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Guest Editor’s Note to the Reader

Evan Peacock

A few years ago, *Mississippi Archaeology* was described in the pages of *American Antiquity* as “one of the nation’s best state journals.” I must compliment the author of that statement on his perspicacity. It is indeed a fine journal, and is something that I am very proud of, both as a member of the local archaeological community and as a native of the state. I suppose being from Mississippi makes one sensitive to all the lists we tend to fall at the bottom of. Quality of scholarly publications in archaeology is not one of them, thanks to the fine efforts of Pat Galloway, the generous (and much appreciated!) support of the Mississippi Department of Archives and History, the scholars themselves, and most of all the loyalty, hard work, and unflagging support of the members of the Mississippi Archaeological Association. Every time the journal appears in the mail and you open it to the table of contents, you are looking at something that you helped create. It is a legacy of excellence, and you, too, are to be congratulated for your perspicacity in helping to build that legacy.

Being a Guest Editor has meant a lot of things. (For one thing, I now use words like “perspicacity” in mixed company without blushing.) As someone who has contributed to *Mississippi Archaeology* several times over the past years, I was curious to see what the job involved. Mainly it seems to involve a lot of time and hard work, as I believe Pat may have hinted to me a few times. It also meant a chance to work closely with many people whose work I admire. I learned a lot in the process, and I appreciate the patience and cooperativeness of the contributors. Most of all, I learned that the editorship is something of a balancing act, in which one tries to leave the door open for submissions from a variety of sources without compromising the high quality that the journal has become so well-known for. This is definitely not an easy task, but one that Pat has managed extraordinarily well over the years and one that I hope I have accomplished in this issue. *Mississippi Archaeology* is the perfect forum for students seeking their first refereed publication, for avocational archaeologists to make valuable con-
tributions by sharing their work, for professional, state, and federal archaeologists reacting to the need to make their work more accessible, and for academics who occasionally find time to finish off those nagging projects that tend to fill up the filing cabinet. To make this forum accessible requires that the review process be a constructive one, also not always an easy task. Credit is due to the many reviewers and members of the editorial boards, past and current, who have given their valuable time to make sure that the process works as intended.

This issue contains some works-in-progress I inherited from Pat (the House et al. article on the Menard site, the review essay by Elliott, the book reviews by Rafferty and Lorenz) and a couple of items I was able to drum up myself (the long-awaited Nanih Waiya paper by Carleton, the book review by Davies). I also have had the distinct pleasure of trolling SEAC in search of submissions, and hopefully have set the hook for several future articles. You fish know who you are — so quit flopping and jump in the basket.

Nanih Waiya (22W1500):
An Historical and Archaeological Overview

Kenneth H. Carleton

Abstract

Nanih Waiya Mounds has been a prominent geographical feature since before European settlement in Mississippi because of its association with the Choctaw as the center of their origin stories. Numerous visitors have recorded accounts of the mounds over the past 200+ years, leaving an extremely detailed history of the site. Archaeologically the site is a multi-mound and earthwork complex originally built in the Middle Woodland period.

Migration Story

In ancient days the ancestors of the Choctaws and the Chickasaws lived in a far western country, under the rule of two brothers, named Chahita and Chickasa. In process of time, their population becoming very numerous, they found it difficult to procure subsistence in that land. Their prophets thereupon announced that far to the east was a country of fertile soil and full of game, where they could live in ease and plenty. The entire population resolved to make a journey eastward in search of that happy land... A great prophet marched at their head, bearing a pole, which on camping at the close of each day, he planted erect in the earth, in front of the camp. Every morning the pole was always seen to lean in the direction they were to travel that day. After an elapse of many moons, they arrived one day at Nanih Waiya. The prophet planted his pole at the base of the mound. The next day the pole was seen standing erect and stationary. This was interpreted as an omen from the Great Spirit that the long sought-for land was at last found... (Peter Folsom quoted in Halbert 1899:228-29).

Creation Story

A very long time ago, the first creation of men was in Nanih Waiya; and there they were made and there they came forth. The Muscogees first came out of Nanih Waiya, and they sunned themselves on Nanih Waiya’s earthen rampart, and when they got dry they went to the east. On this
side of the Tombigbee, there they rested and as they were smoking tobacco they dropped some fire.

The Cherokee next came out of Nanih Waiya. And they sunned themselves on the earthen rampart, and when they got dry they went and followed the trail of the elder tribe. And where the Muscogees had stopped and rested, and where they had smoked tobacco, there was fire and the woods were burnt, and the Cherokees could not find the Muscogees' trail, so they got lost and turned aside and went towards the north and they settled and made a people.

And the Chickasaws third came out of Nanih Waiya. And then they sunned themselves on the earthen rampart, and when they got dry they went and followed the Cherokees' trail; and when they got to where the Cherokees had settled and made a people, they settled and made a people close to the Cherokees.

And the Choctaws fourth and last came out of Nanih Waiya. And they then sunned themselves on the earthen rampart and when they got dry, they did not go anywhere but settled down in this very land and it is the Choctaws' home (Halbert 1901: 269-70).1

Introduction

The Nanih Waiya Mounds are located on Nanih Waiya Creek in southwestern Winston County in east-central Mississippi (Figure 1). This area is in the southeastern portion of the North Central Hills physiographic province near its boundary on the east with the Black Prairie. The mound site is located near the center of a very complex drainage system within three kilometers of the confluence of Nanih Waiya Creek, Bogue Chitto Creek and Tallahapa Creek, the principal headwaters of the Pearl River. The mound site is also near the drainage divides between the Pearl River drainage and the Chunky/Chickasawhay/Pascagoula drainage (9.5 kilometers to the south) and the Pearl River drainage and the Tombigbee River drainage (about 15 kilometers to the east). Due to its position at the head of the Pearl River it is also near several other drainage divides which are internal to the Pearl system, leaving the site essentially surrounded by drainage divides.

Originally, Nanih Waiya was a multi-mound site with one large, ramped, pyramidal mound, one conical burial mound, and a segmented semi-circular earthwork, with a ditch and several smaller mounds of unknown configuration located between the two larger mounds. Today the large mound and small remnants of the conical mound and the earthwork are all that survive after more than 180 years of agricultural activity on the site. The principal mound and the "cave mound," an erosional remnant with a small cave system inside located about one mile east of the principal mound, composes Nanih Waiya State Park. Most of the remaining portions of the site are held by one private landowner, with a small portion now being held by the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians.

---

1 These are two examples of the Choctaw Migration Story and the Choctaw Creation Story, although there are several other examples of each. The exact story told by these tales depends on when the story was recorded, since both types, creation and migration, change through time. The primary change is in which tribes are involved, with the earliest versions involving the ancestors of the Choctaw, Chickasaw, and Chakchiuma and the latest versions involving the "Five Civilized Tribes." For a more detailed recent discussion of the Choctaw origin stories see Galloway 1995:331-36.
The cave and cave mound is an odd natural feature located about one mile to the east of the pyramidal Nanih Waiya mound on the opposite side of Nanih Waiya Creek/ Swamp in the Nanih Waiya * of Section 1, T12N, R13E. This feature is a large erosional remnant about forty feet at the highest point and about 180 meters long and 80 meters wide, with a small cave or cave system inside it. The cave has had several entrances, at least two of which were probably natural and at least two of which were probably dug in the twentieth century. All but one of these entrances have now been filled; two (one natural and one artificial) were filled by the Mississippi Department of Parks and Recreation for safety reasons and one of the artificial ones is currently largely blocked by erosion. While there are numerous local claims to have been inside the cave there are only a few credible recorded accounts. One of these, by James Atkinson, an archaeologist, was written in 1997 about a venture in about 1960. The other is an oral description given to the author by J. Gregory Keyes, a Ph.D. student in anthropology, after his exploration in 1995.

This cave is not mentioned in any of the creation stories recorded before the twentieth century, but it is currently believed by most Choctaws to be the hole through which the Choctaws and others emerged into this world. I believe that this is probably a case of transference of significance from the pyramidal mound to the cave mound, which probably occurred after and as a result of the filling of the hole in the top of the pyramidal mound in the early nineteenth century. Halbert, who was very familiar with the Choctaw and the area, never mentions the cave in any of his writings. Since he was such a thorough researcher it seems unlikely that he would have missed something that important and that central to his research interests if the Choctaws at the time had attributed such significance to the cave/cave mound. The remainder of this article will focus on the parts of the site attributable to human construction.

Historical Overview

As the "Mother mound" of the Choctaw, Nanih Waiya has been a prominent and well known geographic feature since before the time of French settlement along the Gulf Coast and, as such, has been visited regularly by travelers since the eighteenth century. Fortunately for us, several of these travelers were writers who recorded descriptions of the site at the time of their visits. As a result, Nanih Waiya has one of the earliest descriptions of any mound site in the Southeast (Adair 1986) and is one of the best historically-documented prehistoric sites in the region. We have a fairly detailed description from James Adair, who published his description in 1775 but who probably first saw the mounds in the 1760s. He was followed by George Gaines, who first saw the mounds before 1810; Gideon Linecum, who first saw the mounds in 1843; B. L. C. Wailes, who visited the site in 1854; Henry Halbert, who first saw the mounds in 1877 and published accounts in 1891 and 1899; Calvin S. Brown, who visited the site in 1917 and 1923; and Moreau Chambers, who along with James A. Ford visited the mounds in 1933. There are in addition to these descriptions many other less detailed references and second-hand reports from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

The first description of Nanih Waiya that has any real detail is the one James Adair published in 1775 in his History of the American Indians. Adair states:

"About 12 miles from the upper northern parts of the Choctah country, there stand on a level tract of land, the north-side of a creek, and within arrow-shot of it, two oblong mounds of earth, which were old garrisons, in an equal direction with each other, and about two arrow-shots apart. A broad deep ditch inclosed those two fortresses, and there were raised an high breast-work, to secure their houses from the invading enemy. This was a stupendous piece of work, for so small a number of savages, as could support themselves in it; their working instruments being only of stone and wood. They called those old fortresses Nanne Yab "the hills, or mount of God" (Adair 1986:405-06).

Adair's measurements, allowing about 100-120 meters for an "arrow-shot," are fairly accurate. However, he has obviously let his Hebraic obsession get the better of him in his transcription and translation of the name. Nanih Waiya is variously translated from Choctaw as "stooping or leaning hill" or "plentiful fish." This depends on whether the name is actually nanih wuiya, "stooping hill," or nani iwa, "plentiful fish." The most common translation given in the historical record is "stooping hill" but one of the earliest is "plentiful fish." Today most Choctaws say the name is Nanih Waiya, but a few do still say that it is Nanilana, so there is not even consensus from that quarter."
Our first detailed description from the nineteenth century comes from a transcribed interview conducted in 1848 by Albert James Pickett with George S. Gaines, who was for many years a trader and U.S. Factor for the Choctaw. Gaines states:

On a path, being the route from St. Stephens to the present city of Jackson, lay a large Indian mound embracing at the base about two acres & rising in a cone form some thirty to forty feet — apparently a large ditch had been once cut around it enclosing in a square form some twenty acres. This mound was called by the Choctaws Nanna, wyah (hill/mother) & according to their tradition was the mother of the whole tribe, out of whose hole in the top, their ancestors sprung up suddenly one day; this hole was quite large and deep immediately in the top & was about 10 feet in circumference — The Indians had great regard for this mound & when hunting in its vicinity, would always throw down a portion of the killed game into the hole — thus feeding their mother as they believed (Papers of Albert James Pickett, bound with “Notes upon the History of Alabama”; Section 14, no. 2. Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery).

This account is certainly a memoir and many of the incidents related by Gaines are from the early part of the nineteenth century, including a meeting with Pushmataha at Nanih Waiya about 1810, so we can safely assume that Gaines first saw Nanih Waiya before 1810. This description, along with Adair’s, are the only mentions of a ditch in any of the historical descriptions. It is interesting to note Gaines saying that “apparently a large ditch had been once cut around it,” the past tense implying that the ditch was no longer there by the time of the interview in 1848. Halbert states that the Choctaws had already plowed up at least portions of the site by the time white settlers first moved into the area in 1832 (Halbert 1891:349), so it is possible that the ditch had already been filled by the 1830s or early 1840s, before Linecum and the others ever saw it. This would explain why it does not appear in any other descriptions from a later date. The other significant item mentioned in this account is the hole in the top of the principal mound. This is a rather curious feature, and one wonders if it represents eighteenth-century potting of the mound. Nonetheless,

2 This location is not correct. This probably stems from the fact that this account is really notes recorded by Pickett during his interview with Gaines, and Pickett was not familiar with the location of Nanih Waiya Mounds.

This feature influenced the Choctaw, reaffirming their belief in the creation story. It should be noted that Gaines only mentions one conical mound. This account is a memoir, recorded by Pickett 40-50 years after Gaines first saw the mounds, at a time when Gaines was in his mid-60s. Thus, this account has not only been put through the filter of Gaines’s memory, but through the filter of Pickett, who recorded it. Therefore it is hardly surprising that some inaccuracies appear in it.

Our next nineteenth-century description comes from Gideon Linecum, who first saw the mounds in 1843. This account was not published until 1904 from Linecum’s manuscript papers and, while Linecum is generally a problematical source at best,3 his description seems to be fairly accurate. It is not clear from the published source, and may not be stated in the original source, whether this is a memoir or exactly when it was originally written, but most of Linecum’s writings seem to be memoirs written in the decades after he moved to Texas. Linecum states:

I first visited this celebrated mound in 1843. I found it a rounded off, oblong square, 200 yards in circumference at its base; 80 feet in height, with a flat space on the top 52 yards in length by 25 yards in width. The whole mound was thickly set with forest trees. 200 yards to the north of it is a lake, which I suppose to be the place whence they carried the earth to construct the mound.

I went all around this earth wall . . . It seemed to be a complete circle, and from one and a half to two miles in circumference, the southeastern portion cutting the bluff of Nunih Waya [sic] creek. Many places in the wall were still eight feet in height. The two gaps in the wall had never been filled up (Linecum 1904:530, 542, notes).

First we should note that Linecum makes no reference to the second mound but discusses a lake “north” of the primary mound. The conical burial mound is in fact northeast of the principal mound and there is still a very marshy area, a lake when the water is up, due north of the big mound. However, it is curious that he does not mention a conical mound which

3 Linecum is believed to have taken genuine Choctaw beliefs and stories and to have fictionalized and elaborated them for his own purposes. See Galloway 1995:332-33 for a discussion of some of the problems involved with Linecum as a source.
would at the time have been at least ten feet high (and probably much higher) and no further from the big mound than the lake he does mention. Lincecum also tells us that the earthwork, or a portion of it at least, was about eight feet (ca. 2.5 meters) high in 1843.

Our next, and best, mid-nineteenth-century accounts are B. L. C. Wailes' brief second-hand report from 1852 and his much more detailed first-hand description and sketch map of 1854 (Figure 2). Wailes was a geologist and naturalist who traveled extensively over the state in the middle nineteenth century and whose observations of both the natural history and the social landscape of Mississippi at the time are extensive and accurate. In 1852, in a brief quote from a Mr. Greer, Wailes reports on Nanih Waiya:

Sept 20, 1852: Mr. Greer has seen the celebrated Indian work of which a tradition remains from the mounds the Choctaw claim to have originated and call it their mother. He visited it about 16 years ago [1836] ... He crossed an embankment running nearly N. and S., and [it] appeared to be about waist high, ten ft wide and seems to be of considerable length (Brown 1996:13-14).

In 1854, Wailes himself visited the mound site and recorded the following description:

December 5, 1854: Accompanied by Mr. Cabe rode about three miles to visit the Indian mound and intrenchment in the fork of Nana Waya and

Tallahaga — identified by tradition as the place of origin or the birth place of the Choctaws who held it in superstitious reverence as their mother — and believe that there is a guardian spirit or genie who presides at the place — The interpretation of Nana Waya [sic] is said to be Big fish and Tallahaga, Standing Rock.

The principal mound A, where the cavern and well are said to have existed, is at least 50 ft above the level of the general plain, and which itself falls off (there is an illegible insertion at this point) 50 feet more to the bottom or flat lands of Nanawaya Creek, which is but a short distance.

