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Destruction of the Blaine Mound, a Mississippian Period Site in the Central Pearl River Valley, Mississippi

Keith A. Baca

Abstract

This paper presents information salvaged in late 1998 during the razing of the Mississippian period Blaine platform mound in southeastern Hinds County, Mississippi. Burned debris from two levels represent mound-top buildings, radiocarbon samples from which date the mound's construction from between ca. A.D. 1000 and 1400 or later. Blaine likely was the seat of a small, local polity.

The unfortunate circumstances of the Blaine Mound's demise underscore three major lessons. Documenting archaeological sites accurately is critical to preservation; second, there is no protection for sites like Blaine without the public's cooperation; third, there is a need for improved communication between the public and preservation agencies, as well as increased public involvement.

Introduction

The Blaine Mound (22Hi544), a prehistoric platform earthwork located near New Byram, a few miles south of Jackson, recently fell victim to the unregulated suburban sprawl that is rapidly consuming large expanses of countryside in Mississippi. Constructed in several stages between A.D. 1000 and sometime after A.D. 1400 to support a succession of ceremonial or elite residential buildings, the mound was destroyed to make way for subdivision house lots on November 30-December 1, 1998 (Figures 1-2).

Archaeologists of the Mississippi Department of Archives and History (MDAH) in Jackson were belatedly notified that the mound was being leveled on November 30, when the destruction
was already well underway. The informant was a construction foreman concerned about bones, which he thought were possibly human, being unearthed by heavy machinery from beneath the mound during the leveling operation. Douglas Sims and I immediately went to the site to assess the situation. We examined the bones and identified them as deer and other animals, dislodged from a sub-mound midden deposit. As is all too often the case, state and federal preservation laws afforded no protection to the site because no human remains appeared to be present, and no government funding, permitting or licensing were involved with the private development. Also in typical fashion, limited local land use controls give no consideration to archaeological or historical resources. Consequently, the subdivision construction project had not been brought to the advance attention of MDAH’s Historic Preservation Division for review.

MDAH archaeologists attempted to explain to the developer the great archaeological significance and cultural importance of the site, and appealed to him to spare the remaining portion of the mound, to no avail. He did, however, allow observation of the mound’s destruction and the retrieval of any artifacts that might

be exposed between passes of the earthmoving machinery. As a result, Sims and I had a few hours on November 30 and December 1 to hurriedly salvage what we could before the mound disappeared (Sims 1999). Several charcoal samples for radiocarbon dating and some fragmentary artifacts were randomly snatched from the track-hoe and bulldozer cuts, some measurements and photographs were taken, but little else could be done. The salvaged materials, photographs and field notes are stored at the Historic Preservation Division of MDAH in Jackson.

Background

The story of the mound’s demise actually begins several months prior to its destruction. On June 19, 1998, an informant telephoned MDAH to report the impending destruction of an “Indian mound” somewhere near New Byram. According to the available MDAH archaeological site inventory data, the vague general location given by the caller seemed to coincide with that of the Blaine Mound. Unfortunately, our informant refused to guide us to the site, and would only give the name of a person

Figure 1. Blaine Mound, 1 Dec 1998, looking southeast. Douglas Sims stands at left.

Figure 2. Blaine Mound, 1 Dec 1998, looking north.
said to be the developer of the threatened subdivision. This lead was a dead end; we were unable to track down this individual, and we could not re-contact the informant, for he had declined to provide us with his telephone number.

Sims and I drove to the reported location of the mound the following day. A large subdivision consisting of several hundred house lots was being laid out. Extensive land grading and leveling had been underway at the location for some time, and we observed no topographical eminence resembling a mound, or remnant thereof, anywhere in the vicinity. We could only conclude that any mound that may have been present had already been destroyed by the earthmoving activity. Future developments would disclose that the location of the mound recorded in the MDAH state archaeological files was inaccurate. As it turned out, at the time of our unsuccessful initial attempt to find it, the mound was actually still intact but located some distance away and concealed from our view by woods. Unfortunately, the 1970 site survey mislocated the mound over ½ km south of its actual position. This data error prevented us from finding the mound until there was no chance of convincing the landowner to change his plans. This story should serve as a sobering reminder of the critical need for accurate site location data. Archaeological sites must be recorded to be monitored and protected, but if the recorded locational information is wrong, important sites can escape official notice until it is too late, as in this case.

