, because flexibility is currently allowed in making significance determinations. This does not mean that the National Register criteria could not be improved through making them more explicit, but this must not be done at the expense of flexibility. From the perspective of paradigm formation, the paradigm itself may lack flexibility but, as seen when observing a variety of disciplines, paradigms are often replaced. Replacement of an old paradigm with a new one is usually accompanied by major strides in understanding.

This review of the eight groupings and 21 concepts identified by the authors is selective and reflects those for which we thought could provide some insight. There is certainly much in this section of Trends and Patterns for archaeologists to consider that we did not touch upon here. We feel that these 21 concepts are an excellent starting point for developing a paradigm for determining significance and managing significant cultural resources.

The final section of this volume is "Opportunities and New Directions." The authors believe that to put the concepts and ideas in practice, archaeologists must move beyond "immediate interests and expertise" (27) to a practice of stewardship. The authors advocate a holistic ecosystem or landscape approach for evaluating, protecting, and preserving cultural resources. An important component of stewardship is the development of set-aside areas for managing different resources. Stewardship then would be one of the overarching elements of the paradigm formed by the authors. Also, the authors repeat their case for adopting GIS and other new analytical tools and approaches. They discuss cooperative links as a means to lower costs for set-aside areas, and such cooperative links might also be useful for making expensive new equipment available to a large number of archaeologists involved in CRM. Finally, future plans for this series are discussed, with the focus on "development of one case study illustrating how new approaches to significance evaluation can be operationalized and tested in the field" (32). Such a case study would fit the idea of paradigm as an exemplar. An exemplar would go far in establishing a paradigm for others to adopt. This case study/exemplar is in the works and has a planned publication date of late 1997.

The volume Trends and Patterns is an excellent discussion of the issues related to cultural resource significance. In reviewing past literature on the topic, the authors have the background for developing a paradigm that moves well beyond previous approaches to significance. If the authors want other archaeologists to adopt the idea of stewardship and embrace new analytical tools and approaches, then they must complete the next step of providing an exemplar where these ideas, approaches, and methods are put into practice. The publication of the case study in 1997 is eagerly anticipated. Viewing their proposed series of publications as an exercise in paradigm formation may aid the authors in making an even greater contribution to the field of archaeology.

The volume is also a valuable resource on significance for a variety of audiences. Students of archaeology will appreciate the "Cliffs Notes" aspect of the volume as it summarizes a large amount of literature and provides insight into that literature. Archaeologists in academia will find the volume useful for providing points for classroom discussion. CRM archaeologists will find Trends and Patterns a handy resource for their own use and a volume that could be passed along to their supervisors who are not archaeologists. In this way, the complexity of decisions regarding cultural resources and the considerations that must be taken into account will be illustrated.

These two volumes should be read by professional archaeologists, students, and avocational archaeologists. They stimulate thinking on critical issues affecting cultural resources in our state and around the world. Further, some new solutions are offered for addressing old problems. These volumes are particularly timely for Mississippi, as old prob-
lems continue to plague archaeologists and new ones continue to arise, but solutions are also being discussed and tried.

One of the old problems is the looting and selling of artifacts, which is pervasive in the state as well as other regions of the world. The consequences of these destructive activities are clearly illustrated in *Archaeological Ethics*, and some potential answers to the problem of looting are discussed. The arrest and subsequent sentence of looters at the Vicksburg National Military Park in 1990 show that law enforcement can work to prevent some looting in the state. Also, education efforts in Mississippi such as the U.S. Forest Service Passport in Time Project (PIT) are important for reaching the public and providing constructive activities for interested individuals. The protection of archaeological sites in Mississippi is also being attained through acquiring sites for preservation and management. These are important steps, but more work is still needed.

One of the newly recognized problems in Mississippi pertains to archaeological site significance. At the 1996 Mississippi Association of Professional Archaeologists (MAPA) meeting, a heated debate centered on determining the significance of archaeological sites. No conclusions were reached, but a dialogue was begun. *Trends and Patterns* outlines some key issues for consideration and may aid archaeologists in Mississippi in coming to some consensus.

These volumes also point to some deeper issues that deserve consideration, such as what it means to be a professional archaeologist. The question for professional archaeologists in Mississippi to consider is what, precisely, do we owe to the archaeological record, upon which rest our inferences about the past and our very livelihood? We all acknowledge that there is only a limited number of archaeological sites and there are threats to the survival of those sites. As professionals in Mississippi, have we too often focused on discussion and avoided taking action? The demands on our time are substantial, and it is difficult to work actively for the preservation of our archaeological heritage. In other words, the reward system and our interests/priorities being what they are, we complacently give lip service to the idea of preserving the past while acting on a different set of priorities and principles. It is time to recognize that the responsibility for preserving the past lies largely with professional archaeologists, because without this database there would no longer be a need for archaeologists at the Corps of Engineers, Mississippi Department of Transportation, Mississippi Department of Archives and History, National Park Service, Mississippi State University, University of Mississippi, University of Southern Mississippi, U.S. Forest Service, and private contracting firms. After all, who else is truly in a position to bring about those changes that are necessary? Certainly, efforts to preserve the archaeological record should be done in collaboration with amateurs.

government officials, teachers, and landowners, but the impetus should derive from us.

The volumes *Archaeological Ethics* and *Trends and Patterns* point out that the two greatest threats to the archaeological database and our livelihood are: 1) looting and 2) loss of sites through failing to recognize their significance. Both of these threats have resulted to some degree from our own negligence. A few individuals have worked to educate the public about the consequences of looting, or prosecuted looters, or argued about widening our collective vision of the significance of various archaeological sites. This is not enough, as is evident in reading the two volumes reviewed here and examining the state of archaeology in Mississippi. We can no longer afford the luxury of only being concerned with a small subset of archaeological sites that we as individuals find particularly interesting such as Paleoindian, or African-American slave, or Poverty Point, or Mississippian mound sites, because such an attitude and lack of action have proved ineffective. All of us need to do our part and work together, realizing that acting in concert increases our strength and effectiveness. We have in place two institutions, MAA and MAPA, to work through to address the two greatest threats to archaeological sites.

MAA, historically, is professional and avocational archaeologists working together. With a little more effort from each of us, we can use this vehicle to teach more non-archaeologists about the effects of looting and the importance of preservation. Public outreach through MAA, if everyone contributes, would be a powerful way to prevent site looting.

MAPA, as a professional organization, can provide a forum for addressing issues of site significance and preservation in our state. The only way to reach this goal is if all professional archaeologists participate and work together. The valiant efforts of a few people have not been enough to stop the destruction of our past. These are important beginning steps, but if more people do not join the battle, such efforts are no more than straightening deck chairs on the Titanic.

Decisions must be made and questions answered. What do archaeologists owe the archaeological record? What do people owe their collective past? We owe our undivided attention. The volumes, *Archaeological Ethics* and *Trends and Patterns*, can help us focus that attention.

Philip J. Carr is a Staff Archaeologist for the Environmental Division of the Mississippi Department of Transportation. Amy L. Young is an Assistant Professor of Anthropology and Sociology at the University of Southern Mississippi.

Reviewed by Eugene M. Futato

This book is an outgrowth of a symposium presented at the 1989 Southeastern Archaeological Conference in Tampa, Florida. The symposium was entitled “Twenty-six Years Along Kentucky’s Green River: Papers in Honor of Patty Jo Watson.” The volume includes the symposium papers, except one, and is supplemented by the addition of three contributions not included in the original proceedings.