Some 200 ft to the north of the high mound is one covering more extent, but either unfinished or obliterated in part, being only ten ft high, and might first be supposed to be not more than half that height from the surface it covers. It is a parallelogram with the curves rounded off by ploughing over it many years. It is 180 or 200 ft long from east to west and perhaps 100 to 125 ft wide from north to south. Some small mounds almost obliterated intervene between the two large ones.

The high mound has still several stout chestnut trees growing on the north side. It measures on the top, which has been cultivated, 120 ft E & W and 60 ft N. & S. The wall or entrenchment goes around three sides of the mound and in many places in the woods has trees of 4 feet diameter growing upon it, and in the most elevated places it is near ten feet high and has a base of 30 to 40 ft. Many gaps or gate ways have been left in it, some of them at least 100 feet wide — in other places it dwindles away to a slight embankment and in cleared lands, east of the mounds, can scarcely be traced, owing to the continual ploughing that has passed over it.

The entrenchment or wall embraces about a section or mile square lying in two sections, and in the counties of Winston and Neshoba, the mounds being in S.4 T.12 R. 13.E. in the later county. [Margin Note: The locality given is not be relied on as I have examined the maps of the NS [?] swamp.] The mounds are situated about 1 mile to the N. E. of the junction of the two creeks, which is the head of navigation in Pearl River, which takes that name from the junction of these streams.

Very slight indication exist of a well or cavity near the north end of the high mound, but it is said by the present proprietor to have been quite distinct about 15 years since [late 1830s], but has since been filled up by long cultivation. The highest portion of the wall or entrenchment is on
the north side, and it appears not to have been made across two or three
flat or depressed places, upon which the water stands in wet weather, this
portion being probably fortified or protected by palisades, or wooden
defenses. (Wailes 1854).

Wailes's account is full of detail, giving measurements for both of the big
mounds and the earthwork, and while his figures for height and area en-
closed are certainly greatly exaggerated, his measurements of the ground
dimensions of the larger mounds seem to concur with the later and more
accurate figures given by Brown from 1923 (Brown 1926:24). The one
primary fact that Wailes's description brings out is the amount of site de-
struction which had already occurred by 1854. The conical mound had
been extensively spread and, as it is given as still about ten feet high in 1854,
we can only imagine its original height. The earthwork had been extensively
damaged, with entire sections of it having been completely obliterated. The
several small mounds between the two big ones, which I believe may have
been eighteenth- or even seventeenth-century Choctaw burial mounds, had
been nearly eradicated. The hole in the top of the mound, which the
Choctaws believed was their emergence hole into this world, had been al-
most completely filled by ca. 15 years of plowing. No mention is made of a
ditch, so, as stated earlier, we can assume that all evidence of it had pre-
viously been destroyed. All of this was accomplished in less than fifty years,
and probably less than thirty-five years, with animal-drawn, shallow plows.4

The last of the nineteenth-century descriptions come appropriately from
Henry S. Halbert, one of the great, and largely unacknowledged,
ethnographers and anthropologists of the late nineteenth and early twenti-
heth centuries. Halbert spent many years among the Choctaw as a teacher
and researcher and it is only through him that much of the Choctaw oral-
historical and cultural data that we have today survived. Halbert published

4 Brown supposedly quoted this passage from Wailes in his 1926 work Archaeology of Mis-
issippi, but in fact Brown seriously misquotes Wailes. Among other things, Brown gives Wailes's
dimensions of the conical mound as his measurements of the principal mound and omits the
reference to the guardian "genie" entirely. Brown basically rewrote the entire passage, unify-
ing mentions about each element of the site, but did it very badly. Since Brown is the pri-
mary published source for Wailes's account of Nanih Waiya, this passage has been largely
misquoted for the past seventy-five years. I have attempted to present a correct version from
Wailes's notes, but Wailes's handwriting is very difficult to read. The version presented herein
is correct on all the important points but more illegible sections may not be exactly right.
traced in the fields on the west have now utterly disappeared. About two hundred fifty yards north of Nanih Waiya is a small mound, evidently a burial mound, as can be safely stated from the numerous fragments of human bones that have been exhumed from it by the plow and the hoe. The great number of stone relics, mostly broken, scattered for hundreds of yards around Nanih Waiya, shows that it was the site of pre-historic habitations. In addition to this, bullets and other relics of European manufacture evidence the continuity of occupancy down within the historic period. The magnitude of these ancient works — the mound and the rampart — together with the legendary traditions connected with them, leads one irresistibly to the conviction that this locality was the great center of Choctaw population during the pre-historic period. It should be here stated that the symmetry of the mound has been somewhat marred by a tunnel which was cut into it in the summer of 1896 by some treasure-seekers, who vainly hoped to unearth some wonderful bonanza from out the deep bosoms of the mound. (Halbert 1899: 223-224; emphasis in the original)

Halbert, as usual, gives us the most detail both of the large mounds' condition in 1899 and the changes that had taken place from the time he first saw it in 1877. He tells us that according to Choctaw tradition the earthwork originally had eighteen segments, of which only portions of ten survived in 1899. The conical mound is confirmed as a burial mound by the presence of human bone on the surface around its ruins. Halbert notes that artifacts were plentiful, which contrasts interestingly with Brown who, in 1923, said that artifacts were scarce. Halbert's account is supported by Chambers, who collected about two hundred sherds fairly quickly in 1933 (see below). Halbert notes that not only prehistoric artifacts but also historic European artifacts were plentiful, supporting the association of Nanih Waiya with historic Choctaw use of the site. Finally, Halbert gives us our first well-documented example of the looting of the site with his mention of a tunnel dug into the principal mound in 1896. It is unfortunate that Halbert does not give more information about the placement of this tunnel, but his statement that the "symmetry of the mound has been somewhat marred," coupled with examination of the 1914 Powell photographs (Powell 1914) of the mound (Figure 3), leads us to the conclusion that the tunnel was placed in the east end of the mound.

We have only two known detailed descriptions of the mound from the early part of the twentieth century. The first of these accounts comes from Calvin S. Brown in his 1926 work Archeology of Mississippi. Brown visited the site on at least two occasions, once in 1917 and once in 1923. He states:

The famous Nanih Waiya, which Halbert designates as the sacred mound of the Choctaws, stands in Winston County about ten miles south-east of Noxapater. The name signifies in Choctaw "slanting hill" It is a typical rectangular mound, 218 feet long by 140 feet wide at the base, thus covering seven-tenths of an acre. The axis is north-west by south-east. The dimensions of the flat top are 132 feet by 56 feet, the area being one-sixth of an acre. The height is 22 feet, in some places nearly 25 feet. The slopes of the mound are covered with trees; the top seems to have been cultivated ... [July 6, 1917].

I visited the site again on August 3, 1923, and located one section of the earth-wall or rampart near the residence, more than half a mile from the great mound. This section of the wall is now 2.5 to 4 feet high and about a hundred yards long. The resident on the farm states that four sections of the earth-wall still exist. The low mound about 250 yards to the northeast of the great mound is now about 7 or 8 feet high, and very much spread by cultivation. Artifacts are scarce.
The great Nanih Waiya retains its original height and is still in a state of excellent preservation, tho the small mounds and the wall have been much reduced. This historic mound should be preserved for all time to come. (Brown 1926:24).

Brown gives us our first accurate measurements of the mounds and puts to rest the estimates of forty to fifty feet for the height of the principal mound. His 1923 measurements of the principal mound largely conform with measurements made by the author in 1993. The primary variance is in the width, with Brown's measurement being larger. I believe that a significant portion of the ramp was removed in the early 1950s, which would account for that difference. It should be noted that the previous nineteenth-century descriptions generally agree with Brown's measurements of the ground dimensions of the mounds, but all tend to grossly over-estimate the height of the large mound. Brown documents the further destruction of the site, particularly the earthwork, of which only four of the ten sections mentioned by Halbert twenty-four years earlier still existed. The mound was again covered in trees; while Halbert is silent on this subject, Wailes tells us that the mound had trees only on the north side in 1854. As we shall see, these trees must have been cut shortly after Brown's visit in 1923, since Chambers says in 1933 that they had been cut years before. Brown also tells us that the conical burial mound has lost about a meter of height in the seventy years since Wailes's account in 1854.

Our second early-twentieth-century description comes from the other prominent early archaeologist in Mississippi, Moreau Chambers. Chambers, along with James A. Ford, visited Nanih Waiya Mounds in 1933 and there performed the only archaeological fieldwork on the principal mound which has yet been conducted. In his unpublished fieldnotes Chambers states:

The large Nanih Waiya Mound is situated on a slightly rolling plateau about 200 yards NE of Nanih Waiya Creek, and protected by bluffs and sloughs on the east and west sides. 260 yards N30°E is situated the smaller mound, now under cultivation and measuring 5 ft high x 165 ft. in basal diameter. A low ridge connects the two mounds. The large trees formerly covering the large mound were cut years ago, and the entire mound put in cultivation. Only the top could be successfully plowed, as the sides were so steep that one or two mules were said to have fallen off, and the farmer had to resort to the hoe to finish the year's work. Fortunately, since that experiment, the sides have grown up in a thick covering of bushes, which effectively resist erosion. The top is now planted in a watermelon patch by tenant, Mr. Chas. Coward, whose attitude prevented our full investigation of the large mound, and we had to content ourselves — for the present, at least — with deepening the hole left by treasure seekers near the south end of the summit plateau. We took the hole down to the depth of ten feet with shovels, then with a long handled post-hole digger sank a ten-inch hole nine feet deeper, finding the soil mottled from top to bottom, with lens-shaped masses throughout, indicating basket loads of dirt. Tiny bits of charcoal were encountered, but not a single sherd or bone fragment . . .

I collected nearly an eight-pound sack full of sherds and artifacts from the surface of the ground near the two mounds, finding H. B. Collins' typical Choctaw sherds (comb-marked) thickest near the smaller mounds, and further away a good proportion of cord-marked sherds and some bearing trailed, scroll designs (Chambers 1933:17-18).

Chambers provides our last detailed description before modern farming practices and equipment began to be used on the site and destroyed virtually all but a few small remnants of the conical mound and the earthworks. It is also the first and, until 1996, the only example of archaeological excavation on any of the mounds or the earthwork. While the account is sparse, Chambers does give us several useful pieces of information. First, he documents the further destruction of the site, reporting that the principal mound had been cleared, that the summit was once again in cultivation, and that the conical mound had been reduced to five feet (a loss of two to three feet in ten years) and was also in active cultivation. He also tells us that the principal mound does not appear to have any internal features or burials, unless they are further toward the center of the mound than Chambers was working, or are sub-mound. Since we do not really know where Chambers was working, it is impossible to say which may be correct. Chambers tells us that there are spatial-temporal differences in the distribution of artifacts over the site, with "H. B. Collins' typical Choctaw sherds" concentrated presumably in the plaza area between the pyramidal and conical mounds, where the smaller mounds once stood, and the Woodland material being concentrated away from the plaza area and along the site perimeter. This is one of the facts which supports the smaller mounds being of Choctaw origin. We also have Chambers's surface collection, which has been relocated with the other collections which Ford took to Louisiana State University in
the mid-1930s and largely reassembled after sixty years. This is discussed further below.

Our next source of information is oral-historical. R. J. Luke, a member of the family of the landowners of the site for most of the twentieth century, reported that the majority of the remains of the conical mound were plowed down about 1950, leaving it at its present height of less than a meter (Luke, personal communication). Luke also stated that a fairly significant amount of dirt was removed from the principal mound in the early 1950s. This removal of dirt was probably mainly from the ramp area which, while readily visible today, appears severely truncated.

Aerial photographs of the site area are in the Winston County office of the Natural Resource Conservation Service. These photographs, taken in the 1930s–1950s, show that in the middle to late 1940s the landowners started intensively plowing and terracing the site center, presumably using mechanical chisel plows or their like. The conical mound is readily evident on these photographs since it is clearly outlined by terraces or plowing contours. This intensification of agriculture revealed by the aerial photographs is consistent with R. J. Luke’s statement that the conical mound was greatly reduced about this time.

The principal mound and a very small area around it were donated by the Luke family to the state of Mississippi to form a new state park in 1959. The state then purchased the “cave mound” and about 100 acres of land adjacent to it in 1962.

At present, the site consists of the principal mound, which despite its many years of at least partial cultivation still measures about the same as it did when Brown measured it in 1926; a small visible remnant of the conical mound; and one small remnant of the western terminal end of the earthwork (Figure 4) which was reported by the author in 1996 (Carleton 1996). There is a visible rise running along the eastern edge of the site which may be remnants of the earthwork where it has been spread by cultivation since the 1820s, but this remains to be confirmed with excavation.

From these historical accounts, then, we know that the Nanib Waiya Mound group once consisted of a semi-circular, segmented earthwork, perhaps composed of eighteen segments; a ditch which encircled the entire earthwork; the pyramidal principal mound; a conical burial mound, and several smaller mounds located between the two larger ones. We have estimated dimensions which are both fairly accurate and wildly exaggerated; the measurements seem to be fairly accurate for the ground measurements of the two larger mounds but get wildly exaggerated when the height of the largest mound is estimated and when discussing the overall length of the earthwork. Estimates for the length of the earthwork are generally consistent at about 1.5-2 miles, which is an obvious exaggeration. However, since the earthwork is essentially completely destroyed, we will probably never be able to determine its actual length. Estimates based on the descriptions, plus the placement of known features including the larger mounds, one terminus of the earthwork, Nanib Waiya Creek, and the general topography of the site on a 7.5’ U.S.G.S. quad map, put an upper range for the length of the earthwork at no more that about 1 kilometer or 0.6 miles. The topography of the area, with the adjacent Nanib Waiya Creek and other landscape features, does not allow for the earthwork to have been any longer.

From these accounts, if and when anyone actually conducts any excavations on the principal mound at Nanib Waiya they will have a good idea of at least some of the disturbances that will be encountered. From the oral-historical data of Choctaw sources and from Gaines and Wailes we know
that there was a fairly large hole in the top of the mound during historic times, at least. From Halbert we know that a tunnel was dug into the mound in 1896 by looters, and from Chambers we know that another pot-hole was dug into the summit during the late 1920s or early 1930s. We know that at least the summit has been plowed at various times since the 1830s. We also have learned that the mound has been through several episodes of clearing and regrowth of vegetation and presumably the same number of episodes of erosion.

Finally, from these accounts we see the well-documented, near total destruction of this mound group by agriculture. Portions of the site had been put under cultivation by the 1820s by Choctaws. By the 1850s significant damage had been done, with one-third to one-half of the earthwork, the several small mounds in the plaza, and the ditch being completely destroyed, the conical burial mound already beginning to be plowed down, and the hole on the top of the big mound having been largely filled. By the close of the nineteenth century, the earthwork had been further reduced and the conical mound had lost about a meter in height. In the first half of the twentieth century the site continued to be plowed, no doubt further destroying archaeological deposits, further reducing the earthwork remnants and the conical mound, and eroding the principal mound. By about 1950, the conical mound had been reduced to less than a meter of its original ca. 3-5 meter height and the site had begun to be mechanically plowed and terraced, probably resulting in the complete destruction of any unprotected archaeological deposits in the site center. Examination of the aerial photographs of the site from the 1940s and 1950s leads one to the conclusion that if any significant archaeological deposits remain intact in the site center today, they can only be beneath the large mound or covered by the basal stump and fill of the conical burial mound or perhaps portions of the now-spread fill of the earthwork.

Archaeological Overview

As stated previously, there has been little archaeology done at the Nanih Waiya site. What has been done consists of Chambers’s unreported work on the pot-hole and his coring of the mound, one small excavation conducted by the author in 1996, and four extant surface collections. Chambers’s excavations and coring, discussed above, provide little information about the principal mound and even less about the rest of the site, especially given our lack of information about his findings.