Site Description and Salvage

The Blaine Mound, named for the landowner at the time of its initial recording, was located in the SW1/4 NE1/4 NW1/4 of Section 15, Township 4 North, Range 1 West (Universal Transverse Mercator coordinates, 1927 North American Datum: Zone 15, Easting 755350, Northing 3564810). This position is about 2 km west of New Byram, in southeastern Hinds County, Mississippi. The mound was situated on the right (south) bank of Big Creek, about 80 m from the channel. Big Creek is a tributary of the Pearl River; the confluence of the two streams is located some 3 km southeast of the mound. As originally recorded on the old

Figure 2. Blaine Mound, 1 Dec 1998, looking northeast.

site form, the mound's dimensions ("20-25 ft. high x 100 ft. at base") were exaggerated. Measurements taken with tape and stadia rod from as-yet undamaged portions of the flat-topped, rectangular mound revealed it to actually be about 5 m (16 ft.) high, and the still-intact north and west sides respectively measured about 22 and 25 m (72 and 82 ft.) at the base, narrowing to about 12 m (39 ft.) E-W by 15 m (49 ft.) N-S on the platform summit. The sides of the mound were oriented to the cardinal directions, with the long axis running north-south. There was no trace of a projecting access ramp, a feature of many platform mounds, along the north or west side of the mound; whether a ramp had been present on the south or east side is unknown, since both were heavily disturbed prior to our arrival.

The organically darkened midden soil exposed beneath the base of the mound extended to an undetermined depth. Abundant mussel shells were present, as were other subsistence remains. Randomly retrieved specimens include the aforementioned deer bones (pelvis, rib, radius and tibia fragments), plus bones of turtle and turkey. Some ceramic sherds also were recovered from the midden, and are discussed below. Cursory examination of the
heavily grassed area surrounding the mound revealed that there was midden adjacent to the mound as well as beneath it. While the full extent of the midden was not determined, a particularly conspicuous area of organic-rich soil was noted on a slightly elevated knoll located about 50 m northeast of the mound, directly overlooking the channel of Big Creek.

By the time we arrived, the mound had been stripped of its tree cover by heavy machinery, and gouging to remove stumps and roots had caused disturbance to depths of up to a half-meter beneath the surface. A wide cut had been dug about one-quarter of the way into the mound from the south side, fortuitously exposing a vertical section extending east-west across the most of the mound (Figures 2 and 3). This offered a brief opportunity to gather some data on the construction sequence of the mound. Sims quickly scraped smooth two sections of the cut to expose stratification. Photographs of these profiles were taken (Figures 4 and 5), but there was no time to make drawings. Variation in soil texture and color in one cleaned profile near the center of the mound indicated individual loads of construction fill (Figure 4). In another area near the east side of the mound, the stratigraphic exposure reached the sub-mound midden deposit; Figure 5 shows the zone of contact between the dark horizon of pre-mound midden and the base of the overlying mound fill. About 80 to 95 cm above the mound-fill/midden interface, a charcoal deposit about 1 m wide and up to 10 cm thick was exposed in the face of the profile cut (Figure 5). This stratum likely consisted of the burned and collapsed remains of a building that had stood atop an early mound stage. The V-shaped angle in the middle of the deposit (Figure 5) may represent a corner of a fallen wall. Given the intact state of the charcoal deposit, it evidently had been buried promptly under more fill. Above this occupation level was a stratigraphically indistinct zone of fill about 2.5 to 3 m thick representing an undetermined number of subsequent construction stages, at the top of which was another layer of charcoal, which we had no opportunity to measure or photograph. The carbonized matter in this deposit consisted mostly of cane splints, commonly used as wall and roofing material in prehistoric buildings.
Table 1. Radiocarbon Dates, Blaine Mound.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lab</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Uncalibrated</th>
<th>Calibrated (12)</th>
<th>Calibrated (25)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beta-131297 Charcoal</td>
<td>600 BP ± 40 (AD 150)</td>
<td>AD 1302 (1227, 1346, 1399) 1404</td>
<td>AD 1295 (1337, 1346, 1393) 1419</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta-131298 Charcoal</td>
<td>950 BP ± 80 (AD 1000)</td>
<td>AD 1002 (1037, 1143, 1148) 1205</td>
<td>AD 1001 (1037, 1143, 1148) 1260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta-131299 Charcoal</td>
<td>840 BP ± 60 (AD 1110)</td>
<td>AD 1160 (1216) 1263</td>
<td>AD 1032 (1216) 1285</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Covering this layer was a final mantle of fill rising another 1 to 1.5 m to the mound summit. The heavy machinery disturbance of the mound’s surface had destroyed any features that might have existed in the uppermost half-meter of fill. However, daub fragments found on the surface indicate a possible third structure built on the final summit. Some of the daub pieces were flat with a smooth surface, probably the remnants of a plastered wall finish.