In the introductory chapter, Cheryl Ann Munson provides a brief history of Watson’s research in the Green River area, dividing the work into three phases. The first phase consisted of work in Salts and Mammoth Caves “with an emphasis on time-space systematics.” This was followed by ten years of research on the Early Woodland economy and the origins of the food plants which had been found in the caves. This era saw the area of research shift to include the shell mounds in the Big Bend area, downriver from the caves. The final, and continuing phase, is characterized by broader work by additional investigators on additional types of sites and on a regional scale. Site preservation efforts and a renewed emphasis on the value of curated collections are additional hallmarks of the current period of Green River archaeology.

The next several papers focus on the archaeological research on the Mammoth Cave system. These include: the development of an initial cultural chronology for the area (Chapter 2, by Kennet C. Carstens); a discussion of site distribution and settlement patterns in Mammoth Cave National Park (Chapter 3, by Guy Prentice); an overview of prehistoric mining at Mammoth Cave (Chapter 4, by Kenneth B. Tankersley); the description of glyphs in several caves (Chapter 5, by Philip J. DiBiaski); a summary and analysis of radiocarbon dates (Chapter 6, by Mary C. Kennedy); and a consideration of the management of caves as cultural resources (Chapter 7, by Jan Marie Hemberger). The papers in this section are quite uneven in length. Four of the papers are only six pages to eight pages long. The two more substantial articles in this section are those by Prentice (21 pages) and by Kennedy (34 pages).

Prentice’s analysis of archaeological survey data from Mammoth Cave National Park (MCNP) utilizes data from three field seasons of work. A total of just over 70 hectares of uplands and 30.3 hectares of bottomlands was investigated by a total of 1,594 shovel tests. Assuming a uniform distribution, this works out to 1 test per 667 square meters, or the equivalent of testing on 26 m grid intervals, fairly intensive coverage. Another 1,359 hectares of bluffline were also surveyed. The site survey data were supplemented by a third season devoted to test excavations at seven sites. Six types of habitation sites were defined: large and small rock shelters, large and small upland scatters, and large and small bottomland sites. Both of the large open site types were associated with proximity to the river, while both of the smaller types were associated with smaller tributaries.

The study of bluff shelters includes a comparison of the size distribution of occupied rock shelters as opposed to all available overhangs. The size distribution of all overhangs produces a rather smooth J curve with a great many very small shelters and relatively few medium to large shelters. The graph of occupied shelters is bimodal, with few occupied shelters in the smallest class and few in the middle sizes. I suspect, however, that the apparent bimodality is an artifact of the analysis or the data sample. There are very few overhangs in these middle sizes, and the occupation of only one or two would have erased most of the apparent bimodality. What is obvious, though, is that larger overhangs were somewhat selected for and that very small overhangs were largely selected against. I suspect that removing the smallest size class from the analysis would result in a much more random-looking picture of size utilization.

What is more significant, perhaps, and on more solid footing, is the different function of the large and small shelters. The larger shelters include a broader range of artifact types and facilities and seemingly were utilized by larger numbers of occupants for longer periods of time. The small shelters usually contain fewer artifacts from only one occupation or from multiple occupations that may be widely separated in time.

The large and small upland site categories both appear to represent sites of short term occupation, with the larger sites simply being occupied more often. Interestingly, no evidence of features has been located at either the large or small upland sites. All occupation of the floodplain is limited by the frequent, severe spring flooding.

The chapter concludes with the integration of the settlement data from MCNP with settlement and subsistence data from the Big Bend area of Green River, approximately 60 km downstream. The settlement of MCNP is considered to reflect an upland/lowland season round, established by the Late Archaic and lasting, with some changes, for nearly 3,000 years. The model presents not only accounts for the observed site types, but also offers an explanation of why the remains from the caves
are so dominated by cultivated plants when cultivated plants are so minimally represented in materials from other sites. One unaddressed point about which I remain curious is whether Prentice believes that the MCNP settlements and those of the Big Bend area are part of one system, or that the MCNP sites form a complete system on their own.

The second extensive chapter in this section is a detailed review of the available radiocarbon dates from Mammoth and Salts Caves. This is by far the longest chapter in the book, almost as long as the second and third longest combined. The chapter is far more than a review of the dates, however. The dates are described and the basic data presented, but most of the article is spent in an analysis of the dates, the physical and cultural contexts of the dates, potential sources of error in the dates, and stratigraphic inconsistencies in the dates. Anyone who falls into a relaxed mode of thinking of these things as simple should read this paper carefully. In the end, the dates show that the interiors of the caves were most intensively utilized during the first millennium B.C., with evidence for significant utilization in the prior millennium as well. Moreover, the dietary complex evident in paleoeces from the interior and the archaeological deposits in the Salts Cave vestibule seem to constitute a suite of plants that are temporally diagnostic in their own right.

The following section of the volume comprises the shell mound portion, six contributions primarily on the work in the Big Bend area of Green River. These include papers on: ethno-botany, emphasizing methodology and its effects on sample bias and comparability (Chapter 8, by Galen E. Wagner); analysis of the lithic materials from WPA excavations at the Read shell mound (Chapter 9, by Christine K. Hensley); an overview of the bioarchaeology of the sites (Chapter 10 by Valerie A. Haskins and Nicholas P. Herrmann); a second bioarchaeology paper which more specifically considers the paleopathology of three of the sites (Chapter 11 by Mary Lucas Powell); a consideration of the various research domains of shell (Chapter 12 by Cheryl Claassen); and an overview of riverine adaptation in the MidSouth (Chapter 13 by David Dye).

Claassen’s paper outlines a number of general research topics and specific research questions concerning shells and their use. Some of the topics addressed include the use of shell in studies of seasonality and habitats. The question of why many mounds show an abundance of paired (unopened) valves is also considered, as is the use of shells in the manufacture of beads and other ornaments. What is the origin of some of these shells? Why go to the trouble to import shells to a shell midden anyway? And what can we learn by examining the distribution of various bead types through time and space? The final section of this paper addresses questions of site type, site function, and the symbolic meaning of shells. Although this is one of the shorter papers in this section of the book, I find it one of the more intriguing. As in any overview, many of these questions have been raised before, and Claassen has considered some of them in more detail elsewhere. But one key to productive research is asking interesting questions, and while I do not always agree with Claassen’s proposed answers, her work almost always gives me something new to think about.

Dye’s paper, the longest in the shell mounds portion of the book, ranges outside the Green River area to look at the development of Middle Holocene riverine adaptations and increasing cultural complexity across the Middle South. The sites he discusses include: the Anderson site, on the Harpeth River in central Tennessee; the Eva site, located in the western Tennessee River valley of west Tennessee; and the Mulberry Creek site, located in the middle Tennessee River valley in northwestern Alabama. The occupation of these sites generally begins, more or less, during early Morrow Mountain times and extends through some portion of the Eva/Morrow Mountain, Sykes/White Springs, and Benton continuum recognized across the region. The developmental and occupational sequence of each site is outlined with regard to subsistence, seasonality, site facilities, intergroup exchange and conflict, etc. Evidence from these sites and others is then drawn together to indicate that at approximately 5000 B.C., there began an increasing focus on riverine resources associated with a warming and drying trend which encouraged the development and/or stabilization of shoals along the major rivers. The increasing use of these locations is associated with evidence for greater sedentism, higher increasing territoriality, and possibly concomitant increases in both intergroup aggression and exchange. Most of these ideas are not new, but Dye does a good job in summarizing a lot of information in one of the more substantive contributions in this volume.

The book ends with a short chapter by Patty Jo Watson that provides a personal history of the cave and shell mounds research and reviews both the contributions and future directions of the research.