In 1996, I received word that a fragment of the earthwork still existed on a piece of property which was being offered for sale to the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians. I immediately went to examine the area and discovered what did indeed appear to be a possible fragment of the western terminus of the earthwork and what may be a remnant of the ditch which is reported to have surrounded the earthwork in the early nineteenth century (Figure 4). A 1 x 2 meter test unit was placed on the northwest side of the supposed earthwork remnant and excavated to 90 centimeters below current ground surface. This unit revealed four strata: the current topsoil, a fill layer 31 centimeters thick, the original ground surface/topsoil, and subsoil below that. Included in the fill layer were one piece of ground sandstone and one Tallahatta quartzite flake, the only artifacts recovered in the excavations. Soil cores made along the surface of the earthwork remnant showed that the fill layer continued to the northeast for about 50 meters from Nanih Waiya Creek, gradually becoming thinner until pinching out completely. From this work it is obvious that the western end of the earthwork was built along a natural ridge extending into the flood plain of Nanih Waiya Creek and that only a very thin layer of the original ca. 2-3 meter high feature still exists along the top of this ridge. Whether the depression which runs along this ridge is in fact part of the original ditch or simply an erosional feature can not be stated at this time, and given the near total destruction of the earthwork and the obviously disturbed conditions of the area, it is doubtful whether such a determination can ever be made with certainty.

Our best source of archaeological information about the Nanih Waiya site comes from the four surface collections that are still extant. These include the collection made by Chambers in 1933, the Charles H. Nash Memorial Museum Collection, the Mississippi Department of Archives and History collection made about 1969, and the Mississippi State University Field School collection made in 1970. At least one other major collection from the site did exist in the early part of this century, one that was made by W. A. Love. Love was an enthusiastic amateur archaeologist, one of the founders of the Mississippi Historical Society, and the person responsible for the 1914 photographs of Nanih Waiya. He donated his extensive collections to the Mississippi Department of Archives and History sometime in
the 1910s or 1920s. These collections were unfortunately destroyed when the building they were stored in at the old state insane asylum burned in the early 1940s (Baca 1989:38). Since the overwhelming artifact class represented in all of the extant collections is ceramics and since the lithic artifacts do not add any significant data about the site, only the ceramics will be considered in the further discussion.

Chamber's collection from 1933 consists of 225 sherds, although originally there were more since the material I have does not include two
cordmarked sherds which Ford illustrated in 1936 (Ford 1936:Figure 5). This collection (Figure 5) is composed predominantly of Middle and Late Woodland material, with some Early or Early Middle Woodland, a signifi-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>VARIETY</th>
<th>NUMBER (RIMS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIDDLE WOODLAND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alligator Bayou Stamped</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin Plain</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>19 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayou Basin Incised</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>25 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marksville Incised</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>4 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penet Zoned Incised</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Stamped</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grit Tempered Plain (May be crushed sandstone)</td>
<td></td>
<td>16 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LATE WOODLAND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baytown Plain</td>
<td>Raw</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unspecified (smalting)</td>
<td>36 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unspecified (grog)</td>
<td>9 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulberry Creek Cordmarked</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>22 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grog/Sand Tempered Incised</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(May be Alligator Incised)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MISSISSIPPIAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Brushed</td>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Plain</td>
<td>Unspecified (probably Warrior)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HISTORIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickasaw Plain</td>
<td>Not Defined</td>
<td>34 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickasaw Corded</td>
<td>Not Defined</td>
<td>19 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickasaw Incised</td>
<td>Not Defined</td>
<td>5 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickasaw Indeterminate (Decorated but whether corded or incised is impossible to tell)</td>
<td>Not Defined</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHRONOLOGICALLY UNKNOWN (MOST MAY BE CHOCTAW)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grog/Sand/Shell Plain</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grog/Sand/Bone Plain</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand/Grog Plain</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell/Shell Plain</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>225 (35)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
cant Choctaw component, and a very small Mississippian component. Table 1 gives the ceramic totals. Overall, the physical condition of these sherds is consistent with what is known about the site history. They are generally eroded and plow-scared, with most sherds being relatively small and battered. The picture which this collection yields is of a site whose history began with some habitation in the Early Woodland or early Middle Woodland, depending on what you consider the Tchula Period. The primary occupation at the site took place in the Middle Woodland, as evidenced by Marksiville period ceramics, and continued into the Late Woodland. The site was then abandoned until sometime in the Mississippian, when there was a small occupation. It was then used in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries by the Choctaw.

Our second large surface collection from the site is that from Charles H. Nash Memorial Museum at the Chuculissa site, Memphis, Tennessee. One major problem with this collection is that there are no supporting documents associated with it. The only information about the collection is the labels on the box and bags, which identify it as being from Nanih Waiya. There is no date of collection nor a collector given. Based on the labeling and handwriting thereon, the collection seems to have been made about the time that Nash made collections at Pinson Mounds, in the late 1940s or early 1950s. The sherds have numbers stamped on them, which was only done on the earliest collections at Chuculissa, again in the late 1940s and early 1950s (Camille Wharey, personal communication). Steve Williams remembers that an amateur named Kenneth Bowdin, who worked with Nash and Williams and who had extensive collections from Arkansas, Mississippi, and Tennessee, was supposed to have visited Nanih Waiya in the early 1950s (Stephen Williams, personal communication), so this may be the source of the collection. However, most of Bowdin’s collections were donated to the Pink Palace Museum, Memphis, Tennessee, not Chuculissa, so it is still an open question whether Nash, Bowdin, or someone else made this collection.

This lack of background information is such a problem because the collection looks quite different from any of the other collections definitely made at the site. Table 2 gives the ceramic totals. This collection contains a total of 103 sherds. The sherds are generally large and in very good condition, but the collection cannot be called representative since it is apparently

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>VARIETY</th>
<th>NUMBER (RMS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EARLY WOODLAND/GULF FORMATIONAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandre Parched</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE WOODLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bousa Plain Incised</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complicated Stamped (Roodel)</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comanche Cord Impressed</td>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potter Zone Incised</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltman Brushed</td>
<td>Saloman</td>
<td>5 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teller Lake Painted</td>
<td>Comanche</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teller Lake</td>
<td>Shenest</td>
<td>4 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Creek Incised</td>
<td>Shenest</td>
<td>6 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATE WOODLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bousa Plain</td>
<td>Shenest</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Fork Incised</td>
<td>Shenest</td>
<td>5 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lott Red Painted</td>
<td>Lott</td>
<td>5 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manika Incised</td>
<td>Manika</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McHoney Creek Coated</td>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td>15 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Parched</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSISSIPPIAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton Incised</td>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Nanih Waiya Mounds (22W1500). Charles H. Nash Memorial Museum collection (collector unknown, date est. 1950).
very biased towards decorated sherds. The site history shown by this collection is somewhat different from that shown by Chambers and Ford's. It has the Middle and Late Woodland components, a small Mississippian component, and a very small Choctaw component. However, it has a large Tchula component, with 15 sherds of Withers Fabric Marked, 15 sherds of Wheeler Check stamped, 12 sherds of Twin Lake Punctate and 1 sherd of Cormorant Cord Impressed (Figure 6). In addition to these, the collection also includes 5 sherds of Larto Red Filmed and 5 sherds of Saloman Brushed, types rarely seen in the east central Mississippi region.

There is a notable lack of sand in the pastes of the overwhelming majority of these sherds, as compared with very sandy pastes from the other three collections as well as from other Woodland sites in the region. So the question is whether this collection, or at least part of it, actually came from Nanih Waiya. In support of its being from Nanih Waiya are the lithics, which include sandstones that look like east central Mississippi sandstones, and particularly petrified wood which certainly came from the east central Mississippi area.

One possible explanation for both the excellent condition of the sherds and for the differing size of the components represented can be found in the site history. Starting in the 1940s, shortly before this collection was presumably made, the landowners began terracing and deep-plowing the main portion of the site. So it is probable that they were exposing previously undisturbed and older portions of the archaeological deposits. Thus the sherds in a collection made in the early 1950s would be larger and in better condition than a collection made twenty years earlier, since they had not been plowed over for a century. The same process can also account for an older component being better represented in this collection, since the deeper mechanical plowing begun in the 1940s would have exposed more deeply buried, and hence presumably older, archaeological deposits. There remains, however, the obvious difference in the sandiness of the ceramic pastes. This is a problem which is unsolvable at this time, since we cannot, based on the currently available information, definitely say that this collection did or did not come from Nanih Waiya or whether it has been mixed with a collection from another site. The data from this collection are therefore presented side by side with the other collections with this caveat.

The last two surface collections are the Mississippi Department of Archives and History's collection made about 1969 by Samuel O. McGahey and John Connaway and the Mississippi State University Field School collection made in 1970 under the direction of Richard A. Marshall. Both
collections are very small, containing twenty-nine sherds and forty-eight sherds respectively. The condition of the sherds is extremely poor, with the majority of them being unidentifiable, eroded sherdlets. The ceramic totals for the MDAH collection are given in Table 3 and the totals for the MSU collection in Table 4. Since these collections are both small, and the condition of the sherds is so poor, they do not add any more information to the picture of the site provided by the two earlier and larger collections. One item of note is the presence in the MSU collection of one sherd each of Santa Rosa Stamped and Withers Fabric Marked, which supports the presence of a Tchula period component at the site and gives greater credence to the Nash collection.

Given the extremely small size and extremely poor condition of the ceramic collections that we have, especially when considering the overall size of the site and the long period of occupation represented, and given the fact that we are not sure that fully one-quarter of these sherds are actually from Nanib Waiya, it would be unwise to extrapolate very much from these collections. It is obvious, however, that Nanib Waiya, which has always been considered a Mississippi Period site based primarily on the presence of a flat-topped, pyramidal mound and its association with Choctaw origin stories, is not solely or even primarily a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>VARIETY</th>
<th>NUMBER (RIMS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE WOODLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin Plain</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayou Basin Incised</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grit Tempered Plain (may be crushed sandstone)</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSISSIPPIAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Plain</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISTORIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Plain</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRONOLOGICALLY UNKNOWN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand/Greg Plain</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>29 (1)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This rim is a punctured Choctaw rim.


Mississippian site. There is certainly a Mississippian occupation at the site, as evidenced by sherds of Barton Incised and Grace Brushed from collections whose provenience is not questioned and less certainly by the sherd of Parkin Punctate from the Nash collection. However, the Mississippian sherds comprise only 1.5% of these collections if you exclude the Mississippi Plain, which could just as easily be eighteenth-century Choctaw as Mississippian. Even when the Mississippi Plain sherds, excluding one sherd that is certainly Choctaw, are included, the percentage only rises to 3%. It is thus obvious that Nanib Waiya is primarily a Woodland site. Now, given our lack of knowledge and particularly the lack of excavations in the mounds, the question of when any of the mounds were built is certainly an open one. It is entirely possible that this was a vacant Mississippian ceremonial center and that the pyramidal mound is in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>VARIETY</th>
<th>NUMBER (RIMS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE WOODLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin Plain</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayou Basin Incised</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Stamped</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withers Fabric Marked</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grit Tempered Plain (May be crushed sandstone)</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATE WOODLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Tempered, Broadline Incised, Punctured Rim</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg/Sand Tempered Incised (May be Alligator Incised)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSISSIPPIAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Plain</td>
<td>Unspecified (probably Warroc)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISTORIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickasaw Plain</td>
<td>Not Defined</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickasaw Combed</td>
<td>Not Defined</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRONOLOGICALLY UNKNOWN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Plain</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand/Greg Plain</td>
<td></td>
<td>19 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>48 (3)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

fact Mississippian. However, since the vast majority of the artifacts which we have are Woodland, it would seem reasonable to assume that all of the primary mounds at Nanih Waiya are Woodland until such time as this is proven otherwise.

Other factors which support Nanih Waiya being a Woodland mound complex include its many similarities with most of the other flat-topped Woodland mounds/mound sites, including Ozier Mound at Pinson Mounds in Tennessee, Ingomar Mound and the Slate Springs Mound in Mississippi, and the Florence Mound in Alabama. These similarities include the overall placement of the site near drainage divides. Both the Pinson and Ingomar sites are situated very near major drainage divides. While Nanih Waiya is not on a major drainage divide, there being none in this portion of the southern North Central Hills, it is surrounded by several smaller drainage divides made up of tributaries of both the Pearl and Noxubee Rivers. Another apparently significant similarity among all of the mound sites listed above and Nanih Waiya is the orientation of the flat-topped mounds. All of these mounds have the main axis of the rectangular mound oriented northwest-southeast, with their ramps on the northeast side and two corners pointing nearly due north and due south (Keith Baca, personal communication; Edmond Boudreaux, personal communication 11/21/99; Mainfort 1986; Rafferty 1983) This seems to be a diagnostic feature of the Middle Woodland flat-topped mound. Nanih Waiya is therefore very probably the southernmost known of the Middle Woodland Pinson–Ingomar flat-topped mound complex (Johnson 1988).

Conclusions

The Nanih Waiya Mounds site, despite our lack of archaeological knowledge, has some of the richest historical documentation of any site in the state of Mississippi and among the richest in the Southeast. Using written historical accounts, oral-historical accounts, aerial photographs, historical photographs and limited archaeological work, it is possible to build a reconstruction of this site, which has been largely destroyed today, and to document its history over the past 200+ years. A detailed site history can be extremely useful when trying to interpret archaeological collections, particularly older ones with limited information about their acquisition. The extant archaeological collections, although extremely limited, tell us that Nanih Waiya began as a Middle Woodland site, possibly in the early Middle Woodland Tchula period, with occupation continuing throughout the Middle Woodland period and into the Late Woodland. It was then abandoned and re-occupied during the late Mississippian Period. The Mississippian occupation seems to have been limited, implying that the mounds are probably all Woodland, but that remains open to debate. Finally, the mound site was used extensively by the Choctaw in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, probably as a burial site, and was venerated as the "Mother mound" of the Choctaw.

A great many questions remain to be answered about Nanih Waiya, not the least of which is when all of the mounds were built. Due to the extensive destruction of the site over the past two hundred years it may never be possible to determine this for all of the mounds. However, it should certainly be possible to discover the origins of at least the conical burial mound, of which a small remnant still stands, and the principal mound, which despite centuries of abuse seems to be largely intact.
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Abstract

The Menard-Hodges site on the lower Arkansas River in southeastern Arkansas is identified with the late seventeenth-century Quapaw village of Osotouy and early (1686-1749) locations of Arkansas Post. Excavations conducted by the Arkansas Archeological Survey and Arkansas Archeological Society in 1997-98 were designed to complement results from almost two centuries of prior scientific investigation at Menard. The Survey/Society team excavated in and near the plaza and on two outlying site areas, the Northern Periphery and the Lake Dumond site. A discrete early 1700s occupation was identified on a third outlying site area, the Wallace Bottom site. Preliminary results from the 1997-98 work broaden our view of the dynamism of the landscape at Menard and of the extent of prehistoric, Protohistoric and Colonial occupations in this celebrated archaeological locality.

Introduction

In 1997 and 1998, the Menard-Hodges site and its outlier, the Lake Dumond site, were the scene of two successive seasons of the annual Arkansas Archeological Survey-Arkansas Archeological Society Training Program. The Menard-Hodges site, located in Arkansas County in southeastern Arkansas, had been the object of scientific attention for nearly two centuries and, by consensus of historians and archaeologists (e.g., Faye 1943, Ford 1961), had come to be regarded as corresponding to the late seventeenth-century Quapaw village of Osotouy and the location of De Tonti's 1686 Arkansas Post. The 1997-98 excavations were the first concerted field studies undertaken at Menard locality in nearly 40 years and were the first excavations conducted by the State of Arkansas. We will here report on the scope and methods of the 1997-98 fieldwork and present preliminary results, emphasizing new information on physical and cultural contexts.

English naturalist Thomas Nuttall made the first scientific observations at Menard on January 20, 1819:

... at first view, I thought I discovered a considerable hill, but it was, in fact, an enormous mound, not less than 40 feet high, situated towards the centre of a circle of other lesser mounds, and elevated platforms of earth. The usual vestiges of earthenware, and weapons of hornstone flint, are here also met with, scattered over the surrounding soil (Nuttall 1821:68-69).