Chronology

Samples collected from the two charcoal deposits were submitted to Beta Analytic, Inc. for radiocarbon dating. One sample was taken from the east half of the lower stratum seen in Figure 5 and another from the west half (Beta-131298 and Beta-131299, respectively); a third (Beta-131297) came from the upper feature. (An additional sample from the upper deposit has been reserved for future analysis.) The chrono-metric data are presented in Table 1; the dates were calibrated using the CALIB 4.1.2 program obtained from the Quaternary Isotope Laboratory, University of Washington (Stuiver and Reimer 1993; Stuiver et al. 1998). As expected, the early dates from the lower stratum and the later assay from the upper deposit conform to the order of superposition, representing a time span of several centuries between deposition of the two layers.

A small grab-sample of 59 ceramic sherds was retrieved from the site. Most are plainwares (n = 56); the majority of these (n = 42) are coarse shell-tempered (Mississippi Plain), while the rest have grog-tempered Addis paste. Only three decorated specimens were found. Two of them were taken from bulldozed mound fill; one is Coles Creek Incised, var. Hardy and the other Anna Incised, var. Anna. As defined for the neighboring Lower Mississippi Valley to the west, these types are diagnostic of the terminal Coles Creek period (A.D. 1000-1200) and the early Mississippian period (A.D. 1200-1350), respectively (Brown 1998; Williams and Brain 1983). These artifacts, along with an unnamed, probably Woodland-period stemmed projectile point, obviously are redeposited debris accidentally included with fill taken from an adjacent habitation area, negating their usefulness for evaluating the age of the mound. However, the other decorated sherd, Carter Engraved, var. Carter, came from the sub-mound midden and is a marker of the early Mississippian period, A.D. 1200-1350 (Brown 1998; Williams and Brain 1983). In addition, the twelve undecorated sherds recovered from the midden are revealing: while one is a chronologically ambiguous Addis specimen, the other eleven are Mississippi Plain, the archetypal Mississippian diagnostic (Phillips 1970:130-131; Williams and Brain 1983:108). These specimens, along with the Carter sherd, firmly establish a Mississippian time frame for both the midden and the mound subsequently built on top of it.

In view of the Mississippian artifacts composing the sub-mound sample, the radiocarbon dates from the lower burned deposit of the mound may seem somewhat anomalous. They suggest that this early mound level was slightly pre-Mississippian (i.e., late Coles Creek), if one adheres rigidly to the conventional but arbitrary A.D. 1200 dateline for the onset of the period as defined for the Lower Mississippi Valley (Brown 1998; Williams and Brain 1983). Nevertheless, the aggregate relative and absolute chronological evidence is in good accord overall, indicating a mound built mostly if not entirely during the Mississippian period.

Site Function, Intersite Context and Comparisons

The specific functions of the buildings placed on sequential stages of the Blaine Mound are unknown, but it is likely that they were used in one or more capacities inferred for Mississippian mound-top structures, including elite/chieftly residence; temple/shrine; and group meeting place, e.g., council house
succession to chiefly office or some equivalent change in community or corporate group status. The death or replacement of a chief represents a transitional crisis in community continuity...that may demand that the mound monument...be renewed. Viewed this way, mound-building episodes represent successive sociopolitical events (Lindauer and Blitz 1997:184).

The Blaine Mound yielded data sufficient to establish it as the northernmost confirmed Mississippian period platform mound site in the Pearl River valley. Blaine’s status as a single mound center is assumed, although it is possible that other mounds were destroyed before the site was recorded. Additional Mississippian platform mounds reported for the Pearl drainage are at the Pevey site, a.k.a. Mill Creek or Pearl Mounds (Livingood 1999; Mann 1988) and the Lowe-Steen site (Livingood 1999), respectively located about 85 km and 70 km south of Blaine. In contrast to the single-mound Blaine site, Lowe-Steen apparently has two mounds, while Pevey, by far the largest known Mississippian mound center in the Pearl River valley, has at least nine.