What, then, is the sum of this book? It does provide an overview of the breadth and significance of the caves and shell mounds research. And the influence of Watson (the original SEAC honoree) is shown in the general directions of the research and the concern for rigor in methodology, etc. But in many ways, this book, like the research itself, is a work in progress. There are only 164 pages of text and illustrations divided among 14 papers. Much of this length is in a few long chapters; the majority are eight pages or less. Many do not seem to have been expanded beyond the original SEAC 15 or 20 minute length. It is probably no coincidence that the three post-SEAC additions are among the longer contributions.
This book can be thought of as a Whitman’s Sampler of cave and shell mound archaeology. It contains a little bit of a number of things. They are generally done pretty well and you will get your money’s worth. On the other hand, if you approach it with real hunger it will likely leave you wanting more.

Eugene M. Futato is Curator of Archaeological Collections with the University of Alabama Museums.


Reviewed by Jeffrey Mitchem

This book is a revised version of David Anderson’s 1990 doctoral dissertation, for which he was awarded the Society for American Archaeology’s Doctoral Dissertation Prize in 1991. Although the title sounds like it would be mainly of interest to archaeologists in South Carolina and Georgia, the book is of much broader significance. Archaeologists interested in chiefdoms and/or the late prehistoric and early contact periods anywhere in eastern North America and the Mississippi Valley will find plenty of interesting ideas in Anderson’s work.

The overall focus of the book is an examination of what Anderson calls “cycling,” which refers to the process of change in the complexity of chiefdoms over time, becoming both more and less complex. Complexity, as used here, refers to the number of decision-making levels within a particular chiefdom. Anderson’s argument is that changes or fluctuations in complexity are an inherent factor in all chiefdoms. He uses archaeological and ethnohistorical data from the Savannah River Valley as a case study.

The first couple of chapters define cycling and discuss the general evidence for it in the Southeast. As Anderson notes, the Savannah River drainage reveals especially good evidence of extensive cycling among late prehistoric chiefdoms. In his discussion of the causes of cycling, he brings up a number of thought-provoking points about southeastern chiefdoms that are equally applicable to late prehistoric cultures in the Mississippi Valley region.

In the third and fourth chapters, the author begins setting forth the evidence for late prehistoric and protohistoric political change, both ethnohistorical and archaeological. The ethnohistory chapter is a thorough overview of information gleaned from early European narratives, with special emphasis on forays into Georgia and the surrounding area. The archaeological evidence begins with discussions of Mississippian culture and chiefdoms, then integrates archaeological and ethnohistorical information from Mississippian polities as widespread as Cahokia, Moundville, and Coosa. Anderson does an admirable job of synthesizing a tremendous amount of information about Mississippian culture, and Chapter 4 could stand by itself as an introductory overview of Mississippian archaeology.

The next chapter focuses on the archaeology of the South Appalachian area and the Savannah River Valley. There is a lot of information about specific sites, along with data from excavations and other research projects. In the sixth through eighth chapters, Anderson goes into great detail discussing the archaeological evidence for political change at individual sites and within aboriginal polities in the area. He looks at change through time, as well as at environmental and sociocultural factors that influenced political development and decline.

The sum total of all this is nearly overwhelming to the reader, because it is virtually impossible to assimilate all of the data that are included. I imagine this would be especially true for someone with no prior knowledge of the archaeology of the South Appalachian region. But the message comes through that complex chiefdoms arose and declined in the Savannah River drainage among a great many smaller, simple chiefdoms. And similar situations existed to varying degrees all over the Southeast and the Mississippi Valley.

Wading through the sea of data is worth it, as Anderson devotes the ninth and final chapter to summarizing his interpretations of cycling in the Savannah River Valley. The main message I got from this is that the evidence does not support an interpretation of collapse of the local complex chiefdoms solely due to environmental factors, but more likely because of a combination of political and climatic changes. Many of these natural and cultural factors influence each other, and Anderson points out that both in the Savannah River Valley and elsewhere in the greater Southeast, depopulation, abandonment, and the general collapse of complex chiefdoms were often the result of the natural cycling inherent in chiefdoms.

Two appendices provide the interested reader with annotated early descriptions of Mississippian sites and with an overview of the cultural sequences in the Savannah River Basin. The overview also includes reproductions of various stamped designs from pottery typical of the region.

The book is attractively designed, well-bound, and I noticed few typographical errors. Once again, the University of Alabama Press is to be commended for publishing professional books at an affordable price.
Anderson’s book is a tour de force, and it is easy to see why it won the SAA Dissertation Prize. Archaeologists interested in chiefdoms and Mississippian cultures will find many stimulating ideas here, and the concept of cycling is an important contribution to the field of late prehistoric and protohistoric archaeology in the Southeast and the Mississippi Valley.

Jeffrey M. Mitchem is the Arkansas Archeological Survey Station Archaeologist at Parkin Archeological State Park, and is an Assistant Professor of Anthropology at the University of Arkansas.


Reviewed by Jon L. Gibson

John Griffin departed this life in the fall of 1993 but not without leaving us with a legacy of his life’s work in Fifty Years of Southeastern Archaeology. This handsome book contains sixteen milestone papers and a personal letter, which document the scope of his archaeological and ethnohistorical interests and chronicle his career. With one exception, Griffin himself chose the papers to be included, and this makes an important statement. These sixteen papers are how John Griffin wanted us to remember him. His narrative clarity, provocative ideas, and impeccable logic enrich formative southern archaeological and ethnohistorical literature, and they evoke warm memories of an anthropologist and a man who played a large role in the coming-of-age of historic sites archaeology.

Patricia Griffin, John Griffin’s long-time colleague, edited the volume and penned the introduction, which traces his long archaeological career and provides insightful commentary on his papers. No one was ever better suited for such a task. You see, Patricia Griffin is not only a well-known historical anthropologist and preservationist, she was also John’s wife.

Kathleen Deagan wrote the foreword. She acknowledges Griffin’s mentor status (12), despite his having followed a career largely outside academia. And what an eventful period of American archaeological history his career spanned; starting in the late 1930s when culture history quietly born, through the 1960s–1970s when an ungrateful “new” archaeology “screamed and kicked” at its culture-history parent, to the 1980s–1990s when archaeology began a fresh search for “what it really wants to be when it grows up.”

John Griffin’s role in all of this was that of pioneer developer of historic sites archaeology and tireless advocate of public outreach and preservation. Deagan also notes: “His work in prehistoric archaeology...is no less impressive and no less prescient” (xvi), primarily because of its ecological orientation. Griffin set forth some of the earliest syntheses of Florida prehistory and latest syntheses of mission archaeology. Although his adopted state of Florida held his heart, it could not contain his timely works and influence, which reached far beyond the white beaches and red hills and into the core of American archaeology.