By the 1880s, the brothers Julius Menard and Napoleon Bonaparte Menard lived on the site in their respective family dwellings, giving their name to "Menard's Hill," which was investigated in 1882-83 by Edward Palmer of the Smithsonian Institution (Holmes 1884; Jeter 1990:242-250; Thomas 1894:29-31). A couple of decades later, Clarence Bloomfield Moore (1908:486-509) excavated 160 burials "near Menard Mound" (evidently including the neighboring Wallace, Poor, and Massey sites; see House 1991). In 1940 and 1941, Philip Phillips and the Central Mississippi Valley Archeological Survey investigated the Menard site, preparing a topographic map and conducting stratigraphic tests (Phillips 1941; Phillips et al. 1951:

Figure 1. The Menard Locality in Arkansas County, Arkansas.
In the following decade, Menard was the scene of excavations by Preston Holder of the National Park Service in 1956 (Holder 1957) and James A. Ford of the American Museum of Natural History in 1958 (Ford 1961).

The long history of scholarly attention to the Menard site contributed to its relatively good state of preservation today and to prospects for its continued preservation. In 1940, Dr. T. L. and Charlotte Hodges of Bismarck, Arkansas, spurred by their abiding interest in archaeology and early history in their state, purchased the site with the assistance of Philip Phillips of Harvard's Peabody Museum. In 1980, Charlotte Hodges sold the property to the Archaeological Conservancy, which renamed the site "Menard-Hodges" in recognition of the Hodges family's contribution to its preservation. The Conservancy has since maintained the site as an archaeological preserve. The Menard-Hodges site was designated a National Historic Landmark in 1991. In 1997, following the dramatic discoveries of that year's summer field season, the U.S. Congress authorized the creation of an Osotouy Unit of Arkansas Post National Memorial. The boundaries of the projected National Park unit encompass the Menard-Hodges and Lake Dumond sites.

Site Description

The Menard-Hodges site complex lies near the Mississippi-Arkansas River confluence, a short distance up the Arkansas on the first high, flood-free land encountered ascending this river. Physiographically, this location is the southern tip of a Grand Prairie outlier known as the Little Prairie (Figure 1). Elevations on non-mound portions of the site range between about 48 and 52 m above mean sea level (AMSL). The soils of the Little Prairie in the immediate vicinity are mapped as Grenada silt loam and Callaway silt loam, both developed in a thick mantle of loess (Maxwell et al. 1972). The archaeological sediments of the Menard site complex are very silty but include admixtures of clay and dark concretions from natural B horizons. They are also pervasively acidic, though some localized areas of anthropogenic enrichment (or midden) have good faunal preservation.

The Menard-Hodges site centers on an array of mounds around a plaza (Figure 2). Mound A on the north, about 11 m in height, is conjoined on the southwest to Mound B, approximately 3 m in height. Mounds A and B might be considered a single mound exemplifying a characteristic late Mississippian two-platform configuration. Ford (1961:Figure 3) designated four additional, smaller mounds, C through F, completing the circuit of the plaza in a counter-clockwise direction. The plaza itself is a fairly regular square space oriented diagonally to the cardinal directions, with Mound A-B defining the northwest boundary. The dimensions of the plaza are roughly 100 m on both axes for a total area close to 1.0 ha. The smaller mounds flanking the plaza are associated with deposits of dark soil containing Native American pottery, lithic artifacts, and faunal remains. Though a few locations exhibit abundant daub, that material is sparse compared to late Mississippi period sites elsewhere in the Central Mississippi Valley. Present evidence suggests that graves are frequent on the off-plaza side of the smaller mounds in the site core.
Three areas in the vicinity of the site core appear to represent borrow pits. Approximately 100 m north of Mound A-B is an oval depression, roughly 50 m east-west by 30 m north-south, that holds water much of the year. Coring in the center of this evident borrow pit in 1991 revealed 0.6 m of saturated dark gray silty sediment overlying an abrupt boundary with compact light-colored silt. To the east and west of the plaza and its flanking mounds are indentations in the Little Prairie terrace edge which were suspected, at the outset of the 1997-98 investigations, of being at least in part borrow pits; we designated them the East Borrow Area and West Borrow Area, respectively (Figure 2).

The extent of outlying village areas in the Menard site complex has become evident only in recent years. In 1991, we recognized the presence of prehistoric and Protohistoric archaeological components on the peninsular southern extremity of the Little Prairie south and west of the Menard-Hodges site proper, beyond a wooded ravine. We designated this area the “Lake Dumond site,” though it may properly be considered an outlying area of the Menard-Hodges site (Figure 1). In addition, in 1997, information from the plowed Road Relocation Transect on the northern periphery of the archeological preserve (see below) revealed the presence of hitherto little-suspected Baytown-Coles Creek period, prehistoric Mississippian, and Protohistoric occupations.

Completing the picture of the physical make-up of the Menard-Hodges site complex are two abandoned Arkansas River channels. The channel scar on the southeast is occupied by Menard Bayou, which at that point opens to a broad expanse of open water flanked by cypress trees. The mound-plaza array at the core of the Menard-Hodges site may have been oriented to parallel this channel scar. Above and below the Menard-Hodges site, Menard Bayou interconnects the Merriesach Lake wetlands on the west with the lowlands along the White River to the east. North of the Menard-Hodges site, the Wallace, Poor, and Massey sites lie where Menard Bayou swings against the foot of the Little Prairie (Ford 1961:Plate 20; House 1991). The body of water known as Lake Dumond, occupying the second, more recent Arkansas River channel scar associated with the Menard-Hodges site, arcs through the lowlands to the west. Approximately 250 m of lowlands separate the terrace extremity at the Lake Dumond site from Lake Dumond itself. As will be seen below, one of the most dramatic discoveries of the 1997-98 program of investigation was that of yet one more outlying area of the Menard site complex. This is an evident Colonial European and Native American occupation at the Wallace’s Bottom No. 2 site, located on an elevated area in the floodplain on the bank of Lake Dumond about 400 m south of the Lake Dumond archaeological site (Figure 1).

The 1997-1998 Project

The research design for the 1997-98 work at Menard (House 1996) called for collection of wide-ranging baseline data on physical and cultural contexts. In planning this project, we were informed by results from the preceding century of archeological investigation. We intended, however, to complement — not duplicate — previous investigators’ focus on mounds, graves, and rich deposits of habitation refuse. We chose rather to “cast a wide net,” to excavate numerous dispersed 1 x 2 and 2 x 2 m units, directing our attention to portions of the Menard site complex and to kinds of archeological contexts which had not been examined hitherto.

In late winter 1997, we initiated the current field investigations in the Menard site complex by establishing a metric grid system. The grid is oriented to magnetic north, with its N100E300 point at Central Mississippi Valley Survey’s 1941 benchmark, which was the 0-0 point for Ford’s 1958 excavations. Permanent benchmarks were established at four additional grid points at even 100-meter intervals. This grid provided horizontal control for the 1997-98 excavations. Prior to the 1998 work, a survey team from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Pine Bluff District, established the AMSL elevation for the five benchmarks on the Menard-Hodges site and the two on the Lake Dumond site (see below). This allowed consistent elevation recording throughout the excavations. We established a separate grid system for the Lake Dumond site, with its N100E100 point at Datum A, one of two permanent benchmarks on the southern edge of the site.

We excavated in three areas within the Menard-Hodges site complex: (1) the Northern Periphery of the archaeological preserve; (2) the Menard-Hodges Plaza Area (including the plaza proper with its flanking small mounds plus the East Borrow Area and West Borrow Area); and (3) the Lake Dumond site.

The 1997-98 project was under the overall direction of John H. House. A total of 119 volunteer members of the Arkansas Archeological Society participated in the June 1997 Survey/Society Training Session at Menard-
Hodges and Lake Dumond, and 110 participated in the project the following June. In addition to working in the field on the two sites, the Society volunteers worked in the field laboratory in the Sunday school room at nearby Campshed Methodist Church. Arkansas Archeological Survey staff members supervised the teams of volunteers in the field and laboratory, aided by more experienced avocational Society members who were designated as supervisors.

Over the two successive years, the Society/Survey team opened excavation units totaling 45 m² on the Northern Periphery, 47 m² in the Plaza Area, and 53.5 m² at Lake Dumond. With a few exceptions, excavation levels were dry screened through quarter-inch mesh. Throughout both field seasons, a SMAP-type flotation apparatus was operated on the bank of Menard Bayou. Samples of bulk matrix collected for flotation included volumes of nine liters from most standard excavation levels and whole volumes of most cultural features. One hundred and forty-one samples totaling 3179.5 liters of bulk matrix were processed by flotation in 1997, and another 147 samples comprising 4190.0 liters were processed in 1998.

Members of the Quapaw Tribe of Oklahoma took a lively interest in the excavations on their old village site on the lower Arkansas River. Quapaw Tribal Chair Leonard Smith officiated at a cedar smoke blessing of the site and the participants in the project in June 1997; Jess McKibben officiated at a similar ceremony the following year. Carrie Wilson, the Quapaw representative for the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, joined other tribal members in formally consulting on the recovery of human remains and grave goods at the Lake Dumond site in 1997.

Northern Periphery

The northern periphery of the Menard-Hodges archaeological preserve was little-known archaeologically prior to 1997-98. It was taken out of cultivation in the mid-1980s and has since been maintained in short grass by annual bushhogging. The research plan approved in 1996 included field studies to evaluate a proposed relocation of a farm road to this area. The farm road presently crosses the house mounds, middens and cemeteries south of the plaza. In early 1997, Donald Wallace plowed and disc'd a strip across the Northern Periphery that House had previously flagged as a potential road relocation route. After heavy rains in April and May, we were startled to observe evidence of Native American occupation throughout the length of the 537 m long, 5.7 m wide plowed transect. We spent several days at the end of May collecting surface artifacts from the plowed strip in 54 ten-meter collection units. We also recorded nine surface stains (RR Features 1 through 9) that appeared to be refuse-filled pits.

When the tabulated specimens from the Road Relocation controlled surface collection were plotted on a map of the transect (Starr 1999), four concentrations of habitation debris were apparent, each possibly representing a discrete residential unit or household cluster (Flannery 1976). Each of the concentrations included Protohistoric artifacts; e.g. shell-tempered sherds, endscrapers, and Nodena and Madison arrow points. The concentration at the western extremity of the transect also included grog-tempered ceramics indicating Woodland (Baytown and/or Coles Creek) period occupation. One blue glass bead from the western end of the transect is associated with the Protohistoric occupation. In the second concentration (along the north side of the borrow pit), a tiny flake of Mill Creek chert that suggests an early Mississippian period occupation (Brown et al. 1990:265). An apparent wrouth nail from this vicinity may date to the Colonial or Early American periods.

We selected the area of the second artifact concentration on the road relocation transect for excavation during the two June field seasons in 1997. Thomas J. Green and Marvin Jeter supervised the Arkansas Archeological Society Basic Excavation Methods Seminar in this area; in 1998 Green and Ann M. Early supervised the Basic Excavation students on the same locus, renamed the Northern Periphery. In both seasons, experienced Society supervisors helped direct the Northern Periphery excavations.

Excavation units were opened at two of the pit features observed in the plowed transect, and additional 1 x 2 m units were excavated to reveal post hole patterns or other features that might be part of a Protohistoric household cluster. Three refuse-filled pits (RR Features 4, 5, and 11) were excavated; each was roughly circular in plan and about 1.5 m in diameter but extended only about 0.2 m below the base of plowzone. The excavators recorded numerous apparent post holes in the vicinity, but no wall alignments were evident and the intrusions extended only a short distance below the base of plowzone. The shallowness of the pit features and postholes and the well-developed B-horizon characteristics of the soil immediately beneath the plowzone suggest that much of the natural soil profile on this portion of the Menard-Hodges site has been removed by erosion. Results of investiga-
tions on the Northern Periphery of the Menard-Hodges site in 1997-98 indicate that relocation of the field road to this portion of the site is not a readily-available option.

The Plaza Area

Plaza Area excavations were directed in both years by Mary Evelyn Starr with the help of Society supervisors. Previous scientific excavations, not to mention clandestine pothunting, on the Menard-Hodges site were concentrated in this central area of the mounds and plaza. This was also the location in the nineteenth century of the two Menard family homesteads. Transects made with a one-inch diameter solid-core soil probe during preceding winters helped us select areas for excavation during the two June field seasons. We deliberately avoided the areas of the nineteenth-century farmsteads and any areas where Native American graves were suspected based on prior knowledge of the site. We ultimately focused our excavations on two east-west alignments of discontinuous 1 x 2 m units across the plaza (the N100 and N132 rows), the East and West Borrow Areas, and two of Ford’s 1958 trenches (Figure 2).

On both the east and west ends of the N100 row, excavation units in the edges of the house mounds flanking the plaza revealed stratigraphy complicated by dense arrays of post holes, 20-50 cm in diameter and 60-90 cm deep. The size of these post holes suggests a non-domestic function for the structures represented. To date, all of the architectural evidence from Menard-Hodges indicates single-post, as opposed to wall-trench, construction techniques. Both the house mound fills and underlying topsoil in these areas contained abundant habitation debris.

In the approximate center of the plaza, where coring on the N132 Row had revealed deep cultural deposits, excavation revealed ramped pits extending to 2.4 m below the present plaza surface where two, very large (36-45 cm diameter) poles had been erected, one replacing the other. Evidence for tall central poles in the plaza center has been found in many late prehistoric and Protohistoric village plan sites in the Southeast and Midwest (e.g., Morse and Morse 1990: Figure 15; Nass and Yerkes 1995:66-67; Stout and Lewis 1998:151, Sullivan 1995).

The principal post-occupational landscape process in the Plaza Area appears to have been redeposition of sediment eroded from mounds. Stratigraphic profiles from most of the Plaza units (Figure 3) show a plowzone around 20 cm thick formed in colluvium overlying disturbed or truncated natural soil horizons.

Beyond the Plaza proper, we excavated in suspected borrow areas. The stratigraphic evidence from the East Borrow Area was ambiguous with respect to inference of a borrow pit. The profiles of the units on the western, uphill end of the East Borrow Area trench, however, revealed a house mound fill 60 cm thick, containing secondary refuse including ceramics and faunal remains. A blue glass bead was found in the disturbed upper portion of the fill sequence. The stratigraphy in the West Borrow Area, however, appears to confirm it as a borrow pit. At the base of the excavation we found an abrupt, unconforming boundary between underlying, unmodified C-horizon silt and overlying colluvial infilling that contained abundant habitation refuse including ceramics and charcoal and occasional blocks of light-colored silt corresponding to the underlying natural stratum. The total depth of colluvium in these units was 1.2 m, further underscoring the role of erosion and redeposition of mound fill in producing the present-day surface configuration of the site.

By relocating and re-excavating James A. Ford’s 1958 trenches, we intended to reexamine lengthy stratigraphic profiles and to sample the exposed deposits by natural strata, maximizing contextual information while minimizing disturbance of hitherto pristine archaeological contexts. Ford’s Trench 3 and Trench 2 were relocated in 1997 and in 1998, respectively. Both were in house mounds in the former “pear orchard” east of the Plaza, reputed to have been the main focus of Moore’s 1908 digging (Ford 1961:143). We easily relocated both old trenches by converting coordinates between Ford’s 1958 English grid system, oriented to about 357° magnetic, and our metric grid oriented to 0° magnetic. Ford’s Trench 3 was exposed in the easternmost units on the N132 row. Thirty-eight meters to the north, we excavated the East 270 Trench and relocated Ford’s Trench 2. In neither case, however, did the condition of the backfilled 1958 excavations warrant their being cleared in their entirety to expose the stratigraphy in their walls. To our surprise, the mound fill and underlying topsoil sectioned by Trench 3 were almost devoid of cultural debris; Ford (1961:149) reported only that the analysis unit corresponding to Trench 3 “... proved to be rather insensitive” for seriation. The paucity of habitation debris in the house mound
crossed by Trench 3 contrasts with the abundance of such material in the house mounds intersected by the two ends of our N100 alignment. This suggests that the house mound at Trench 3 was constructed comparatively early in the occupational history of the site. The profile of Trench 2 was illustrated by Ford (1961:Figure 4). We found that, at least in the area crossed by our trench, the walls of his 1958 excavation had been almost completely obliterated and the floor was overlain by mixed and cross-bedded deposits of silty spoil. This may be the result of a bulldozer having been used to backfill the 1958 excavations (letter from James A. Ford to J. C. Harrington 10 May 1960, Ford correspondence file, Department of Anthropology, American Museum of Natural History, New York).