In relation to Blaine, the nearest recorded Mississippian platform mound lies approximately 30 km to the north at the town of Pocahontas, outside the Pearl drainage in the adjacent Big Black River watershed (Ford 1936:123-125; Rucker 1976; Steponaitis 1991). Pocahontas is dissimilar to Blaine in that more than one mound is in the vicinity, if not at the same site: a possibly contemporaneous conical burial mound that has yielded Mississippian ceramic vessels is located 550 m northeast of the platform mound (Rucker 1976:103-107; Steponaitis 1991:218). The platform mound at Pocahontas has confidently been designated Mississippian on the basis of midden excavations directly adjacent to the mound (Rucker 1976; Steponaitis 1991). However, the specific time span of the construction and use of the mound itself is undetermined, as it has not been excavated. Besides Blaine, the only other solitary Mississippian platform mound in the region to have been directly dated by absolute means is at the Old Hoover site, located in the Big Black River valley some 95 km north of Blaine (Lorenz 1990, 1996).

As discussed by Lorenz (1996), in areas where no large mound centers exist, small Mississippian mound sites such as Hoover and their outlying villages/hamlets and farmsteads represent a localized, “two-tiered” settlement hierarchy. Such territorial units are suggestive of simple chiefdoms or even egalitarian systems in which positions of leadership were achieved through merit. Steponaitis (1991) discerns a similar pattern for Pocahontas and its hinterland, which he terms a simple chiefdom. The two-tiered settlement pattern is in contrast to larger, three-tiered settlement systems in which principal multiple-mound centers, subsidiary single-mound sites and surrounding supporting settlements signify complex chiefdoms with more pronounced ranking of social status (Lorenz 1996; Steponaitis 1991). Blaine seems to fit the simpler two-tiered pattern of a small autonomous polity in that there is no superordinate, multi-mound center in the area. Affiliation with large centers such as Lake George, located 80 km to the northwest (Williams and Brain 1983), or Pevey is unlikely given the intervening distances; Lorenz (1996:162) cites research by Blitz (1993) and Hally (1986) showing that the territories controlled by even the largest three-tiered Mississippian chiefdoms in the Southeast seldom exceeded about 40 kilometers in diameter (see also Hally 1993).
Discussion

It is obvious that the extreme brevity of this report is in no way commensurate with the complexity and significance of the site it so inadequately documents. This is, however, an inevitable consequence of the minimal amount of time – just a few hours – available to record it. The irony is that it took the Blaine Mound’s destruction to prompt its first accurate basic documentation. The meager information that was salvaged is better than none, but is small consolation considering what was lost. Hopefully, this report, with its graphic images of the mound’s demise, will serve to further raise awareness of the need for concerned citizens to become involved in more than a hesitant way when they know significant archaeological sites are threatened. The individual who initially notified MDAH of impending danger failed to take adequate action because he would not provide sufficient information, refusing even to give his name and phone number. This is a distressingly common behavioral pattern that archaeologists at MDAH have observed for years. On repeated occasions, and in spite of MDAH archaeologists’ assurances of confidentiality, people who have informed MDAH of imperiled sites have remained anonymous and have withheld other essential information, apparently fearful of angering their neighbors whose development plans will result in a site’s destruction. Consequently, MDAH has been unable to effectively follow up on these tips. In the case of the Blaine Mound, had the mystery informant only agreed to take archaeologists to the mound when he contacted MDAH in June of 1998, it would have been possible to promptly confirm the site’s existence and location. This would have given MDAH several crucial months to identify the landowner and negotiate with him to change his plans. Because the profit motive is often the most effective means of inducing landowners to cooperate, the mound might have been rescued by enlisting the aid of the Archaeological Conservancy, which has taken timely action to purchase threatened sites in Mississippi. As it was, the last-minute plea to preserve the Blaine site for posterity was futile, because the developer’s plans were too far advanced; indeed, the bulldozers were already tearing the mound apart.

Those who wish to effectively participate in the cause of saving archaeological sites must communicate freely with preservation agencies. Archaeologists are few and far between, and are not omniscient; they rely upon concerned members of the public at large, with their firsthand knowledge of their own localities, to come forward and report threatened sites. Many people realize the significance of archaeological sites and make the effort to find out that MDAH is the agency to notify when threats arise. Unfortunately, they often fail to follow through by cooperating fully, as in the case described herein.