In Chapter 1, Griffin tells how he came into anthropology and became a historical archaeologist. Chapter 2 is an assessment of the status of Florida archaeology, which, in Patricia Griffin’s words, “led to his being hired as Florida’s first professional archaeologist” (7). Chapter 3 is about a short-lived migration of bison into Illinois and the economic impact the animal had on native economies. Chapter 4 is a cogent plea for using both history and archaeology to “clarify the picture of the aboriginal population during the contact period” (44), a plea reiterated in Chapter 13. He is speaking about Florida, but his words are really geographically unbounded. Chapter 5 is one of the earliest culture-historical summaries of Florida prehistory, and Chapter 10 describes the Florida investigations of early archaeologists Jeffries Wyman, S. T. Walker, and Clarence B. Moore. His archaeological research on Spanish missions—the capstone of his career—is presented in Chapters 6 and 9; the first dealing with the Apalachee mission of San Luis, and the second with the Cubo Line, a fortification built during the Second Spanish Colonial period in St. Augustine. His work at the Addison Blockhouse, detailed in Chapter 7, confirmed that it was a fortification built by Americans during the Seminole War and was not a colonial Spanish fort, as local myth insisted. Griffin dug at Booker T. Washington’s boyhood home, confirming its location and its humble nature (Chapter 8), and at Osceola’s grave, dispelling reports that the famous Seminole chief’s remains had been stolen (Chapter 11). His paper on “Prehistoric Life in Russell Cave” is a prime example of his ecological slant and an exposition of winter-hunting-camp occupations, which took place there over an 8,000-year span (Chapter 12). Chapter 14 is one of the seminal accounts of the Timucuans at the moment of Spanish entrada. In Chapter 15, Griffin documents the upset of native life in the Everglades at the hands of the Europeans and white Americans, and Chapter 16 is a more general discussion of contact consequences, especially acculturation. Don’t look for sympathy or apology for the foul treatment of indigenous peoples. Griffin is a dispassionate collector and presenter of historical facts and figures.
The book contains two appendices; the first is the text of a 1940 letter advocating a statewide survey of Florida archaeological sites, and the second is a selected bibliography of his publications. An index and a hidden, untitled page giving original sources of his Selected Works complete the book.

Some people will come to know John Griffin only from his Selected Works. And they will find a remarkable anthropological archaeologist, a specialist in contact-period historic sites and a founding figure in the development and legitimization of that field. But for those of us who knew him first hand, his Selected Works have deeper meaning. They will always remind us of a thin, tousle-haired, bespectacled man with a contagious enthusiasm, who by kind word and infectious grin enriched the quality and joy of our professional lives.

Jon L. Gibson is a son of the South and an archaeologist who works at the University of Southwestern Louisiana.


Reviewed by Jim Barnett

Janet Rafferty’s report on the Owl Creek site (22-Cs-502), in northeastern Mississippi, documents a Mississippian manifestation that is significant because of its unexpected location. This multi-mound ceremonial center is situated on an upland ridge over 30 kilometers from the nearest major river. The Owl Creek Mounds, also known as the “Shiloh Church Mounds,” are five mounds arrayed around a central plaza, which is rudely bisected from east to west by a county road. Mounds I and II are north of this road and are owned by the U. S. Forest Service. Mounds III-V are south of the road and are privately owned. The site was excavated by Rafferty and Mississippi State University (MSU) Field School students during 14 weeks of fieldwork in 1991 and 1992.

The project’s goals are clearly stated in the Introduction: make a detailed map of the site, determine when the mounds were built, and estimate the intensity of occupation. These goals were met, although not without difficulty. In Owl Creek, the MSU team tackled a site that had been disturbed by aboriginal mound-building activities, scarred by plowing and unscientific digging, trenched by Depression-era archaeologists, cut by road construction, and partially bulldozed by well-meaning Forest Service personnel.

The first systematic examination of the site took place in the summer of 1935, when Moreau B. C. Chambers visited the area under the auspices of the Mississippi Department of Archives and History (MDAH). He and his team made a surface collection and dug trenches through Mounds II, IV, and V. Rafferty has reconstructed Chambers’ work using his diary, his letters to colleagues, surviving profile drawings, photographs, collections now housed at Louisiana State University (LSU), and even notes in bottles, which Chambers buried in one of the mounds. (Chambers died in 1994, while the Owl Creek report was being prepared for publication.) Also put to good use are the observations and surface collections made at the site by a succession of other distinguished archaeologists: Jesse Jennings, Robert Neitzel, Richard Marshall, Jim Atkinson, and Sam Brookes.

The field school began with excavation units combined with auger testing in the two mounds owned by the Forest Service. Rafferty’s reopening and use of Chambers’ trench in Mound II will serve as an example to those working in previously-excavated sites. Limited excavations were also carried out in the three privately-owned mounds. In areas away from the mounds, shovel testing was used along with excavation units to determine occupation intensity.

Ceramic analysis dominates the chapter on chronology. Finding relatively few decorated sherds, Rafferty focused on tempering material as a sorting variable. Although I admit to having a low pain threshold when it comes to looking at tables of potsherd counts in archaeological reports, I found Rafferty’s tables to be quite accessible. Archaeologists working with sites in the vicinity of Owl Creek will certainly appreciate this careful attention to ceramic details. A Woodland occupation is represented by sand- and grog-tempered sherds with some fabric and cord marking. Rafferty’s argument for an Early Mississippian component at Owl Creek is supported by finding shell-tempered sherds on the pre-mound surface beneath two of the mounds and by calibrated radiocarbon dates from mound samples ranging from A.D. 782 to 1219. Although comparisons with sherd collections from other early Mississippian sites in the region showed some predictable similarities—Moundville, Bessemer, and Hiwassee Island receive careful consideration—Rafferty failed to locate an exact soul-mate for Owl Creek. She speculates that this may be due in part to Owl Creek’s slightly earlier Mississippian occupation. A protohistoric/historic component is recognized from a Chickasah Combed sherd, a gun flint, and a piece of green glass found by the MSU team. Chambers also found some evidence of late occupation. His diary mentions trade beads in burials on one of the mounds and contains a refer-
The report concludes with a section on Floral Remains. Wood remains were found to be mostly hickory or oak. All excavated areas of the site except one yielded corn remains. A detailed table provides a list of other floral remains. Since only a few animal bone fragments were recovered, the report lacks a faunal inventory. Deer, represented by pieces of a tooth, is the only species mentioned.

For now, Owl Creek’s upland location makes it an anomaly, although this may change with future work in areas where Mississippian sites are least expected. Rafferty concludes that the site was first a Middle to Late Woodland village that later became an Early Mississippian ceremonial center. During this latter period, the site was apparently vacant most of the time. This interpretation is supported by the low density of occupational debris, low phosphate levels in soil samples, and low counts of shell-tempered sherds in the non-mound areas. Perhaps future work in the vicinity of Owl Creek can provide information on the settlement behavior of the people who used the mound center. I was a little disappointed that Rafferty didn’t offer any speculation about the protohistoric/historic component in the report’s Conclusions.

In addition to broadening the Mississippian database, Janet Rafferty’s Owl Creek report provides a good opportunity to contrast the archaeological techniques and standards of today with those of sixty years ago. Missing from Chambers’ 1935 work, but present in Rafferty’s, are definite project goals, a conservative excavation philosophy seeking to extract the maximum amount of data with a minimum amount of earth-moving, timely report publication, and careful consideration of interpretive possibilities. This report is essential reading for professionals interested in Mississippian ceremonial centers. I also recommend it to serious amateurs as a good example of how an archaeological project is conducted.

Jim Barnett is Director of the Historic Properties Division of the Mississippi Department of Archives and History.


Reviewed by Charles H. McNutt

Edwin Lyon has provided the student of southeastern archaeology an incredibly detailed account of southeastern archaeology during the 1930s and extending into the early 1940s. Projects sponsored or supervised by the Smithsonian Institution, the Federal Emergency Relief Administration (FERA), the Civil Works Administration (CWA), the Works
Progress Administration (WPA), the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), and the National Park Service (NPS) are discussed.

Lyon rightfully observes that the FERA's main contribution to New Deal archaeology was its early demonstration, with its project at Marksville in the summer of 1933, that respectable fieldwork could be done with very large crews. Frank Setzler of the Smithsonian Institution and his assistant, James A. Ford, directed a crew of more than 100 men in an orderly excavation that recovered much valuable information. Unfortunately, the results of this excavation were never properly published, but the ability to use large crews—critical to most of the subsequent New Deal projects—had been demonstrated.