The widely dispersed Plaza Area excavation units revealed artificial fill deposits of 0.5 m or more in depth, in locations flanking the plaza which had not been hitherto designated as mounds. The plaza cannot, then, be said to be flanked by a number of discrete individual house mounds. Rather, it may be more accurate to say that the plaza is ringed on three sides by an almost continuous band of artificial deposits on the order of 30 m in width. Our excavations yielded glimpses of the complex physical make-up of this band of fill and suggested that it is made up of stratigraphic units with varying dates of deposition.

**Lake Dumond**

The Lake Dumond archaeological site is the Menard-Hodges site outlier on the west (Figure 1). It consists of an irregular and somewhat dissected peninsular area of terrace some 300 m long north-south and slightly under 100 m wide. On the north, the Lake Dumond site merges with the western edge of the Menard-Hodges site but is separated from the latter by an intervening ravine on the east. The Lake Dumond site only began to attract historical and archaeological scrutiny in the past decade. In an endnote in his *Colonial Arkansas*, Judge Morris S. Arnold (1991:190) marshaled historical clues pointing to the banks of Lake Dumond as the likely location of Tonti's 1686 post and of the early 18th-century French military establishments that succeeded it. Archaeological evidence also pointed to a Colonial-era occupation at the Lake Dumond site. In 1991, on the last occasion that the site was cultivated, House conducted an initial survey revealing the presence of Native American ceramics and lithics and recovering a single
cuprous metal (henceforth simply "brass") tinkling cone. Collectors over recent years had recovered a number of lead musket balls from the vicinity of the tinkling cone find. The Lake Dumond site was selected as one of the locations to be investigated in 1997-98, with the goal of elucidating the Protohistoric and Colonial components.

The 1997-98 investigations at the Lake Dumond site were directed by Stewart-Abernathy with the assistance of Society supervisors and, in 1997, of Virgil Noble, archaeologist with the National Park Service, MidWest Archaeological Center, Lincoln, Nebraska. The two and one-half weeks of field work in June 1997 included site mapping, metal detector survey, and limited test excavations. The metal detector survey produced a Colonial-era metal assemblage including unfired lead musket balls, bar lead, wrought nails and spikes, iron kettle fragments, a wrought iron pindle, cut brass scrap, a triangular brass pendant, and two concentrations of sheet brass tinkling cones. At the south end of the site the investigators identified a substantial 1800s occupation, including a trash deposit in a deep pit feature.

In June 1997, two 2 x 2 m units were excavated on the two tinkling cone concentrations. Excavation revealed that the cones had been plowed out of two of a total of six Native American graves. Other grave goods discovered during excavation included additional tinkling cones (a total of approximately 45, some in fragments), hundreds of rolled brass beads averaging only six mm in length, 698 blue glass seed beads, 38 white glass seed beads, six dark red glass seed beads, and a coil of brass wire. These burials (three of which included trade goods) were in what is currently interpreted as a European-style cemetery, that is, laid out in at least two rows with all remains oriented in the same direction with feet slightly to the northeast. That orientation is approximately consistent with common Christian practice (but it is intriguing that Mound A-B on the Menard-Hodges site also lies northeast of these burials). All of the graves had been truncated by plowing and sheet erosion, but at least two of the burials were associated with trapezoidal soil stains representing either coffins or at least graves dug with shovels. All but one of the sets of human remains were juveniles. The skeletal material was so deteriorated that only dental evidence and bare traces of long bone were present. As required by Arkansas laws, excavation was immediately suspended when the graves were identified and application was made for a state burial excavation permit. As part of the permitting process, formal consultation was carried out with Quapaw tribal officers, some of whom were already present on site to conduct a cedar smoke blessing for the participants in the archaeological work. The Quapaws, archaeologists, and land owners agreed that excavation of the graves was best under the circumstances. The human remains were removed for analysis and curation by the Arkansas Archeological Survey until further disposition is made.

The June 1998 excavations at the Lake Dumond site were preceded in April by a geophysical survey. This survey, employing magnetometer and electrical resistivity methods, was directed by John Weymouth of the University of Nebraska, Lincoln. It was funded by the National Park Service, MidWest Region, and supported by personnel from the National Park Service and Arkansas Archeological Survey and volunteers from the Arkansas Archeological Society. Numerous geophysical anomalies were identified, some of the strongest of which may represent additional graves in the apparent European-style cemetery tested in 1997.

The excavations in June focused on exploration of the geophysical anomalies identified in April. Anomalies in the vicinity of the known graves were not excavated since the presence of a cemetery on this portion of the site had already been demonstrated. Of the five anomalies investigated, two proved to be Native American trash deposits in large, basin-shaped pits. One of these pits is particularly significant since it yielded a large L'Eau Noire Incised rim sherd (Taylor 1998:38) indicative of an early Mississippi period date. This is presently a little-known interval in the prehistoric sequence in the Menard locality and in the lower Arkansas River region in general. Testing on a third anomaly revealed a complex array of post holes including several in pairs, some of which may represent a Native American house rebuilt at least once. A fourth anomaly proved to be associated with a pit or large post hole containing both Mississippian and Woodland pottery and a shallow, disturbed burial (which was not excavated). Excavation on the fifth anomaly revealed possible Native American post holes and an intrusion containing abundant Historic trash, datable to the late nineteenth or twentieth century.

In summary, the investigations at the Lake Dumond site produced evidence of an important prehistoric Native American component and of Colonial period occupation. The latter includes Native American graves that date to at least the general era of Toni's post, but no direct evidence of
either the 1686 post or its early eighteenth-century successor was revealed. The 1997-98 work revealed that archaeological contexts at the site are heavily damaged by a century or more of Historic cultivation and sheet erosion and that much of the original soil profile is missing in many areas. Erosion and gully ing appear to have been particularly severe on the steep western edge of the terrace fronting the river. Notwithstanding, the work demonstrated that substantial intact portions of cultural features, representing prehistoric through nineteenth-century Historic deposits, still survive.

The Wallace's Bottom No. 2 Site

In the final days of the 1998 Training Session, the Society's Site Survey class, taught by David R. Jeane of the Arkansas Archeological Survey, followed up the find of a possible Westerwald sherd by Donald Wallace. This artifact was found in a bottomland soybean field near the bank of Lake Dumond, south of the Lake Dumond archaeological site. The field has been farmed for generations by the Wallaces but is in a tract recently acquired by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, White River National Wildlife Refuge. The Site Survey class found an assemblage of 1700s European material in the field, including tin-glazed earthenware, green-glazed redware, and brown spall gunflints, along with a Native American assemblage including shell-tempered sherds, endscrapers, and chipped lithic debitage. Three of the Native American pottery sherds appear to be Fatherland Incised, a Natchez type also found at early 1700s French Colonial sites in the state of Illinois (Walthall 1992).

Conclusion

The 1997-98 field studies at the Menard-Hodges site and its outliers have highlighted not only the long and eventful occupational history of the locality, spanning the last millennium of prehistory into the Colonial era, but also the enormous physical complexity of its archaeological record. At Menard, we can make few meaningful statements about the historical or cultural significance of any archaeological observation without knowing which contexts date to the eighteenth century, which to the seventeenth century, which to the sixteenth, to the fifteenth, and so on back into the centuries of prehistory. Until we have completed analysis of the materials collected in the field, including botanical specimens, faunal remains, and other Native American and Colonial European artifacts, we may offer only a few preliminary conclusions.

First, the field studies culminating in the 1997-98 project have filled out our picture of the spatial extent of prehistoric and Protohistoric Native American occupation at the Menard site complex. It now appears that Protohistoric occupation is present throughout much of the 13.8 ha of the Archaeological Conservancy's Menard-Hodges preserve. Carrying our field gear up the rutted and often muddy field road from the gate during winter grading work, we became aware of the occurrence of shell-tempered pottery, endscrapers, and Colonial European items some 200 m east of Mound A. The 537 m-long plowed transect subsequently revealed occupation across the length of the northern periphery. Observations by Preston Holder (1957) suggest that the dispersed village area north and east of the core of the Menard-Hodges site merges with that at the Wallace site over one kilometer away. For the Lake Dumond site to the west, we may add another 1.5 to 3.0 ha of dispersed Protohistoric village area. This evidence suggests a dispersed village pattern, similar to colonial era Southeastern Indian towns (eg., Adair 1930:302; Swanton 1946:392-393, 629-641), extending beyond a site core with heavier (or more long-term) occupation. The Wallace’s Bottom site floodplain below the extremity of Little Prairie comprises another 3.75 ha of Protohistoric to Colonial Native American occupation in the locality.

The current field research at the Menard site complex yielded evidence of the ongoing dynamism of the physical landscape. On the outlying Northern Periphery and Lake Dumond site areas, sheet erosion accompanying modern farming appears to have removed all but the deepest primary contexts. In the Plaza Area, conversely, we found widespread deposits of colluvium that must, at least in large part, have been derived from mounds. Henry Jackson Lewis's sketch of Mound A-B (Jeter 1990:Figure 7.32) indicates that the configuration of these monuments has been comparatively stable over the past century. The massive colluvial accumulation spreading out from the foot of these mounds, however, suggests that their configuration may have been altered substantially over the centuries leading up to 1883.

The units excavated in the plaza at Menard-Hodges revealed that this portion of the site is not a void but an archaeologically-complex place where
a variety of substantial facilities were constructed over the span of occupation of the site. Nonetheless, the area does seem to have been an open public space and one kept comparatively free of refuse accumulations.

Refuse-filled pits, such as those we encountered in the Northern Periphery excavations, are the archaeological analog of the food storage pits documented in the ethnohistorical record from widespread geographical regions in eastern North America. Large underground storage pits may be the hallmark of seasonally abandoned settlements, such as for extended hunting expeditions (DeBoer 1988; Drooker 1997:7). Refuse-filled storage pits appear to be infrequent in prehistoric village sites in the Central Mississippi Valley after the Emergent Mississippian horizon, consistent with the inference of full sedentism and storage of maize and other foodstuffs in above-ground granaries. The re-appearance of storage pits in the Protohistoric may be a symptom of the pervasive economic transformations of that era.

Ford (1961:181) commented on the circumscribed distribution of the late Baytown (Coles Creek period in current nomenclature) component at Menard and also speculated that Mound A may have been in part a pre-Mississippian monument. We found Baytown-ware ceramics to be most conspicuous in our samples from the western end of the road relocation transect and the adjacent northern end of the Lake DuMont site. Ford likewise recognized an early Mississippi or Plaquemine period component at the site. This was corroborated in our work by the recovery of the Mill Creek chert hoe flake on the Northern Periphery and the large fragment of a L'Eau Noire Incised jar from the Lake DuMont site. One may speculate that portions of the mound-plaza configuration at Menard-Hodges site date to this prehistoric interval.

One of us has elsewhere argued, primarily on the basis of mortuary vessel assemblages, that much of the Menard Complex (formerly "Quapaw phase") dates to the sixteenth century and that the Menard Locality, in particular, was heavily occupied during this interval (House 1991, 1997). At this point, however, we cannot confidently discriminate between the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries on the basis of utilitarian assemblages such as those recovered in the present Menard field studies.

Ford (1961:158-159) commented on the paucity of European trade goods at Menard, notwithstanding what he saw as compelling evidence that the site corresponds to Quapaw Osotouy. A preliminary tally of probable Colo-
nial-era European items from our 1997-1998 work within the Menard-Hodges archaeological preserve consists of five glass beads (four blue and one white with blue stripes), two lead musket balls, one apparent wrought nail, and one white clay pipestem fragment. These items came from disturbed contexts and were widely dispersed throughout the 13.8 ha preserve. This low overall frequency of European trade items implies that Native American occupation of the southern extremity of the Little Prairie became attenuated soon after 1686. One suspects, however, that if sealed contexts dating to the post-1686 interval were unearthed, large European trade goods assemblages would be recovered, as proved to be the case on the Lake DuMont site in 1997.

A short time ago, one of us (House 1997:93) maintained that no unambiguous eighteenth-century Native American contexts had been identified on the lower Arkansas River. With the identification of the Wallace's Bottom site, happily, this is no longer the case. Understanding the historical context of this remarkable discovery awaits detailed analysis of the collection made by the Arkansas Archeological Society Site Survey Class in 1998 and results from future field investigations. One of the promises of future work at this site is that we may, at long last, identify an undisputed Historic Quapaw archaeological assemblage.

Prospects for the preservation of the Menard-Hodges site and its outliers now seem bright indeed, and surely there will be many future investigations at this fascinating locality on the lower Arkansas River. The field studies just completed and the laboratory studies underway have launched the rediscovery of one of the premier archaeological sites of the Southeast.
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Archaeology and Its Public: A Voegelinian Perspective

Jack D. Elliott, Jr.

For the essence of life is presentness, and only in a mythical sense does its mystery appear in the time-forms of past and future. They are the way, so to speak, in which life reveals itself to the folk (Thomas Mann, Joseph and His Brothers).

Introduction

The view of archaeology as a detached, objective science of the past is slowly giving way to a broader perspective, driven in part by the need to make archaeology more relevant to a broader non-professional audience. This is in part acknowledged by a newly published volume entitled Presenting Archaeology to the Public, where the opening passage observes that the waning years of the 20th century will be identified in the history of archaeology as a time when the profession, as a whole, came to the realization that it could no longer afford to be detached from the mechanisms and programs that attempt to communicate archaeological information to the lay public (Jameson 1997:11).

Yet, as I will argue, we must go beyond the mere communication of information to the public. For if we think of archaeological sites and artifacts as only sources of information, we will perhaps be perplexed by a public for whom information often appears to be secondary. A brief remembrance will help exemplify this. As a child I was fascinated by the aura of the past around my home, ranging from historic sites to Indian mounds to Cretaceous chalk outcroppings. I regularly found buried artifacts in our yard and garden, which my father explained were probably of family origin; my family had resided at that house site since 1846. Having only a limited knowledge of family and local history, I wondered about who used the artifacts and what life must have been like for them. Even though this wonder eventually led me to a career studying the past, yet the modern methodologies for interpreting the past seldom addressed the experiential basis through which the inaccessible past appeared through acts of imagination. Nor did it address the fact that the sense of wonder, whether articulated in scholarly writings or in play-acting a Civil War battle, could never be reduced to simple conceptual language about past things, i.e. people, events, and places.

Today the human experience of the past, from a visitor to a mound site to a Civil War reenactor to a person who views the past through the lenses of myth and sacred texts, raises questions outside the traditional methodological scope, not only about how to present archaeological findings to the public, but also what does the past mean and of what value is it to the common good? These questions originate in the experience of places and artifacts from the past and the meanings and purposes behind preserving them and are implied in the discussion of the “significance” of archaeological and historical sites. They also recall the recent tension between archaeologists and Indians regarding, specifically, claims to graves and grave goods and, more generally, to sacred places. Furthermore, the usage of terms such as “sacred” and “shrine” in reference to “secular” historic places points to a unity of experience that transcends facile dichotomizations between the secular and the sacred, fact and value, and what C.P. Snow (1964) has termed the “two cultures” — the sciences and the humanities.

These questions still warrant considerable discussion. This is in part because the issue of meaning and sacred places involves a dimension that is usually ignored by professionals who are often ill-equipped to deal with questions that lie outside the scope of their disciplinary training. Furthermore, the general avoidance of certain questions pertaining to value, meaning, philosophy, or religion is part of a cultural schizophrenia that has complex roots in the past and that is reinforced today by institutionalized inducements to maintain narrow focuses.

However, in this essay I examine our relationship to history and attempt to establish a common ground for dialogue between scholars and other more public and more ancient ways of viewing it. Although addressed to an archaeological audience, I deal with history in the broader sense as covering the entire story of human experience, both prehistoric and post-prehistoric, to stress the relevance of the discussion to the full range of relevant disciplines.