The challenge, then, is to inform as many people as possible about the options available for saving sites, and in the process hopefully reduce the widespread misunderstanding and distrust of government preservation officials that contributed greatly to the demise of the Blaine site. To help meet this urgent need, two new mass public outreach efforts, consisting of the annual Mississippi Archaeology Week (Sims 2001) and a free educational booklet (Baca 1999), are conveying the message of site preservation to a wider segment of the state’s population. Increasing public awareness by such means should help bolster assistance from citizens at the grassroots level, offering the best hope for sparing sites that are unprotected by preservation laws—the great majority—from the fate that befell the Blaine Mound.
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The Twin Lakes Phase — 26 years old, former Middle Woodland phase in the Upper Yazoo Basin, died, finally, in the screens at the Batesville Mounds in the summer of 1996 (Johnson et al. 2001). Born in the Peabody Museum in 1970 (Phillips 1970), this phase suffered an early setback (Connaway and McGahay 1971) but was resuscitated by a loyal supporter (Toth 1988). However, a closer examination of its parentage (Ford 1988) and character (Brookes 1988) casts a shadow on its viability. The discovery of a pure Early Woodland assemblage in Mound B at Batesville which includes Twin Lakes Phase “diagnostics” has proved fatal to this archaeological construct.

Jay K. Johnson

Abstract

The Twin Lakes Phase is one of the best examples in the Lower Mississippi Valley of the way in which preconceptions of the archaeological record control the way in which that record is interpreted. It is also a very good example of the role of authority and presentation in archaeological discourse. What follows is a review of that discourse and a summary of the results of the analysis of the ceramics from the Batesville Mounds (22Pa500), a Woodland Period platform mound complex located a few miles from the Twin Lakes site in the Loess Hills of Northwestern Mississippi.

Twin Lakes

The Twin Lakes site (22Qu526) is located near the eastern edge of the Yazoo Basin on the banks of the Tallahatchie River below the junction of the Little Tallahatchie and Yocona Rivers. Members of the Lower Mississippi Survey (LMS) visited the site during the 1940s and made a large surface collection. A test pit was begun but abandoned due to high water (Phillips, Ford, and
Griffin 1951:432). Strata cuts were made at only nine sites in the entire survey area, which were selected on the basis of depth of deposit and potential for yielding data from specific points in the ceramic sequence from as many areas as possible. The excavations at the Twin Lakes site were no doubt prompted by the presence of early ceramics in the surface collection. It is also likely that they were designed to address the question of the chronological priority of sand temper in the Yazoo Basin.

James Griffin had wrestled with the temporal placement of sand temper in his studies of the ceramics from Norris and Wheeler Basins in Tennessee and Alabama (Griffin 1938, 1939) and was certainly aware of William Haag’s (1942) conclusions, based on similar material from the Pickwick Basin, that sand tempered sherd’s were early in the Woodland sequence. Jesse Jennings’s (1941) publication on the Miller sequence in northeastern Mississippi where sand tempered, fabric impressed sherd’s are assigned an Early Woodland date is also cited by Griffin and his coauthors. Therefore, the predominately sand tempered ceramics that were recovered from the Twin Lakes site were considered by Griffin to indicate an Early Woodland, Tchula Period occupation of the site. James Ford and Philip Phillips, who had more experience in the archaeology of the Lower Mississippi Valley, thought otherwise (Phillips, Ford, and Griffin 1951:432). Excavations at the Lake Cormorant site (22Ds501) tended to support Phillips and Ford. That is, the two test pits dug there showed apparent stratigraphic patterning in the distribution of the many of the decorated types but sand tempered sherd’s were found in small numbers from top to bottom.

We must conclude, for this site at least, that the occasional presence of moderate amounts of sand in the pottery has no chronological, and presumably no cultural, significance. The writers are not yet in perfect agreement as to the applicability of this conclusion to the area as a whole (Phillips, Ford, and Griffin 1951:252).

However, the Twin Lakes assemblage was assigned to the Tchula Phase, which was characterized by “Crowder and Twin Lakes Punctated, Cormorant Cord-impressed, Jaketown Simple Stamped, Tammany Pinched, Indian Bay Stamped, and Larto Red Filmed” in addition to “high proportions of Withers Fabric-impressed, Baytown Plain, and Mulberry Creek Cord-marked” (Phillips, Ford, and Griffin 1951:432). This chronological placement is completely consistent with Ford’s seriation of the Upper Sunflower ceramic assemblages in which Jaketown Simple Stamped, Twin Lakes Punctated, Crowder Punctated, Cormorant Cord-impressed, and Withers Fabric-impressed are all initial period types and the Twin Lakes site is third from the bottom, below the Norman site (22Qu518) and squarely within the Tchula Period (Phillips, Ford, and Griffin 1951:Fig. 19).