Pre-Depression archaeology in the Southeast is summarized succinctly in Chapter 1. Most of the work in the Southeast had been sponsored by major northern museums—the Peabody Museum at Harvard, the American Museum of Natural History, the Heye Foundation, and Phillips Academy at Andover. Much, but not all, of their activity was stimulated by the productive efforts of C. B. Moore and other early collectors. The Smithsonian Institution made major contributions in problem-oriented projects concerning the “mound-builder” question (Squires and Davis; Cyrus Thomas), ceramic provinces (Holmes), and a handbook of aboriginal American antiquities (Holmes). The significance of the National Research Council's (NRC) sponsorship of state archaeological surveys is also described. Work by southern agencies was not well developed—primarily due to lack of major museums and other sources of funds. The Smithsonian and NRC assisted some individuals in the South, but on a limited basis. The 1928 assessment of the pre-Depression situation in the South prepared by Carl Guthe, chairman of the NRC Committee on State Archaeological Surveys, will be of interest to all.

Chapter 2 deals with the origins of New Deal archaeology, stressing the importance of the large CWA and TVA projects. Most of the earlier FERA projects had been managed at the state level, causing considerable confusion and inconsistency from project to project. Many of the CWA projects were executed through the Smithsonian Institution, hence were more closely coordinated. Major projects were at Macon, with Arthur R. Kelly as supervisor, and in Florida, with Matthew W. Stirling as overall coordinator. Activities in the Tennessee Valley presented quite a different picture. Here, a series of dams was to be constructed along the course of the Tennessee River drainage that would affect sites in Mississippi, Alabama, and Tennessee. A natural stage for interstate competition was set—and it lived up to expectations. William S. Webb was selected as TVA's archaeological consultant. The first projects were in the Norris and Wheeler basins. Webb chose T. M. N. Lewis as supervisor for work in the Norris Basin, which began in January 1934. Work in the Wheeler Basin began at about the same time; Webb appointed David DeJarnette as supervisor for this project. Reports on these basins were published by Webb in 1938 and 1939, respectively.

Chapter 3 is devoted to the state of archaeology in the 1930s. The Depression turned many collectors into pot-hunters, and the number of fakes increased dramatically. Setzler and William Duncan Strong called for a united front against these depredations. They were joined by the NRC's Committee on State Archaeological Surveys, which ultimately founded the Society for American Archaeology in 1934. The importance of stratigraphy and the direct historical approach, the McKern taxonomic system, and the significance of the University of Chicago's field school at Kincaid for training many of the future New Deal archaeologists is discussed.

Chapter 4 discusses WPA archaeology, which became increasingly important after the passage of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935. The WPA sponsored a large number of archaeological projects, but had little initial expertise in selecting or monitoring professionally acceptable projects. Advice was sought on an informal basis from the Smithsonian Institution and the National Park Service. Finally, the need for an archaeological director in the WPA became increasingly apparent. The efforts of Vincenzo Petruillo, and later Stella Deignan, to find a middle ground between the WPA's desire for efficiently organized projects and the archaeologists' desire for maximum flexibility were truly Herculean—and successful. The importance of these people to New Deal archaeology deserves more recognition than is commonly acknowledged. Major WPA-funded projects are discussed by state.

Chapter 5 deals with post-Wheeler Basin TVA-WPA archaeology. Webb had been maintaining as an archaeologist for the TVA, and when three new dams were initiated—Chickamauga, Guntersville, and Pickwick—Webb was placed in overall charge. Work in all three basins began in 1936. Webb opposed Lewis' desire to control work in both Chickamauga and Pickwick, finally persuading Lewis to concentrate on Chickamauga and allow the University of Alabama to manage Guntersville and Pickwick. The Pickwick report by Webb and DeJarnette was published in 1942, but publication of the Guntersville report, 95% complete in 1941, was delayed by World War II, and published in abbreviated form by Webb and Wilder only in 1951.

The Chickamauga Basin proved to be a major sore point between Webb and Lewis. Lewis felt that Webb's relatively rapid publication policy left much to be desired, and planned to remedy the situation in his Chickamauga report. This, however, required much time and money, and Lewis was soon being pressed by Webb, the WPA, and the TVA to publish the Chickamauga report. This was particularly the case as Lewis
argued for additional work and funding in the Watts Bar–Fort Loudon-Douglas reservoirs and the Kentucky Lake reservoir. In 1940, the WPA, which was furnishing labor for these projects, pointed out to Lewis that he had set dates of July 1, 1940, for completion of the Chickamauga report (extended by the WPA to April 1, 1941), August 1, 1940, for Watts Bar, and July 1942 for the Kentucky Basin. Lewis called his professional friends to petition the WPA to permit continued expansion of the Tennessee program and was successful. When the rough draft of the Chickamauga manuscript was finally completed, it ran an estimated 750 pages and weighed more than nine pounds. Because of the World War II defense emergency, TVA refused to fund publication of such a huge manuscript, but the University of Tennessee promised Lewis that it would find the necessary funds. Lewis never published the Chickamauga report—or any other basin report—but the University of Tennessee has been true to its word: the Chickamauga Basin report, edited by Lynne P. Sullivan, was published in two volumes in 1995. To the credit of Lewis and Kneberg, they did publish two major site reports: Hiwassee Island in the Chickamauga Basin (1946) and Eva in the Kentucky Basin (1961). It should also be observed that there were massive construction projects in Tennessee throughout the 1930s and into the 1940s, creating many administrative problems for both TVA and the WPA, and generating an environment in which completion of basin reports was particularly difficult.

Chapter 6 deals with the National Park Service and its contributions to New Deal Archaeology. Actually, the NPS has been mentioned several times in the above paragraphs. In 1938, Arthur R. Kelly, who had been in charge of the Macon excavations for the Smithsonian, was placed in charge of the NPS’s Archeological Sites Division. Just as Kelley had earlier tried to dominate Georgia archaeology, he tried to dominate southeastern archaeology from his position in the NPS. Kelly suggested to Petruzzo that all WPA-financed projects be coordinated and integrated by the NPS. Kelley envisioned cooperative projects by many institutions; some of these came to pass. By far the most significant was the survey of the Lower Mississippi Alluvial Valley, which began in 1940. After overcoming various “states-right” jealousies, the project was finally completed in 1951. It was also during this period that the NPS was involved in survey and excavation at Kolomoki, Moundville, the Natchez Trace, Jamestown, and St. Augustine. Most of these projects involved coordination of NPS, CCC, and WPA personnel—and regulations.

The closing chapters deal with the legacy of New Deal archaeology—the foundation of the Southeastern Archaeological Conference in 1937 by such “Young Turks” as James Ford, James Griffin, Preston Holder, Jesse Jennings, and Gordon Willey. New Deal archaeology al-

owed a new and more complete synthesis of regional archaeology, published by Ford and Willey. Tremendous collections of New Deal material, in various states of repair, have yet to be analyzed and merit the attention of future scholars; many have great potential to contribute to the understanding of the prehistoric Southeast.

A New Deal for Southeastern Archaeology is the work of a dedicated historian. Lyon’s research is very thorough, and a tremendous amount of straightforward information is available in this volume regarding when various bills were enacted, who worked where, what their background was, and some of the upper-level political machinations which took place during the period. Although the author was inspired to examine this period by the stories of Bill Haag, there are, unfortunately, few “Bill Haag stories” in the book. A few of these “lower-level” anecdotes have appeared in print, but this very important post-processual aspect of New Deal archaeology remains to be compiled.