This essay is profoundly influenced by philosopher of history Eric Voegelin (1901-1985) who realized that history cannot be separated from the symbolic self-interpretations from the past and, indeed, from the conscious activity of interpreting the past from one’s own perspective in time.
Through focusing on the experiences that underlay and preceded formulation as concepts and ideas, for him philosophy of history became inseparable from a philosophy of consciousness (Voegelin 1984:35; Sandoz 1981:143-144). His comparative methodology focused on the interpretation of symbols ranging from ancient Egyptian myths to the Upanishads to the Platonic dialogues, all reflecting equivalent experiences of the same structures in reality (Voegelin 1990a:115-116; Sandoz 1981:208-209). As Ranieri (1999:39) has pointed out, Voegelin’s “unique contribution lies in the way he has searched for the common ground of rationality by focusing on the experiences underlying humanity’s symbolizations.” Consequently, he “has provided a basis for public discourse that avoids some of the problems associated with certain Enlightenment notions of reason still influential in Western democracies” (Ranieri 1999:43).

As will become clear, history is more than an objective description, or explanation, of the past. Indeed it means something at an experiential level to people. It has been the source of myths of origin and of exemplary personages, of tradition and ideals, of heritage and the sacred. To understand this will demand an effort that will involve reflecting on the nature of human experience, that is, of consciousness.

Archeology and the Modern Mind

According to common usage the modern mind emerged with the Enlightenment and is characterized by a confidence that reality is ordered, that human reason can discern that order, and the goal of human achievement lies in discerning and utilizing that order (Smith 1982:7). The achievements associated with the modern mind and with modern science have been vast. Yet there have been losses due to the narrowing perspective on reality. As science has excelled in studying what it considered to be “facts” about “objective phenomena,” it methodologically excluded “value judgments” as though the world could be viewed from a detached perspective. This attitude arose from the belief that only propositions concerning the phenomenal world were “objective,” while judgments concerning personal behavior and the right order of society were merely “subjective.” The most exaggerated form of this is scientism, the belief that reality is only that which can be known through scientific methodologies (Voegelin 1948; 1952:11-12). The result has been the exclusion of a considerable segment of reality from discussion (Hesse 1988:185-186).

The modern intellectual achievement has been associated with the rise of a “detached” historiography that repudiated an exemplary past. This was largely initiated by Voltaire in his Essai sur les Moeurs et L’Esprit des Nations which repudiated tradition and saw the past as only a source of study which, using the Enlightenment concept of reason, would be used in the transformation of human society into a utopia (Voegelin 1998:34-68). Although faith in progress eventually faded during the twentieth century, the growing availability of information from a wide variety of cultures and time periods, accompanied by the nineteenth-century birth of the modern university with its emphasis on specialization, led to an increasing sophistication of thought regarding an objectively reconstructed past.

Perhaps nowhere can we find a more important statement of a vision that shaped modern academia and still articulates its implicit values than in Max Weber’s 1918 address at Munich University, “Wissenschaft als Beruf” — “Science as Vocation” (Gerth and Mills 1946:129-156; for background see Schwenk 1993:6-11; and for a nuanced view of Weber’s thought see Voegelin 1952:13-22). The lecture attacked the last remnants of education as the cultivation of mind and spirit and promoted the production of specialized knowledge. For Weber, “The fate of our times is characterized by rationalization and intellectualization and, above all, by the disenchantment of the world” (Gerth and Mills 1946:155). The goal of “rationalized” scholarship was to “master all things by calculation” through increasingly specialized research. This agenda was to be “value-free”; issues concerning ultimate meaning and value were specifically not to be examined. By implication, historical and cultural studies were to examine social phenomena but were not to pass judgment on them (in other words, one was not to inquire into their significance, to use the key word of contemporary cultural resources management). Weber concisely distilled the paradoxic vision of an institution that is committed to the ultimate value of understanding the world, yet that is forbidden to examine values including those upon which it was founded.

An emphasis on a “value-free” approach has sustained the illusion that we are capable of interpreting reality from a detached perspective, as though we are merely observers of reality and not participants in it. This has tended to reduce reality to empirical “facts” which has consequently reduced human existence to material phenomena and blind, random forces.
Similarly archaeology is conceived of as a science for studying buried artifactual remains and constructing a fairly objective view of past cultures and events. This view is so commonplace that it is often taken for granted that the past is no more than a phenomenon to be studied and reduced to data, the _ne plus ultra_ of the information age.

In _The Death of the Past_, J. H. Plumb described a detached and objective historiography emancipating society from an exemplary past. For him, industrial society, unlike the commercial, craft, and agrarian societies which it replaces, does not need the past ... The new methods, new processes, new forms of living of scientific and industrial society have no sanction in the past and no roots in it.

The past is now recalled only as

a matter of curiosity, of nostalgia, a sentimentality ... The strength of the past in all aspects of life is far, far weaker than it was a generation ago; indeed, few societies have ever had a past in such galloping dissolution as this (Plumb 1973:14).

Plumb describes an extreme scientistic view in which the past holds no meaning other than a source of data for a world that lives only on science and technology.

**Participatory History**

However, in his magisterial study of our relationship to the past, David Lowenthal persuasively disputes this conclusion. After examining the numerous and varied ways that twentieth-century Western humanity participates in the past through historical reenactments, reading history books and historical novels, viewing television shows and movies with historical themes, and visits to historical sites, buildings, and ruins, he concludes that Plumb's observations are "dubious" because "the cult of nostalgia, the yearning for roots, the demand for heritage, the passion for preservation show that the spell of the past remains potent. Indeed, history can never bring about the death of the past, for every act we take, every plan we make, entail the past's more or less conscious re-evaluation, revision, and re-creation ..." (Lowenthal 1985:411-412). It is exactly this experiential basis of our rela-

tion to the past that has raised the question that this essay attempts to address.

Lowenthal's challenge to Plumb's limited view of history parallels challenges to modernism and scientism. In part post-modernism has reacted to the modernists' claims to objective understanding. Although post-modernism has often been an over-reaction, with extreme forms attempting to totally undercut the notion of truth, yet it is clear that "facts" are not simply there to be recorded and explained without reference to underlying conditions of thought. Indeed, values of what is considered to be good and true are implicit in the attitudes and choices of scientists. Even the very acts of perception and cognition distance us from the objective thing. For example, the material world is not simply there to be perceived but is only known as constructs or images in our minds (Dembski 1999:31). Furthermore, Heisenberg's uncertainty principle and Goedel's theorem all point to human limitations to knowledge as the result of our being located within reality, not outside as detached spectators. In that we are within reality, we are part of the processes that we study and are swept along through time like driftwood in a river.

In one sense we are spectators to the past; we think of it as something that is objective and interpret it in this manner with notable results. However, a reflective approach indicates that it is not simply given to us but is mediated through traces from the past — artifacts, documents, and memories — and through our own experiences and interpretive constructs. Consequently the past, as known to us, is an elaborate symbolic construct, or representation, in our minds.

However, we are not merely spectators, we are also actors within reality. In that the present, the only time that we experience directly, is infinitesimally small, and the future is available to us only through anticipation, virtually all of world as we know it is derived from the past as mediated to us. Consequently, we not only study the past, but it also constitutes our understanding and the collective memory of people and societies through memory, narrative, artifacts, places, rituals, and institutions. History is the source of role models and ideas based upon the experiences of those who have preceded us. In sum, history is something that we are a part of and our interpretation of it; we are spectators and actors in history; we participate in history (Smith 1984:15-17).
This can be illustrated by examining the manner in which history constitutes us as individuals and communities by forming the structures of meaning in which we live. The ideas from history and about history serve to define communities and their values. It is this aspect of history which has led sociologist Robert Bellah and his colleagues to refer to “communities of memory” in that:

Communities . . . have a history — in an important sense they are constituted by their past — and for this reason we can speak of a real community as a “community of memory,” one that does not forget its past. In order not to forget that past, a community is involved in retelling its story, its constitutive narrative, and in so doing, it offers examples of the men and women who have embodied and exemplified the meaning of the community. These stories of collective history and exemplary individuals are an important part of the tradition that is so central to a community of memory (Bellah et al. 1985:153; cf. Bellah 1970:201).

Tradition is the manner in which much of history affects us. In his 1983 Jefferson Lecture in the Humanities, Jaroslav Pelikan (1984:73) argued that “during most of our history, insight has often come through the recitation and rearrangement of materials from tradition.” For it is with tradition that society exposes us to the greatest insights, from the skills needed to build a chair to reflections on the meaning of life. In conjunction with this thesis Pelikan separated his view of the importance of tradition from traditionalism, a view that uncritically venerates the past. For him tradition is an icon, or image, that presents itself “as the way that we who are its heirs must follow if we are to go beyond it — through it, but beyond it — to a universal truth that is available only in a particular embodiment, as life itself is available to each of us only in a particular set of parents” (Pelikan 1984:56).

He further elaborated:

The growth of insight — in science, in the arts, in philosophy and theology — has not come through progressively slogging off more and more of tradition, as though insight would be purest and deepest when it has finally freed itself of the dead past. It simply has not worked that way in the history of the tradition, and it does not work that way now. By including the dead in the circle of discourse, we enrich the quality of the conversation (Pelikan 1984:81).

In that culture is symbolically based and communicated, history and tradition are the origin and basis of the symbolic universes, or the “bodies of theoretical tradition that integrate different provinces of meaning and encompass the institutional order in a symbolic totality” (Berger and Luckmann 1967:95; cf. Geertz 1973:89). It is because of the dimension of meaning that we can no longer see societies as simply aggregates of objective things, an insight that is supported by emic approaches in anthropology. In this regard, Voegelin observed that:

Human society is not merely a fact, or an event, in the external world to be studied by an observer like a natural phenomenon. Though it has externality as one of its important components, it is as a whole a little world, a cosmos, illuminated with meaning from within by the human beings who continuously create and bear it as the mode and condition of their self-realization. It is illuminated through an elaborate symbolism, in various degrees of compactness and differentiation — from rite, through myth, to theory . . . (Voegelin 1952:27).

Consequently, any attempt at understanding our relationship to history should be cognizant of the way in which it is symbolically mediated to us, because it is only through the filter of consciousness that reality appears to us, and consciousness is as much reality as the material world. Therefore our understanding of “objective things” is inseparable from meaning, our constructs, and our sense of what is good and true, so that reality as known is inherently related to meaning, or significance, to use the term so frequently used and misunderstood by preservationists.

The Sacred

Given the depth and ambiguity of our experience of the past it should be of no surprise that the experience of “the sacred” would be integrally part of it. This can be seen from the experience of awe in places, battlefields, buildings, mounds, etc. and through an inchoate urge to refer to such places as “sacred.” Often people will qualify their usage of the term by saying that they did not mean it in a “religious” sense, as though experience and existence could somehow be divided up into religious and secular components. The sense of awe experienced by a Civil War reenactor on an historic battlefield cannot be considered as fundamentally different from the sense of awe felt by a pilgrim at a shrine.
The experience of awe involves an experience of something bigger than us that places us in a meaningful context. So narratives arise that interpret places and what happened there to place the person in a larger context. Although we might regard these narratives as "myths," they will often have degrees of historical objectivity. American history often serves as a myth of national origins, while less objectively, the myth of the Trojan War, which served as a national epic that united the politically fragmented Classical Greeks, was probably an imaginary embellishment of a core of truth.

Although many modern people might discount the experience of the sacred as merely subjective, the issue has been pushed to the fore by the tension between archaeologists and people who consider certain archaeological and natural sites to be sacred. A recent anthology — *Sacred Sites, Sacred Places* — takes up the issue of sacred places and what they mean to people in different cultures and relates it to the practical problems faced by archaeologists involved in cultural resource management. Summarizing from a variety of studies concerning the sacred places of North American Indians, Australian aborigines, Sub-Saharan Africans, and Europeans, the editors argue that:

There are different ways of knowing about the earth, about sacred places, and about archaeological sites. Some of the ways are scientific and some are spiritual. One way of knowing does not negate the validity of another . . .

It is essential that scientific knowledge and influence are accepted, but at the same time the legitimacy of traditional indigenous ways of knowing must also be recognized (Carmichael et al. 1994:7).

As the editors of the volume point out, "there are broad similarities between peoples from various parts of the world, both in the nature of their sacred sites, and in their heritage concerns" (Carmichael et al. 1994:1). This would come as no surprise to scholars of comparative religion, such as Mircea Eliade, Huston Smith, and Wilfred Cantwell Smith, who see in the various mythologies, rituals, and sacred places, a symbolic articulation of a dimension of life that cannot be reduced to empirically-based concepts, an indefinable dimension that Eliade (1959), following in the footsteps of Rudolf Otto (1950), terms "the sacred." This aspect of culture attests to the fact that there is more to the world than can be measured, described, and explained by science by virtue of our being participants within it. After all, although we tend to take it for granted, the existence of reality is a mystery, something that ultimately cannot be explained in scientific terms. As the physicist Max Planck observed: "Science cannot solve the ultimate mystery of Nature. And it is because in the last analysis we ourselves are part of the mystery we are trying to solve" (quoted in Barrow and Tipler 1986:123).

The sacred is a trans-rational experience of dimensions of reality that, in the euphoria of academic successes, we have ignored if not disparaged. For Eliade:

Consciousness of a real and meaningful world is intimately connected with the discovery of the sacred. Through experience of the sacred, the human mind has perceived the difference between what reveals itself as being real, powerful, rich, and meaningful and what lacks these qualities, that is, the chaotic and dangerous flux of things, their fortuitous and senseless appearances and disappearances (quoting himself in Eliade 1978:xiii).

In that the sacred is "part of the structure of human consciousness," it is integral to and implicit in human experience (Eliade 1973:101). The articulation of the sacred has traditionally been through the use of myths which are usually stories of the past, of the mythical time of origins. As Eliade (1973:105) observed: "If man goes again to the mythical event which is being re-actualized, he does not go back in historical time, but rather he goes out of his profane time to the sacred, mythical time when the gods or heroes were with him." However, this mythical time is experientially similar to the imaginative time through which the past is experienced today.

Although primitive and/or pre-modern societies viewed reality through mythic lenses, the rise of more critical, conceptual languages associated with history, philosophy, and science began to more effectively articulate various realms of existence which in many ways made myth increasingly obsolete (Frankfort et al. 1977:363-387; Hyland 1973). However, as Eric Voegelin has pointed out, myth continues to have a value in articulating aspects of reality that cannot be reduced to things and causes. The analogical language of myth conveys a sense that the ultimate meaning of reality lies in a mystery that is beyond our comprehension and through linking our lives to this context; consequently, everything that we describe and explain, everything that we think that we understand will remain shrouded to a certain degree
in ambiguity and a sense of mystery by virtue of our limited perspective within the reality that we can never fully understand (Hughes 1993: 22, 108-110). As Voegelin wrote: "The reality of things, it appears, cannot be fully understood in terms of the world and its time; for the things are circumfused by an ambience of mystery that can be understood only in terms of the Myth" (Voegelin 1990b:175). The term "sacred" is a mythical symbol for this mystery.

Understanding the sacred is often difficult for moderns who are trained to think in terms of radically dichotomized notions of "objective" and "subjective." However, for Eliade the sacred is not absent in moderns but is only hidden and experienced in the form of "imaginary universes" which are the products of creative or artistic endeavors (Eliade 1987:xi; cf. Eliade 1959:207). Indeed, he has seen our experience of history as perhaps the most important element in our hidden sense of the sacred. This is exemplified by our preservation of and visitation at historic sites where we relive the past (Elliott 1994) and by battle reenactors who "seek imaginative entry into the heroic past" (Linenthal 1991:5).

Conclusion

At the beginning of this essay it was noted that the challenge to archaeology is to address a lay public effectively. Although this might be interpreted as simply presenting more programs and writing more popular publications, getting out the information so to speak, it also implies a deeper challenge — to understand and address the fact that most people are not interested in the past because they love to acquire information but because there is something deeper, an experience of mystery in the vicarious participation in unseen origins. Indeed, I suspect that this is primarily why children grow up to be professional archaeologists, the only difference being that along the way they are enculturated into the belief that they are detached spectators who thrive on data collection.