The next major publication of the LMS on the Lower Valley was Phillips’s (1970) monograph on the southern portion of the Yazoo Basin. Although the Twin Lakes site falls to the north of his major area of emphasis, he did propose phases for the region. One of those is the Twin Lakes Phase based on material from the Twin Lakes surface collection and little else (Ford 1988). Ignoring the seriation data and relying on the presence of “extreme minorities” of Marksville Stamped and Incised sherd’s as well as cross-hatched rims, he determined the phase to be early Marksville in time (Phillips 1970:891). He thereby moved Twin Lakes Punctated, vars. Twin Lakes and Crowder out of the Tchula period (Phillips 1970:880). In fact, Twin Lakes Punctated was not found in association with the Tchula period material from the Lake Cormorant site, a result of what we now know to be regional rather than chronological patterning. Phillips (1970:891) did note that the cross-hatched rims from the Twin Lake site are unusual in that they do not seem to be associated with decorated body sherd’s.

Immediately following the publication of Phillips’s work, John Connaway and Sam McGahey (1971) came out with their report on the Boyd site (22Tu531) in Tunica County, Mississippi. Their excavations at that site had uncovered one of the clearest stratigraphic sequences in the Yazoo Basin where an earlier midden deposit was sealed by a layer of sterile sand upon which later material had been deposited. Zone I at Boyd contained an abundance of Withers Fabric-impressed, relatively little Mulberry
Creek Cord-marked in addition to fair numbers of Cormorant Cord-impressed, Twin Lakes Punctated, *vars. Twin Lakes* and *Boyd*, and two cross-hatched rims. The ceramics from Zone I fit comfortably in what had been defined as Tchula period ceramics in the initial report from the LMS and contain most of what had been redefined as early Marksville in Phillips's reworking of the Twin Lakes material. What is more, they were found below Zone 2, a clearly Marksville deposit. Connaway and McGahey (1971:29) drew the obvious conclusion, Zone I at Boyd is contemporaneous with the occupation at the Twin Lakes site and both are pre-Marksville.

Alan Toth finished his dissertation on Early Marksville phases in the Lower Valley in 1977 (Toth 1988) in which he reviewed the data from both Twin Lakes and Boyd. He accepted Phillips's assignment of the Twin Lakes phase to the early Marksville Period without discussion and interpreted Zone I at Boyd to be a mixed Tchula and early Marksville deposit (Toth 1988:118). This put him in the peculiar situation, particularly for a Harvard-trained student, of placing more trust in the surface collection from Twin Lakes than the excavated material from Boyd.

Sam Brookes and Cheryl Taylor (Brookes and Taylor 1986) revisited the Boyd ceramics in a paper given at the 1982 Midsouth Conference on Tchula. The major focus of the paper is an exploration of the relationship between major Early Woodland ceramic traditions in the Upper Yazoo Basin but they do observe that the large sample of Tchula period ceramics from Zone I leads to the likely conclusion that Twin Lakes Punctated was contemporaneous with Cormorant Cord Impressed and must have begun during the Tchula period. However, they follow Toth in viewing the small number of cross-hatched rims from Zone I as evidence of early Marksville mixing.

Janet Ford (1988) specifically addressed the validity of the Twin Lakes phase at the Midsouth Conference in 1984. She notes that the relatively late radiocarbon date from the Womak site (22Ya500), which Phillips uses to support his Marksville dating of the phase, has nothing to do Twin Lakes phase ceramics. She also presents a detailed discussion of the ceramic assemblages from all of the alleged Twin Lakes phase sites, all of which are represented solely by surface collections. Although the data are hard to come by, Ford tabulates sherd counts for six sites (Ford 1988:Table 5.1). Out of approximately 8,000 sherds, only 79 are Twin Lakes phase diagnostics, including 24 cross-hatched rims and 47 Twin Lakes Punctated sherds.

Brookes (1988) used his introduction to the published version of Toth's dissertation to reconsider the cross-hatched rims. He argues that the crude cross-hatched rims found at Boyd and at Twin Lakes phase sites are pre-Marksville in time. He also restates his conclusion (Brookes and Taylor 1986) that Twin Lakes Punctated and Mabin Stamped are Tchula rather the Marksville period types, thereby effectively gutting the Twin Lakes phase as a Middle Woodland construct.