Charles H. McNutt is a professor of anthropology at the University of Memphis.


Reviewed by Paul D. Welch

The ten papers in this volume originated as presentations at the 1990 Mid-South Archaeological Conference held at the large, Middle Woodland mound center at Pinson, Tennessee. The six-year lag between the conference and the publication date has left a couple of the papers chronologically anomalous—earlier material intruding into a more recent context—but some of the excavation descriptions published in this volume have not appeared elsewhere and are most welcome. Most of the chapters focus on single sites, often on a single mound within a multi-

mound site.

The earliest mounds built in North America are over 6,000 years old, but the earliest mounds dealt with in this volume are (merely!) 3,000 years old. Jon Gibson’s paper discusses possible interpretations of Poverty Point iconography. For me, the most useful part of his chapter was the overview of what we know about the earthworks themselves—that they are elliptical rather than octagonal, that additional ridges are now known, and that the construction spanned only three hundred years or less.
From Poverty Point the volume skips forward to Middle Woodland, with Charles Faulkner providing a retrospective on the Old Stone Fort site in central Tennessee. Faulkner had excavated at Old Stone Fort in 1966, before excavations in the Tims Ford and Normandy reservoirs revealed the local culture history; this chapter situates Old Stone Fort within the McFarland and Owl Hollow phases.

Keith Baca and Evan Peacock discuss another Middle Woodland site, the Brogan Mound (actually, there used to be two mounds) in northeast Mississippi. Moreau B. C. Chambers partially excavated the larger mound in 1934, but he did not publish a description of this work. Using Chambers’ field records and the results of CRM excavations at the site in 1990, Baca and Peacock have at last given us a description of this burial mound and the nearby occupation area. This chapter is marred by editorial glitches: after receiving the volume I was sent an errata sheet with revised versions of three of the tables (3.1, 3.2, 3.4) in this chapter; several months later a revision errata sheet arrived; and even the revised errata sheet has at least two errors (numbers obviously in the wrong columns) in Table 3.2.

Between Middle Woodland and Mississippian times there were several mound-building societies west of the Mississippi River. In Chapter 4 Michael Nassaney presents results of survey work in the vicinity of Toltec Mounds in Arkansas. Further to the south and west lived the Fourche Maline peoples, some of whose ceremonialism is described by Frank Schambach in Chapter 5. If you have not heard about Schambach’s work on the Crenshaw site along the Red River, read this chapter. Fourche Maline ceremonialism appears strikingly different from that of either Woodland or Mississippian peoples to the east.

The last five chapters of the book all deal with Mississippian sites. Elizabeth Garland provides an overview of mound use at the Obion site in west Tennessee, published in greater detail in her 1992 monograph on the site. Kit Wesler presents a careful and lucid examination of Wickliffe (western Kentucky) mound D, which may have contained elite burials. Richard Krause gives us a readable account of the construction of the smaller of the two mounds at the Snodgrass site in Guntersville Reservoir in northeast Alabama. I mention the readability of this paper because Krause’s published site report contains the same information but embeds it within logical formalisms that render the text nearly impenetrable for mere mortals. The chapter by Mitchell Childress and Camille Wharey reports excavations done in the early 60s on a mound along the west side of the plaza at Chucalissa, outside Memphis. They also include osteological details on the human skeletal material encountered in the excavations. The final chapter in the book comes from Andrew Buchner, who reports on excavations into Mound A at the West Mounds site in northeast Mississippi. One interesting tidbit from this chapter is the description of a “child’s area” inside a mound-top building, diagnosed from the presence of a collection of seven miniature (“toy”) vessels and an anthropomorphic figurine. Another noteworthy result of the excavations reported by Buchner are the three radiocarbon dates (from two laboratories), all of which are less than 200 radiocarbon years B.P. The earliest of the several possible calibration ranges for these dates falls in the late 1600s, which as Buchner notes will still raise eyebrows for a site at which no historic European artifacts have been found.

These ten chapters deal with sites in six states and spread chronologically across 3,000 years. Aside from dealing with sites at which prehistoric Native Americans made piles of earth, there is little thematic cohesion to these papers. This does not detract from the papers as individual contributions, nor is there anything objectionable to assembling these papers into a single volume. Instead, my point is that the variety of materials covered in this volume is so great that I think most of us will find the book useful for a few of the individual chapters in it. It is the sort of volume that in a more innocent age might have been titled “Miscellanea,” and while it ought to be in university and research libraries, archaeologists (vocational or avocational) may wish to examine the contents carefully before deciding whether to buy it.

Paul D. Welch is an associate professor of anthropology at Queens College of the City University of New York.


Reviewed by Tony Boudreaux

Nearly two centuries of investigations have produced a great deal of information about the societies that occupied the late prehistoric Southeast. Discussions within the discipline of archaeology reflect this growing knowledge. We have progressed from debating the “race” of the “Mound Builders” to attempting to account for inferred ancient behaviors by proposing complex models. Although our understanding of the events that occurred in prehistory will never be complete, the knowledge that we have accumulated is more comprehensive today than it has been at any time in the past. We now know that the Southeast was occupied by a number of diverse politically, economically, and socially complicated societies in its late prehistory. By focusing on the community and household, two levels that have received relatively little archaeological
attention in the past, this volume is a step toward a fuller understanding of these societies.

The first chapter, written by Rogers and entitled “The Archaeological Analysis of Domestic Organization,” provides an excellent orientation for the reader regarding the potential of what can be learned from the excavation and analysis of households. Rogers discusses research topics involving domestic situations that have been pursued in the past as well as the methods and theoretical backgrounds that were involved. He provides case studies for the topics discussed which allow the reader a better understanding by providing concrete examples of research that has pursued these topics. He addresses the concern held by some that investigations limited in focus to the domestic level will produce specialized data with limited applicability. Rogers dispels this notion by demonstrating that household archaeology is not another subdivision of archaeology but rather a representative cross-section of the discipline. As a result, one can learn a great deal about archaeology and anthropology as a whole from this chapter, especially about how certain kinds of evidence are used to infer past behaviors. Rogers also does an excellent job of defining each of the concepts and terms that he discusses, which greatly aided this reader’s understanding.

In his introductory chapter, Rogers discusses how household and community level studies can shed light on issues of a much larger scale, as well as how the household and the community can be used as units for inter- and intra-culture comparisons. The majority of the articles in this volume are characterized by one or the other of these approaches. In an article entitled “Household Archaeology at Cahokia and in its Hinterlands,” Mehrer and Collins discuss their examination of houses within the Cahokia settlement for visible signs of change that occurred during the region’s Woodland to Mississippian transition. Their study included houses located outside of Cahokia’s central precinct as well as houses located in the hinterlands. The authors used the location, orientation, and rebuilding episodes of households in the “rural” and “urban” settings to compare and contrast these two kinds of communities. The information gathered from this comparison was in turn used to make inferences about the degree of influence exerted by extra-community entities, such as the Cahokia site.

In another chapter by Rogers, this one entitled “Dispersed Communities and Integrated Households: A Perspective from Spiro and the Arkansas Basin,” a major decrease in building size between phases is seen as an indication that the size of coresidential groups decreased. The author argues that this as well as other characteristics are a reflection of changes in kinship structure that were occurring in the group as the Spiro site increased its influence over the area. This possible reduction in domestic group size is seen as a reflection of the decline of kinship as an integrative mechanism. It is possible that as Spiro became more influential the extended family became less important.