There are two basic responses that scholars can take toward addressing the lay public. The first can be termed "isolated discourse." According to this each group tolerates the other without meaningful dialogue. This can have two basic forms, which I term the modern and the post-modern approach. The modern is to respect the other parties while regarding them as simply being wrong if they do not adhere to the methodological canons of particular disciplines. The post-modern, on the other, regards each side as being a separate truth, one of many truths, a perspective that implicitly undercuts a need for further scholarship or dialogue because if all perspectives are true then there is no need for critical debate.

The other response is hermeneutic; it recognizes that most interpretations contain some truth, but no interpretations contain it all. As an example, I might consider rival claims to the past from archaeologists and Indian tribes, particularly in cases where claims to graves and grave goods are based upon legendary or mythic tribal histories that often claim that the tribe has been in a certain area "since creation." In this regard, the archaeologists' interpretations are usually superior in an objective sense, although we must always keep in mind the ambiguity that is inherent in all representations of the past. The Indian myths should not be treated as representations of an objective past, although they might indeed incorporate elements that are valid representations of objective history. In general, however, these narratives are symbolic structures that articulate people's sense of meaning within the transcendent mystery.

The hermeneutic route will require developing an awareness that behind all images, objective and otherwise, lie complex interpretive constructs and values, that simultaneously serve as objective descriptions and serve as the symbolic universes or worlds of meaning in which we exist. This will require, in part, reflection upon one's own conscious experience and the nature of interpretation. It will also require considerable reading outside of one's specialization, for which there are few institutional supports. For this purpose, the study of the works of Eric Voegelin will be particularly illuminating by virtue of his focus on the parallels of experience and symbolization across the millennia (as introductions to his large corpus of writing, I would suggest Hughes 1993; Sandz 1981; Webb 1981). In the aftermath of the Cold War with the world increasingly dominated by mutually hostile ethnicities, nationalism, and religions, his work has considerable potential, because it supplies the means of uncovering universalities that underlie seemingly contradictory symbolisms (Webb 1997:162, 168).

Finally, in regard to history as experienced, I can conclude that: (1) the past is not only an object of study and a source of data; (2) instead, it invokes the multidimensionality of human experience that can be partially symbolized but partially lies beyond symbolization; and (3) consequently there is an underly-
ing ambiguity or sense of mystery that can be evoked by the experience of history and that can only be articulated by mythical imagery.

I will recall a well-known parable or myth which speaks truth although it undoubtedly does not describe an objective event. It is the tale of the blind men and the elephant. Each one feels a different part of the elephant’s anatomy and describes it in widely varying terms. The one who grabs the trunk says that the elephant is like a large snake; the one who rubs the torso says that it is like a wall; the one who feels a leg says that it is like a tree, and so on. This is a classical description of varying descriptions of the same reality, and coincides with a line from the Rig-Veda: “The Real is one, although the sages call it by many names.” However, we need not believe that the blind men would have to leave their descriptions at such a disparate level of appearances. If we extend the story to have them continuing to feel about on the elephant and to compare their descriptions, we could reasonably expect that the descriptions would increasingly coincide. Could we conclude that their search for the one truth is justified by virtue of their faith that they are all feeling of the same elephant?
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Book Reviews

_Grit Tempered: Early Women Archaeologists in the Southeastern United States_.
Edited by Nancy Marie White, Rochelle A. Mattina, and Lynne P. Sullivan.

Reviewed by Christopher Davies

Containing 15 chapters concerning numerous professional and amateur archaeologists who worked in the Southeastern United States, _Grit Tempered: Early Women Archaeologists in the Southeastern United States_ is an ambitious book. The editors of this volume make it clear that one of the primary goals of this publication is to inject a little feminism in the study of Southeastern archaeology. The editors state that,

while we do not intend this volume to be a rhabid radical feminist polemic, though those are occasionally healthy for for science, we do wish to bring up, in the context of the lives of the women described, ideas for serious consideration in Southeastern archaeology (p. 5).

Only nine of the 15 chapters within this book are actually biographical sketches of women who have worked in the Southeast. These chapters cover the lives and careers of Margret E. Ashley, Isabel Garraud Patterson, Madeline D. Kneberg Lewis, Betuye J. Broyles, Rochelle A. Mattina, Yulee W. Lazarus, Hester A. Davis, Martha Ann Robinson and Elizabeth S. Wing. An autobiographical sketch by Patty Jo Watson is also included. Each of these chapters includes a selected bibliography of the subject's publications. Another chapter covers the use of African-American women as WPA labor at the Irene mound in Savannah, Georgia. A "memoir" of being a female graduate student at Florida State University in the 1950s is presented by Carol L. Mason. The remaining chapters are the introduction, a discussion of the research subjects for this book, and a final chapter concerning the interpretation of the past.

For the most part, the chapters are ordered along chronological lines. Those readers interested primarily in the archaeology at the beginning of the twentieth century will become less interested as the book goes on, and vice-versa. Those who are interested in the overall development of our field of inquiry will find the entire book hard to put down. For those interested in feminist critique and theory, the introduction and the final two chapters concentrate on these issues. For this reader, the broad range of time and subject matter is what makes the book so appealing.

The editors of this volume made a conscious effort to review differing types of public careers. For instance, Yulee Lazarus was not a professional in the strict sense of the word. She did more for cultural resource preservation at the Ft. Walton Mound, however, than most "professionals" could ever dream. Isabel Patterson also would be classified as an avocational archaeologist. Yet without her unwavering enthusiasm, much of what we know about southeastern prehistory would not have been obtained. Patterson used her prominent social standing to obtain permission for excavations, raise funds for fieldwork, and generally have her ideas on southeastern prehistory taken seriously. As R. Gerald Ledbetter states in the chapter concerning Patterson, "much of Patterson's role seems to have been as this kind of facilitator, smoothing the way for the work to proceed" (p. 50). These chapters also add to the book's appeal by reminding us that one need not to be a professional to have an extremely positive impact on archaeological research and development.

Professional archaeologists are not left out of the mix, however. Perhaps the two most notable figures in the book, especially in the modern sense, are Hester Davis and Patty Jo Watson. The list of contributions that Hester Davis has made to southeastern archaeology, and to historic preservation in general, is extremely long. When reading of her achievements with the Arkansas Archeological Survey, one cannot help but feel insignificant by comparison. According to Nancy Marie White, the author of this chapter,

her work to save sites and educate the public has had far more lasting value than any faddish theoretical orientation of the moment, and a impact upon the discipline that few strictly research-oriented archaeologists could ever hope to achieve (p. 227).

Patty Jo Watson is easily one of the most recognized names in the Southeastern archaeological literature today. Her autobiographical chapter informs the reader of how she began in southeastern archaeology and in the study of caves. Although her career was somewhat later than most in the book, it
seems appropriate for someone of this stature in our field to describe her accomplishments and how these were achieved.

Discussions of early female archaeologists in Mississippi are lacking in this book. Let's face it, Mississippi has always been conservative, especially when it comes to women's roles. There seemingly isn't much to talk about, although it might prove to be an interesting research project for someone to undertake. The only real mention of Mississippi comes in the chapter about Betzye Broyles. Even this discussion of her survey work for Jay Johnson and Robert Thorne feels somewhat lacking. Nonetheless, this chapter was easily this reader's favorite. Hester Davis conveys Broyles' absolute love for fieldwork and unwavering commitment to preservation extremely well in this chapter.

Each chapter concerning a specific individual, including the autobiographical sketch by Patty Jo Watson, makes an attempt to discuss sexism as encountered in their careers. Not surprisingly, this is made more of a focal point of the chapters written by the editors than those written by others. In sum, varying degrees of sexism were encountered by each of the subjects. All of these women overcame this chauvinism and prospered very well in a field dominated by men. In each instance, it is made clear that these problems were overcome because each enjoyed what she was doing.

Other chapters, like the one by Carol Mason on her experience as a student in Florida in the 1950s, serve to break up the monotony of the biographical sketches. Present and former university students of all levels, and both genders, will undoubtedly draw comparisons and find certain similarities to their own experiences in this memoir. The chapter on the Irene mound excavations and the use of African-American women as labor serves as a "wake up" to most present archaeologists. One has to wonder why our field is seemingly so devoid of African-Americans today.

The book does inadvertently bring up a few questions. One might feel overwhelmed by the prevalence of Arkansas and Florida in the text. Is this because the cultural attitudes were somewhat more liberal in these states? Is it simply because the archaeology in Arkansas and Florida interested these researchers more than did the archaeology in other states in the Southeast? Does it have anything to do with two of the three editors of this volume being from Florida? Perhaps, as now, one simply took the job opportunities where one could get them. Still, the reader cannot help but wonder if the research concerning early women archaeologists in other southeastern states is incomplete.

To reiterate, one of the primary goals of this book was to inject a little more feminist thought into southeastern archaeology. Perhaps the only problem with this goal is that this volume does not deal with the archaeological record. This volume deals with the lives of real people who made significant contributions to our understanding of the prehistory and history of the Southeast. Nonetheless, the point is made. In reviewing the accomplishments and lives of the early women archaeologists in this region, we begin to wonder where we would be without these truly extraordinary individuals and their commitment to the understanding of southeastern prehistory.

In closing, this book will appeal to a broad range of archaeologists. Amateurs, professionals, students, historians, and theoreticians will all be intrigued by this well-written volume. Undoubtedly, this book belongs in a variety of university classroom settings. Every professional and amateur archaeologist in the Southeast should have a copy on the bookshelf. It is truly required reading for all those interested in the prehistory of the southeastern United States and the development of archaeological research.

Christopher Dance is an architect with the U. S. Forest Service, Bienville National Forest.


Reviewed by Karl G. Lorenz

In the spring of 1993, the Lamar Institute conducted a small conference at the Ocmulgee National Monument in Macon, Georgia with two primary goals in mind. The first goal was to summarize the history of knowledge of the Middle Woodland period Swift Creek archaeological culture whose "heartland" was centered in Georgia and the panhandle region of northern Florida. The second goal involved gathering those scholars actively engaged in archaeological research on Swift Creek to present the current problems and research directions related to this Southeastern phenomenon. The conference was attended by over 25 archaeologists, of whom 13 presented papers which appear in revised form in this edited volume of 15
chapters. The editors note that starting with Chapter 3, the book is organized geographically from north to south within the Swift Creek region. While this is certainly the case, I would add that the book is also topically organized. The first two chapters cover the early history of Swift Creek research. Chapters 3 through 5 involve settlement pattern studies based on the distribution of Swift Creek ceramics across the lower Southeast. Chapters 6 through 10 involve detailed design analyses of the complicated stamped ceramics that are used to define Swift Creek culture. Finally, chapters 11 through 14 involve analyses and comparisons of excavated artifacts and feature assemblages from Swift Creek sites. The book concludes with an excellent synthesis of what we now know about Swift Creek culture from research contained in this volume, and future directions and research questions that still need to be explored.

Like many edited volumes based on conference proceedings, this book is uneven in the quality of papers and lacks the unifying cohesion suggested by the book’s title, *A World Engraved*. Some chapters provide strong presentations of the archaeological evidence and offer persuasive arguments, while other chapters offer very little evidence, yet provide the reader with more than enough untested but thought-provoking speculation. For the reader uninitiated to the Middle Woodland period phase names of the archaeological regions covered in this book (i.e., Deepford, Napier, Connecce, Woodstock, Cartersville, etc.), I highly recommend David Anderson’s concluding chapter, where he provides a nice introduction to phases, dates, and geographic locations for each archaeological manifestation. I will briefly comment on each chapter’s strengths and weaknesses as they apply to the goals of the conference.

The introductory chapter by the editors is nicely organized chronologically from the earliest archaeological mention in the literature in the late 1800s and early 1900s of complicated stamped pottery, to the excavations conducted at the Swift Creek mound site at Macon, Georgia by A. R. Kelley in 1936 and the first settlement pattern survey by Robert Wauchope in the late 1930s. The chapter goes on to show how recent investigations presented in this volume have further added to our knowledge of Swift Creek culture. Also included in this introduction are a series of observations that the editors offer toward putting the remaining chapters into some kind of explanatory context with regard to understanding Swift Creek archaeological patterns, particularly that Swift Creek represents “social unity on the regional scale”; that local people were “networking” in an information exchange network. The authors candidly admit to speculation about the degree to which wood carving subsumed all aspects of Swift Creek culture like that of aboriginal Northwest Pacific Coast cultures. Such speculation, though, can provide test implications for hypotheses regarding the use and function of carved wooden artifacts, if any are discovered in Swift Creek contexts in future excavations. They conclude the chapter with two questions that the remainder of the book addresses: “Under what economic, social, political, or religious condition does open networking flourish?” and “What was the real value to local people who desired to be connected to the Woodland Information Super Highway?” (p. 11).

The second chapter, by Alan Marsh, follows closely on the heels of the first in that it details the role of African-American women as WPA excavators during the first excavations of the Swift Creek mound site back in 1936. The chapter seems out of place with the rest of the book in that it appears to provide a sociological analyses of the WPA rather than offering a historical overview of the 1936-37 excavation of the site.

The next three chapters provide an overview of the geographic distribution across the lower Southeast of mound and non-mound sites containing Swift Creek Complicated Stamped pottery. Chapter 3, by Daniel Elliott, provides a lot of useful information on sites containing Swift Creek ceramics, but the reader is left wondering what percentage of each site’s decorated assemblage is represented by Swift Creek complicated stamped. Raw sherd counts of Swift Creek Complicated Stamped are given, but without information on sample sizes or other types the reader is unable to determine whether the Swift Creek sherds represent a majority culture or the majority type local to the area. Much of the text of this chapter could have been condensed into a table noting the site name and the frequency of Swift Creek ceramics relative to the overall ceramic assemblages. If indeed, as the author claims, this is the first step to a larger study of interregional settlement patterns, then a map plotting settlement distributions across the study area of the Savannah and Tennessee River valleys would have been useful.

Chapter 4, by Mark Williams and Jennifer Frier Harris, draws heavily on David Hally’s model of hypothesized Mississippian chiefdom size. Even though Hally’s study examined the geographical distances between Mississippian mound centers, Williams and Harris apply this model to Middle Woodland Swift Creek mound locations as determined by site data in the
Georgia Archaeological Site File. The authors freely admit that some of the mounds in their sample lack conclusive temporal affiliation with the Middle Woodland period, and some are only rumored to be actual mounds (i.e., no ground verification). Despite this admittedly weak database, the authors go on to recognize regular distance spacing of 29-35 km between mounds, which leads them to conclude that Swift Creek mounds may have served as some kind of religious shrines that served the ritual needs of local Middle Woodland people. The lack of any significant midden and the absence of habitation areas around some of these mounds help to support their hypothesis of ritual centers, but the regular site distribution is suspect, since even the authors admit that "probably several of the sites or possible sites we have listed will prove not to be part of the pattern" (p. 45).

In Chapter 5, by David Chase, the origins and spread of the Swift Creek ceramic tradition are discussed. While the author suggests some Marksville influence from the lower Mississippi valley, he concludes that the tradition likely emerged from one of three possible places in central or southwest Georgia. Chase presents radiocarbon dates to argue his point, but he is inconsistent in his method of reporting the dates. Even though all dates are compared to one another to note contemporaneity, some dates are corrected with the MASCA correction factor while others are reported as uncorrected. While the uncorrected dates are reported with the one sigma standard deviation, only the intersection of these corrected dates, with no mention of a one or two sigma standard deviation range of error. Despite this inconsistency, Chase does demonstrate a possible Hopewell–Swift Creek trade connection from the Mann site in southern Indiana all the way down to the Mandeville site on the lower Chattahoochee river of southwestern Georgia, with Hopewell type artifacts and Swift Creek Complicated Stamped ceramics being found together at each site. As with Elliott's chapter on settlement distribution, Chase's arguments for the expansion of the Swift Creek ceramic tradition could have been strengthened with a map noting key sites involved in his hypothesized trade network between Hopewell and Swift Creek.