Ford (1990) reviewed the Boyd data in a summary of Early Woodland burial mounds in the uplands of north Mississippi. She argues persuasively that Zone I is much easier to interpret as a pure Tchula period deposit than as a mix of Tchula and Marksville. She goes on to expand the ceramic repertoire of the Early Woodland period to include a new and elaborate variety of Twin Lakes Punctated in which elongated punctations are used to fill zoned body decorations. Richard Weinstein's (1991) summary of the Tchula phases of the Lower Valley included Ford's data, which he relied on to define Tidwell, a new Early Woodland phase located at the eastern margin of the Yazoo Basin and including portions of the Loess Bluffs and North Central Hills. The Tidwell phase essentially subsumes the Twin Lakes phase and moves it back into the Early Woodland where it belongs. Phillips (1970:891) even speculated that, “Twin Lakes sites are marginal to a distribution that centers farther east in the 'Hills.'” So, the Tidwell phase also coincides in it spatial distribution with the Twin Lakes phase as originally perceived. Finally, Ford (1990) demonstrates that, without a doubt, burial mounds are a characteristic of the Tchula period, an association that was proposed by Phillips, Ford, and Griffin (1951:432) but rejected by Phillips (1970:880) when he reassigned Twin Lakes to the Marksville period.
The Batesville Mounds

Until recently, the only excavated data relevant to the validity of the Twin Lakes phase were those from the Boyd site. Therefore, the discovery of a single component Tchula period ceramic assemblage in the fill of Mound B at the Batesville Mounds site is of some interest. When that is contrasted with the nearly pure late Marksville period assemblage that we recovered from excavations in the South Village at that same site, it is possible to reexamine several aspects of the Early and Middle Woodland ceramic sequence from northwestern Mississippi (Johnson, et al. 2001, Stuart 1997).

The first published reference to the Batesville Mounds occurs in Calvin Brown's pioneering work, Archeology of Mississippi (Brown 1926:113-116). He visited the site in 1906 and 1918 to produce a very good sketch map (Brown 1926:Figure 23) and a description of the mounds. William Haag visited the site during the winter of 1949/50 and filled out the first site card which included another sketch map on which he designated the locations of the North and South Villages, the two major midden deposits at the site.

The most recent round of research at the site began in 1990 when the Panola County Industrial Authority, a relatively new owner of the Batesville Mounds, contracted with the University of Mississippi to conduct preliminary data recovery operations at the site. I was the principal investigator on the project. Mimi Holland directed the fieldwork, wrote the contract report (Holland 1992), used the data in her thesis (Holland 1994), and published an article on her work in this journal (Holland-Lilly 1996). This project established a grid for the site, produced the first contour map of the mounds, borrow pits, and midden areas (Figure 1), and mapped the distribution of the archaeological deposits using a mechanical auger to sample the site on a 50 foot interval grid around each of the mounds and in the South Village. The most significant result of this work is that Holland found nothing but Woodland ceramics in the 398 auger holes she and her crew dug. It was evident that the Batesville Mounds were another example of the growing number of Woodland sites in the

Figure 1. Map of the Batesville Mounds showing the locations of the South Village and Mound B. Each tic mark along the margin represents 2,000 feet.

MidSouth with flat topped mounds.

Janet Ford used the summer field school to test the North Village in 1991. In 1993 she moved to the South Village to which she returned in 1994 and 1995. She also tested Mounds B, D, and E. As a result of this work we have much clearer picture of the
location and content of the South Village midden; the presence of blades made from northern chert in the same deposit with Marksville sherds was particularly interesting. Ford recovered enough Tchula period ceramics from the site to conclude that the contemporaneous Tidwell phase, McCarter Mound (22Pa502) located just to the north (Johnson 1969) should be considered part of the Batesville Mounds site. She also demonstrated that very little remained of Mounds D and E and that much more work would be needed in order to understand the structure and dating of Mound B, the best preserved of the flat topped mounds at the site (Ford 1993, Ford 1996).