In his article entitled “Lamar Period Upland Farmsteads of the Oconee River Valley, Georgia,” Hatch focuses on non-riverine, upland sites in the Oconee valley to learn about the role that they played in the settlement pattern of the region, as well as to learn about the effects that an increasing population had on the local environment. When ordered through time, the floral and faunal assemblages for these sites indicate that the uplands were increasingly disturbed by cleared areas. The author sees this as indicating a situation in which higher populations required more active agricultural fields so that areas were not allowed to remain fallow long enough for the soil’s fertility to be replenished naturally. This increased stress on the local environment could have been one of the reasons why the dense population recorded for the area in the De Soto accounts seems to have become much smaller during the centuries that followed.

In their article “Mississippian Homestead and Village Subsistence Organization: Contrasts in Large-Mammal Remains from Two Sites in the Tombigbee Valley,” Jackson and Scott provide information about what the relationship may have been like between a larger site and smaller, neighboring sites for which it served as a focal point. Their research involves the comparison of faunal assemblages from two Mississippian settlements in the Tombigbee Valley, and it indicates that focal sites may have been provided with choice cuts of venison as well as manpower from smaller sites. Evidence for meat provisioning includes the overrepresentation of low-utility anatomical units in the faunal assemblage from the smaller, household site and a significantly greater representation of high-utility units at the larger, mound site. The inference that manpower was provided is supported by the possible winter abandonment of the household site: deer mandibles are used as indicators of seasonality, and their absence at the smaller site coincides with what was the principal deer-hunting period at the larger site. The authors discuss the possibility of this abandonment being related to the participation of the hunters who resided at the household site in communal hunts that were also possibly related to harvest activities. The practice of communal hunts and the seasonal abandonment of smaller settlements are both supported by the ethnohistorical record.

Several of the remaining articles use the household and the community as units of comparison, especially between egalitarian and hierarchical societies. In “Social Differentiation in Mississippian and Fort Ancient Societies,” Nass and Yerkes examine whether the apparently hierarchical settlement patterns of Mississippian groups and the apparently egalitarian-
ian settlement patterns of Fort Ancient groups are reflected at the community level within these societies. The authors look for evidence of social differentiation within a Fort Ancient community in Ohio and a settlement of comparable complexity within the Cahokia settlement system by using a set of established criteria, the purpose of which is to indicate the presence of a community leader.

In developing a model to account for the local Late Woodland to Mississippian transition, Mistovich ("Toward an Explanation of Variation in Moundville Phase Households in the Black Warrior Valley, Alabama") uses these units to make comparisons between the area's Woodland and Mississippian societies as well as between homesteads and mound centers within the Moundville settlement system. The hierarchically-arranged Mississippian society that developed from the egalitarian Woodland society is seen by the author as a response to dramatic increases in population. The series of supra-household decision-makers that appears to have characterized the area's Mississippian organization was, the author argues, a more efficient system of community management than the consensus-building required by more egalitarian societies.

In her article entitled "Mississippian Household and Community Organization in Eastern Tennessee," Sullivan uses the household and the community as units to investigate the relationships between the Dallas and Mouse Creek phases, as well as their relationship to the historic Overhill Cherokee. Debate regarding the exact nature of these relationships has polarized some researchers interested in east Tennessee. One model regards Dallas, Mouse Creek, and Overhill Cherokee as representing the diachronic evolution of a political system from complex chiefdom to egalitarian society, while an opposing model regards Dallas and Mouse Creek as contemporary societies at similar levels of political organization. The author explores the relationships between Dallas, Mouse Creek, and the Overhill Cherokee by comparing them at the community level based on attributes such as overall community plans and burial treatment. The three are compared at the household level based on size, use of domestic space, and composition of the occupying group.

Although the bulk of the chapters in this volume fit neatly into one of the two approaches discussed above, the remaining chapters could not be so readily pigeon-holed. In "Chiefly Compounds," Williams provides an entertaining and informative chapter that invokes the Blues, a great Mississippian tradition (the Deep-South state, not the archaeological culture), to challenge some well-established semantic traditions in the archaeological literature of the Southeast. He focuses on the misapplication of terms in Southeastern archaeology by using examples, mostly from Georgia, to illustrate his argument well. His premise is that terms that have real meanings and a whole host of associated connotations in the English language have been repeatedly applied to Mississippian sites of different sizes, even though their standard English definition may not be what is represented by the site. If the reader has not done so already, this chapter will cause him to wonder what exactly is meant by the terms "village," "town," "hamlet," and "farmstead." Rather than just putting forth empty criticism, Williams proposes some alternatives based on ethnographic information from African chiefly societies.

Scarry's article, entitled "Apalachee Homesteads: The Basal Social and Economic Units of a Mississippian Chiefdom," differs from the other chapters in this volume because, as the author notes, not enough is known about Apalachee households at this time to draw some of the conclusions that household and community level archaeological investigations can provide. After reading the earlier chapters of this volume, the reader will be able to understand and appreciate Scarry's discussion of the potential value of the study of the Apalachee homestead for better understanding the Apalachee chiefdom. This paper serves as a good contrast to the others in this volume because it discusses an area in which household research is just beginning.

The concluding chapter, "The Analysis of Single-Household Mississippian Settlements," is provided by Smith, and it consists of an overview of household level archaeological investigations in the Southeast since the excavation of the Gypsy Joint site in 1974, "the first single-household Mississippian settlement to be excavated and reported in any detail" (224). The Gypsy Joint investigations were conducted to explore several clearly stated research topics. In this chapter, Smith discusses the innovative and failed methods that have been employed to address these research topics in subsequent household level investigations. Innovations that have been developed since the Gypsy Joint investigations include the use of fish scales as seasonal indicators, the application of use-wear analysis to lithic assemblages, and the use of ceramic assemblages to assess duration of occupation. Rather than simply addressing the preceding chapters in this volume, Smith's overview encompasses a number of investigations so that the reader gains a good appreciation of the progress that has been made in household level investigations over the last two decades. Although this chapter could have served as an introduction because it presents a number of examples of what can be accomplished through household level archaeology, it is much better as a concluding chapter. The knowledge that the reader will have gained by reading any or all of the preceding chapters will allow him to assess along with Smith the results of the last twenty years. As one reads Smith's chapter, one can also see how the results of research presented in the chapters in this volume compare to other investigations as well as
how the chapters of this volume have contributed to or benefited from innovations since the investigation of the Gypsy Joint site.

Overall, this is an excellent volume that should benefit anyone interested in the Mississippian Southeast. It is diverse, readable, and affordable and should reward the reader with a better understanding of the cultural diversity and complexity that existed in the late prehistoric Southeast. Its contributors offer a number of different approaches to archaeological research. One of this volume's strongest points is that it leaves the reader with an appreciation of the importance of household level investigations as well as the contributions to our understanding that they can provide. Another of its strong points is its broad coverage of the Southeast. This broad coverage impresses upon the reader the variability that existed between and even within the region's Mississippian societies. Through the excellent exposition provided by the authors for their respective areas, the broad coverage exposes the reader to a substantial amount of information about a number of the region's late prehistoric societies. One can come away from each chapter with a basic understanding of each area's physical environment as well as the time periods and cultural content represented by its late prehistoric phases.

Tony Boudreaux is a graduate student in anthropology at the University of Alabama.


Reviewed by Marvin T. Smith

Barbara Purdy and photographer Roy Craven have produced a remarkably beautiful compilation of archaeologically-recovered Native American art from Florida. This popular work is filled with Craven's color photography and a minimum of text.

The book is divided into chapters based on material of manufacture such as bone and antler, shell, stone, ceramics, etc. It includes rare wooden material preserved at Fort Center, Key Marco, and other Florida locations, as well as metal artifacts crafted by Florida natives from Spanish shipwreck material. Many very unusual items are illustrated, including some from private collections as well as professionally excavated specimens. Clearly the author searched far and wide to show the breadth of Florida Native art.