Chapters 6 through 10 provide the most original contributions of the book, focusing on the hypothesized cosmological symbolism conveyed by the complicated-stamped design motifs produced by Swift Creek potters. Each chapter makes its own unique contribution related to this theme. Chapter 6, by Frankie Snow, provides the most recent results from the author's research on Swift Creek design motifs that has been ongoing for the last 25 years. This paper is concerned with an intensive analysis of hundreds of design patterns that are interpreted to be zoomorphic and cosmological symbols. Snow contends that these symbols could provide valuable information about the Swift Creek people's "world view, magic, religion, and folktales not accessible by other archaeological analyses" (p. 61). Through a tradition of stamping their ceramics with elaborately carved wooden paddles depicting flowers, serpents, birds, insects, wolves, and human masks, Snow believes that shamanistic beliefs were being recorded on ceramics. While Snow provides insight into the possible ritual symbolism of the stamped designs, his specific interpretations relating to parallels with historic southeastern Indian folklore remain conjectural, with a number of untestable assumptions.

Chapter 7, by Frankie Snow and Keith Stephenson, hypothesizes that site-to-site interaction is reflected by the presence of the same complicated stamped design motif from two or more sites. In their case study, they found that 48% of the paddle designs from the Hartford site in central Georgia were also found in assemblages from other sites. They suggest that the origin of the paddle that produced the design would likely be the site where many sherds from several different vessels contained the same design. Given this explanation for design distribution, they conclude that more designs moved to the Hartford site than from it. They suggest that designs could have moved to the site by way of seasonal movements of the same community, gift exchange between communities, or inter-marriage between communities whereby the woman who made the pottery moved to the site. The authors were even able to identify a shifting pattern of alliance and interaction, whereby most of the designs from the submound deposits at the Hartford site are shared with sites upstream, while most of the designs from later deposits at the site are shared with sites downstream.

The next two chapters seek to determine the source site for many of the Swift Creek design motifs using ceramic thin sectioning. Chapter 8, by Betty Smith, is based on a study conducted in 1975 in which she used neutron activation analysis to try to distinguish trace element differences between the clays from the Swift Creek mound site and the Mandeville site. Smith found no decisive difference in the clays, and thus was unable to conclude whether ceramics were locally made or imported. Chapter 9, by James Stoltman and Frankie
Snow, is much more successful in determining whether paste properties of vessels with the same design differed using petrographic analysis of thin-sectioned Swift Creek ceramics from eleven sites around Georgia. They hypothesize that, if paste properties do differ between vessels with the same unique design motif, then the carved wooden paddles producing these designs must be moving from site to site by way of seasonal movements of whole social groups or by intermarriage as discussed in Chapter 7. In contrast, if paste properties between vessels with the same design motif are the same from one site to the next, then pots were being exchanged as part of a larger gift giving/ritual feasting exchange network to maintain intercommunity interaction. The first scenario is affected by social motivating forces predominately involving the circulation of people, while the second involves the circulation of goods, and is therefore motivated by economic forces. In their study they found that the majority of the seven design types analyzed reflected the first scenario of paddle exchange, while two of the design types reflected the second scenario of goods exchange.

Chapter 10, by Rebecca Saunders, is an attempt to compare the spatial distribution of complicated-stamped pottery designs across two sites in coastal Georgia. Saunders isolated ten different design groups based on different combinations and arrangements of certain motifs that include tear drops, circles, spirals, scrolls, diamonds, and ladders. Saunders’ classification system is problematic, however, in that several of her design groups contain motifs that are not unique to one group, so that some elements are shared by several design groups. As a consequence, what might be considered a range of variation within a single design type has been split into several variants defined as different types. This problem is evident in a comparison of north-south distributions of each design type across one site. A chi-square test for significance was conducted to determine if certain design groups could be found to cluster in one part of the site, which might suggest possible clan or lineage descent group affiliations. Saunders found no significant difference in spatial distribution of her ten types, but then again her chi-square was made up of 20 cells (ten designs in the north and ten designs in the south) with sherd counts for each cell ranging from 0-8, with over 91% of the cells containing fewer than five sherds. With so many small cell sizes, any statistical results are questionable. Thus, Saunders’ conclusion that the two sites were occupied by the same people at different times of year is difficult to evaluate with such an ambiguous system of measurement.

The following four chapters present a comparison of excavated Swift Creek feature and artifact assemblages from sites in Georgia (Kolomoki and Mandeville), northwestern Florida (Block-Sterns and Santa Rosa sites), and northeastern Florida (St. Johns River sites). Each chapter tends to focus on site-specific data, but this is useful in demonstrating how much variability existed in Swift Creek settlement organization. These chapters could have complemented the preceding chapters on the importance of design motifs by providing some archaeological context (i.e., ritual vs. domestic) for the distribution of the different motifs on each site. Unfortunately, they do not.

Chapter 11, by Karl Steinen, presents no new data on the Kolomoki site excavated by William Sears in the 1950s. Instead, Steinen develops a model of maize intensification (originally suggested by Sears in 1971) to explain the hypothesized rise of centralized ceremonialism at Kolomoki around AD 250–300. It is interesting how Steinen selectively chooses to interpret certain radiocarbon dates to fit his model. For example, to make the case that the Mandeville site rose in ceremonial importance in the Early Swift Creek period prior to AD 300, but then declined before the rise of Kolomoki, the author presents two radiocarbon dates from Mandeville of 1960 + 150 BP and 1420 + 150 BP and argues that based on radiocarbon dates, “one can easily assign the site to a pre-AD 300 setting” (p. 186). While the first date supports Steinen’s argument, the second date produces an uncorrected range of AD 380–680, suggesting an occupation contemporary with Kolomoki. Steinen briefly alludes to the negative results of a survey that he conducted in Early County, Georgia, in search of a support population of Swift Creek and Weeden Island sites surrounding Kolomoki. The reader is never given any details as to the size of the survey area or the nature of survey sampling methods used. From the survey results, Steinen concludes that the absence of sites around Kolomoki and the large midden at the site suggests a nucleated population, supported by maize agriculture, using a system of scattered garden plots similar to the pattern observed ethnographically on the South Pacific island of Fiji. The author recognizes the established literature that contends that maize did not provide a significant source of food in the diet until the Late Woodland period, and that when maize is found in Middle Woodland period deposits it is found in small quantities and is always restricted to ceremonial contexts. Nonetheless, without any evidence for maize at Kolomoki the author chooses to use his outdated maize agriculture hypothesis to explain the lack of Swift Creek period sites surrounding Kolomoki.
Chapter 12, by Keith Ashley, examines the distribution of Swift Creek ceramics from burial mounds and shell middens in the St. Johns River area of northeast Florida, located outside of the known geographic distribution of the Swift Creek Complicated Stamped ceramic type. An excellent synthesis of Middle Woodland mortuary data for the St. Johns River area is presented to offer some suggestions as to sociopolitical complexity and shared patterns with Swift Creek cultures in northwestern Florida and in Georgia. Using an untested model that the author admits is “simplistic and contains obvious gaps,” a working hypothesis is offered to explain the high frequency of Swift Creek ceramics which appear to be locally produced and used at shell midden sites. Based on shared design motifs, the Early Swift Creek period from AD 100–300 is characterized by interaction and marriage exchange with northwestern Florida Swift Creek groups. During the Late Swift Creek period from AD 300–700, design similarities with Swift Creek groups in south-central and coastal Georgia reflect a shift in interaction spheres, with a noticeable drop in interaction/marriage exchange with northwestern Florida, possibly as a result of the rise of the Early Weeden Island McKee site between AD 200–300. Unfortunately, the most interesting questions of this research are presented by the author as directions for future research. These include, “How do Early and Late Swift Creek designs compare with those from northwestern Florida and coastal Georgia?” and, “Did Late Swift Creek groups from the lower Georgia coast actually immigrate to north-eastern Florida?” (pp. 220–221).

Chapter 13, by B. Calvin Jones, Daniel Penton, and Louis Tesar, provides an excellent summary of excavations of an Early Swift Creek period, multi-stage platform mound site located southeast of Tallahassee, Florida. The summary includes a presentation from the Block-Stearns site of mound stratigraphy and artifact assemblages recovered from excavations in mound contexts in 1973 and village contexts in 1994, including descriptions of house outlines and artifacts, floral remains, and faunal remains. It is interesting to note that mound excavations produced a ceramic female figurine indicative of Hopewell-like ceremonialism, as well as exotic materials of obsidian, galena, worked copper, copper ore, graphite, and quartz crystals. The village excavations produced 400 to 500 gallons of soil which were processed by water screening through 1/16 inch window screen. Despite this impressive effort, no evidence of tropical cultigens, such as maize, beans, or squash, was recovered. Also, no design patterns on the complicated-stamped ceramics appear to match any from Georgia.

Chapter 14, by Judith Bense, summarizes what is currently known (as of 1994) about the archaeology of the Santa Rosa-Swift Creek culture on the northern Gulf Coast of northwestern Florida. The summary includes information related to chronology (site occupations range from AD 150–670), artifact assemblage patterns, subsistence, site types, and settlement patterns. While permanent settlements are largely confined to site clusters located along the coastal strip, site types include large ring middens enclosing open, artifact-free “plazas,” long linear middens, and small midden dumps. Some of these midden sites are associated with burial mounds and some are not. Those that lack burial mounds contain cemetery areas within the plaza, whereas those sites that contain mounds lack burials within the plaza areas. Bense concludes that the settlement pattern reflects an egalitarian sociopolitical organization of a Big Man—Big Woman type with the local leader residing and being buried at the largest site in each cluster, regardless of whether a burial mound is present.

The final chapter, by David Anderson, tries to summarize and highlight the contributions of this most recent attempt to understand the nature of the Swift Creek archaeological culture. He focuses on the factors affecting Swift Creek site locations, such as being linked to the major trade routes of prehistoric natives of the Southeast, namely along major rivers and historic trails. He also notes how much organizational variability existed across Swift Creek culture, from group-oriented enclosures to more socially-differentiated platform mound construction and use. One key contribution that Anderson sees coming out of this volume is the explicit set of analytical methods presented by Snow, Stoltman, and Stephenson for exploring the nature of Swift Creek interaction within the Swift Creek cultural spheres and between Swift Creek and other Middle Woodland regional cultures like those of Ohio and Havana Hopewell and Marksville. Anderson concludes with a number of his own thought-provoking research questions that have been raised from his overview of the volume.

All-in-all, this volume provides the most up-to-date collection of information regarding Swift Creek culture since the topic was first broached with excavations in the 1930s and on into the 1950s. The book definitely could have benefited from a heavier editorial pen so that inconsistencies in radiocarbon reporting and local phase name references could have been cut to a minimum.
Maps and tables could have clarified certain data presented in the text. Finally, I agree with Anderson's comment that the real strength of the book lies in using the reconstructed stamped designs as a means of better understanding social interaction across time and space during the Middle Woodland. However, this central theme of the symbolic significance of the stamped pottery for understanding Swift Creek social and political organization and inter-regional and intra-regional exchange relationships could have been better integrated into each chapter. I had hoped that more chapters would focus on the archaeological contexts where the different designs were recovered from each site rather than merely proveniencing them by site, but perhaps this can be incorporated into future research. Despite these shortcomings, this volume would make a useful addition to the library shelf of southeastern archaeologists or anyone else wishing to understand Middle Woodland period cultures in the lower Southeast and how they interacted with contemporary cultures throughout the Eastern Woodlands.

Karl Lorenz is associate professor of anthropology at Shippensburg University.


Reviewed by Janet Rafferty

Thomas King has somewhat of a reputation as a maverick in the world of cultural resource management. He has been giving students and cultural resource management (CRM) professionals advice, in articles and textbooks, for more than 30 years. His more provocative writings are a mix of far-sighted recommendations, insightfully amusing comments, and over-the-top suggestions. For example, he has advocated a system that would legally provide artifacts excavated from both public and private lands to collectors as a way to limit commercial pothunting (King 1991:91). King has a tendency to cavalierly disregard the implications of such suggestions — in this instance, how such a system would disperse collections and make it difficult for archaeologists to access the objects for re-study. On the other hand, in 1979 he asked, “What if federal agencies declined to contract with any archeologist not certified competent by the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), and the SHPO licensed each applicant meeting appropriate standards . . . and established a review system to rescind licenses for cause?” (King 1979:352). Twenty years later, we have the Register of Professional Archaeologists (RPA), and Mississippi has become the first to put into place the requirement that those supervising CRM work in the state be listed and thus subject to formal sanctions for poor performance.

Although he is himself an archaeologist, King often has been rather hard on archaeology. In the current book, he states that archaeologists invented the term “cultural resource management,” which “… had unfortunate results that are with us today” (p. 18). This is because federal agencies equated CRM with archaeology, so that other kinds of cultural resources (standing structures, cultural landscapes, documents) were slighted as the agencies worked to comply with CRM laws. This seems unfair from two perspectives: first, archaeologists often do explicitly regard landscapes as part of their data; they also see buildings and documents as important artifacts that can aid in understanding past cultures. That they usually have not presented themselves as experts in preservation of these aspects of culture should not bring them blame; that they often have been the main ones on the ground to find these resources and draw them to the attention of land managers should bring them praise. I teach students in my Public Archaeology course that CRM archaeologists have an obligation to note the presence of non-archaeological resources during survey and recommend that experts be brought in to assess them as appropriate. I imagine this is true in most such courses.

This book is meant for use in university classes, but I think its best audience is practicing CRM personnel. As a text in public archaeology, it is a hard book for students to read sympathetically. This is despite it being written in a straightforward and engaging style, with care given to provide examples and cases that unfold from chapter to chapter. The problem for students is that it is an insider’s book, best appreciated by those who already know the acronyms and the broad outlines of CRM practice. From that perspective, one can understand the subtleties of King’s advice and the humor in his viewpoint. Such appreciation is hard for students to achieve, especially while they wade through sentences like this one: “What an EA is supposed to do, though, is to help you determine whether an action is a MFASQHE, and therefore needs an EIS” (p. 44). People in CRM gradu-
ally absorb such acronyms and their implications, but students who are hit with many at one time tend to be overwhelmed.

For practitioners, whether they work for government agencies or universities or consulting firms, I highly recommend this book. It was published just prior to recent changes in Section 106 regulations, though King has anticipated them to some extent. Beyond this small debility, the book will give a boost to those (and that is most of us) who are slightly to extremely confused about how the laws, regulations, and requirements fit together. To read it straight through is a good exercise. It also has considerable usefulness as a reference book, if uncertainties arise about the difference between, say, an EA and an EIS or whether a cemetery can be considered to be eligible for the National Register. It contains lots of advice and opinions about traditional cultural properties, about the National Register of Historic Places, and about NRHP eligibility and how it should be determined. For example, King argues that it may make no sense to nominate a place to the National Register as part of Section 106 review, since that review often allows such places (especially archaeological sites that are important for the information they contain) to be excavated and thus destroyed. King’s recommendations, in this and many other cases, are based on vast knowledge and experience, are cogently argued, and are stated in a disarmingly informal way.

The book focuses on the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the National Historic Preservation Act, with 110 pages devoted to compliance procedures related to these laws. But it also is a good place for archaeologists to learn more about other aspects of cultural resource management. These include social impact assessment and standards for building preservation, restoration, and reconstruction. It also is a good source to straighten out tangled thinking or to put tangles in thinking that is overly simple. Everyone who wants to understand CRM in the United States should have a copy.

Janet Rafferty is professor of anthropology at Mississippi State University.
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Reviewed by Donna L. Ruhl

Written almost 50 years ago, this reprinted volume in the Southeastern Classics in Archaeology, Anthropology, and History series from the University Press of Florida is definitely an appropriate inclusion in this new series under general editor Jerald T. Milanich. Boyd, Smith, and Griffin were among the first interdisciplinary teams to look at historical documents and the archaeological record. Now, collaborative efforts in a discipline that we all recognize as "Historical Archaeology" are not surprising. Then, it was basically unheard of and the specialization in Spanish Colonial research in the southeastern U.S. was even more rare.

This book looks at the declining years of two Spanish mission sites in the Apalachee region near present day Tallahassee, Florida. Some of the first Spanish historical documents translated by historian Mark Boyd and some of the first archaeological excavations at Spanish colonial sites in the southeast — one under the direction of John Griffin at San Luis and the other by Hale Smith (San Francisco de Ocone) — are eloquently discussed. This volume expresses the early insights from such integrated work, some of which are still regarded today as well as many that have been augmented, refined, and modified by the additional research that they championed.

Donna Ruhl is an archaeobotanist at the Florida Museum of Natural History.
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