I was immediately struck by the similarity of artifacts shown in the book to artifacts seen in other sources. An incised motif on a bone hairpin (Plate 7 right) is virtually identical to a common historic southeastern Indian beadwork motif. Incised scrolls on antler (Plate 8 center) compare favorably with later incised pottery motifs. A flower-like motif on an engraved antler piece (Plate 16) recalls a motif seen on Middle Woodland Swift Creek complicated stamped ceramics. An analysis of the art presented in this volume would have added much to its scholarly value, but was beyond the scope of this popular book.

The text is extremely limited. Most chapters have approximately one to three pages of discussion, with additional details of provenience, date, location, and measurements provided in the captions for each illustration. The lack of discussion is perhaps a weakness of this volume, yet readers will appreciate the quality of its illustrations.

If the author would consider making a slide set available, many teachers would benefit. This is a beautiful volume, and it will be enjoyed by many people.

*Marvin T. Smith is an associate professor of anthropology at Valdosta State University, Georgia.*


Reviewed by Grace Keith and Jack Mauldin

Clarence Bloomfield Moore first investigated the site of Moundville near present-day Tuscaloosa, Alabama, in the spring of 1904. This visit, along with his subsequent return to the site in 1906, is chronicled in *Certain Aboriginal Remains of the Black Warrior River and Moundville Revisited*, recently reprinted by the University of Alabama Press as *The Moundville Expeditions of Clarence Bloomfield Moore*, the first volume of the new Classics in Southeastern Archaeology series and a cooperative venture between the Southeastern Archaeological Conference and the University of Alabama Press. C. B. Moore, who traveled the waterways of the Southeast in his stern-wheel steamer, *The Gopher*, is admired by some and admonished by others. He has been labeled variously as a "dilettante," a "sophisticated gravedigger," and one of the "founders of Americanist archaeology" (16).

At first glance this publication looks like nothing more than a collection of exquisite illustrations and photographs of prehistoric art. There is no doubt that C. B. Moore more than adequately illuminates the intrinsic beauty of the artifacts he recovered from Moundville. But what does the reprinting of this volume offer us as archaeologists and enthusiasts of
archaeology besides a photographic documentation of elaborate Southeastern Ceremonial Complex artifacts?

Vernon J. Knight introduces the volume by briefly describing the life and personal accomplishments of C. B. Moore and then the professional climate within which he operated. Moore and his many field colleagues were all highly accomplished scientists of the Victorian era. Concluding Knight's introduction is a critical assessment of Moore's many contributions to the science of archaeology and of those procedures that he failed to consider. But the book is as much a monument to the man as Moundville is to the Mississippian culture.

Aboriginal Remains follows Knight's introduction and contains the research results of Moore's 1905 field season in west-central Alabama. The expedition visited some sixteen different mound and prehistoric cemetery locations and eventually ran out of time at Moundville. The text begins with a full-page map showing the locations of the sites and the major towns along the Black Warrior River. Following this general area map is a detailed narrative description of the locations of the various individual sites, their respective property owners, the measurements of the individual earthworks, and then a very brief statement on artifact recoveries. The account then turns to the research at Moundville, with a systematic detailed description of the work conducted on its twenty-two mounds. Included in this section is a sketch map showing the locations of excavation units on Mound C and high quality black and white photographs and line drawings of the most prominent discoveries. Moore frequently interjects interesting comparisons between Moundville artifacts and those from other sites and cultures and concludes Aboriginal Remains with his interpretation of the mounds at Moundville as domiciliary in nature instead of true burial mounds.

The reprint of Moundville Revisited, which comes next in the volume, describes Moore's second visit to Moundville in 1906. It was on this second and last visit to Moundville that Moore did most of his digging between the mounds and, as a consequence, discovered a greater number of human remains. These burials were then analyzed by Moore's contemporary, Dr. Aleš Hrdlička, at the United States Army Medical Museum in Washington, DC. Hrdlička and his colleagues reported the presence of syphilis and cranial deformation among the population. The presence of syphilis was thought to be of particular importance to physical anthropologists because, as Moore notes, he had discovered no signs of European contact with the Moundville population.

The excavations conducted around the mounds proved as productive as those conducted during the previous season on their summits, and Moore presents the most spectacular of his finds. Large photographs and line drawings represent the Southeastern Ceremonial Complex at its cultural height. These pages show beautifully crafted vessels, palettes, gorgets, pipes, and discs and their intricate shapes and designs. Moore concludes Moundville Revisited with a comparison of the various motif styles represented at Moundville to those of other North American cultures. He identifies the similarities and then leaves the decision of a positive connection to future researchers.

When reading these works, we must remember that the archaeological methods at the time C. B. Moore was working in the Southeast were dramatically different from those we use today. Several times in his work Moore refers to times when the crew was "rewarded" by the discovery of burials with elaborate grave goods. This contrasts with our modern goal of problem-oriented research, in which any and all information gained through the excavation of sites, be it artifacts or post molds or lithic debris, is reward. Of course, it will always be gratifying for archaeologists to recover unique artifacts, but it cannot be our sole purpose for archaeological investigation. Moore's work consisted primarily of gathering and describing data. He did not write lengthy conclusions or attempt to make generalizations about this information, nor did his "research goals" ever really move beyond excavation and description to explanation. The endeavors of C. B. Moore must be viewed in the specific historic context in which he was working. Descriptive works were the status quo in the late 1800s and early 1900s in the Southeast. Archaeology, like all science, is a learning continuum. We theorize, debate, sometimes speculate, and often modify our ideas as our excavations, analysis, and methods provide us with new information. Despite his affinity for mounds and burial goods, as well as field photos, notes, and drawings that by present-day standards would be considered scant or severely lacking, Moore's excavations in the Southeast did make lasting contributions to the field of archaeology.

Moore documented many mounds that were destroyed prior to investigation by trained professionals of the modern era (Bense 1994). C. B. Moore investigated and provided descriptions of an abundance of mound sites and centers on navigable rivers throughout the Southeast. The sheer number of sites that he visited is a testimonial to his energy and enthusiasm for archaeology; there are few major sites located in the larger river drainages of the southeast that were not touched by Moore.

Moore's publications are a starting point for many contemporary excavations. As the first substantial publication on Moundville, his work provides evidence and description of the first excavations at the site. This is also the case for various other sites in the Southeast. At the same time that Moore was excavating sites like Moundville, many major sites in the Southeast were being destroyed by development and looted for personal profit. Many of the artifacts collected during his expeditions were do-
nated to museums and other institutions rather than sold to collectors. Not only did Moore spend his own money to have the findings of his excavations published in the *Journal of the Academy of Natural Sciences*, he did so in a timely fashion (3). This history of prompt publication is commendable, even by present-day standards.

Vernon Knight hopes that “a new generation of enthusiasts of southeastern prehistoric art and archaeology” will be brought “face to face with Moore’s fascinating and lavishly illustrated works” as well as gain insight into the life of the man who precipitated archaeological interest in the area (vii). *Certain Aboriginal Remains of the Black Warrior River* and *Moundville Revisited*, though housed in some university and public libraries and found in a few personal libraries, have been inaccessible to many. This reprinting puts these classic volumes in many more hands. Kudos to the Southeastern Archaeological Conference and the University of Alabama Press, whose cooperative effort led to the reprinting of these works.

**Reference**


Grace Keith and Jack Mauldin are archaeology students at the University of Southern Mississippi.
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