A project aimed at confirming the Woodland period date for the flat topped mounds at the site and gathering more data on external trade was funded by the Mississippi Department of Transportation in 1996. Fieldwork was conducted that summer. One thesis has been completed (Stuart 1997) and one more is being written. The final report has just been published (Johnson et al. 2001). A number of topics are covered in that report including Woodland period mound construction and function, specialized ceremonial center lithic assemblages, raw material exchange, ceramic paste composition as a time marker, and ceramic phase designation. This paper will summarize just the data relevant to the validity of Twin Lakes phase.

We started the project by excavating a trench into Mound B from which we recovered a large assemblage of Tchula period ceramics. One of the reasons that we moved the focus of our work to the South Village midden late in the field season is that we knew from the field school excavations we would find mostly Marksville period material at that location. The contrast of the two assemblages would allow us to address a broader range of questions about the ceramic sequence at the site.

As Table 1 demonstrates, the ceramic assemblages from Mound B and the northern part of the South Village are almost entirely complementary. That is, once the types and varieties are arranged by relative proportion so that those that are more common in Mound B occur at the top of the table and those that predominate in the South Village are found at the bottom of the table, it is evident that most of the varieties (11 of 19) are unique to one portion of the site or the other. Moreover, although some varieties were recovered from both portions of the site, all of the decorated varieties predominate (80% or more) in one context or the other. A detailed discussion of the criteria by which the sherds were assigned to each class as well as a detailed exploration of intrasite distribution is presented in the site report (Johnson et al. 2001). This paper will present a general discussion of the characteristics of the two major assemblages at the site. Mound B ceramics contain all the markers of an Early Woodland assemblage. The predominant surface finish is fabric marking (Figure 2a) and most of the decoration is confined to a narrow band just below the rim (Figures 2b-2f, 3a-3f, 4a). This band is often part of a bolstered rim (Figures 2e-2f, 3b, 3e, 3d, 4d). Decoration includes linear punctuations and short incisions arranged in a heringbone fashion (Twin Lakes Punctuated, var. Twin Lakes, Figures 2b-2d), linear punctuations arranged in rows (Twin Lakes Punctuated, var. Hopson, Figures 2e-2f), round punctuations arranged in rows (Twin Lakes Punctuated, var. Crowder, Figure 3a), and multiple individual cord impressions placed diagonal or parallel to the rim (Cormorant Cord Impressed, var. Cormorant, Table 1. Sherds classified by Type and Area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mound B</th>
<th>South Village</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Withers Fabric Marked, var. Withers</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Lakes Punctuated, var. Hopson</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Hatched Rim</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cormorant Cord Impressed, var. unspecified</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malbin Stamped, var. Cassidy Bayou</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Lakes Punctuated, var. Twin Lakes</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Lakes Punctuated, var. Crowder</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chupupa Punctuated, var. Boyd</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withers Fabric Marked, var. Twin Lakes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baytown Plain, var. unspecified</td>
<td>2580</td>
<td>1199</td>
<td>3779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baytown Plain, var. Thomas</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1119</td>
<td>1279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulberry Creek Cord Marked, var. unspecified</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1107</td>
<td>1112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey Paw Plain, var. unspecified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chupupa Punctuated, var. Chupupa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marksville Stamped, var. Troyville</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marksville Stamped, var. unspecified</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marksville Incised, var. unspecified</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey Paw Cord Marked, var. unspecified</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulberry Creek Cord Marked, var. Blue Lake</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1078</td>
<td>1078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>3448</td>
<td>5164</td>
<td>8612</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2. Withers Fabric Marked, var. Withers, a; Twin Lakes Punctuated, var. Twin Lakes, b-d; Twin Lakes Punctuated, var. Hopson, e-f (all actual size).

Figure 3. Twin Lakes Punctuated, var. Crowder, a; Cormorant Cord Impressed, var. Cormorant, b-c; Cross-Hatched Rim, d-f (all actual size).
Figures 3b, 3c). The fundamental similarity of all of these varieties in terms of organization and placement, as well as the presence of the characteristic bolstered rim in each of the varieties, should have made separating out the Twin Lakes punctated type as a marker for a later period suspect, even without stratigraphic data to the contrary.

The other major marker for the Twin Lakes phase was the cross-hatched rim. All of the cross-hatched rims from the Batesville Mounds came from Early Woodland contexts. The cross-hatching on the Batesville rims is carelessly applied (Figures 3d-3f, 4a) and often occurs on a bolstered rim. There is no indication that it was part of a vessel with body decoration as is characteristic of the classic Marksville cross-hatched rim. In this, the Batesville examples are like the cross-hatched rims from the Twin Lakes site (Phillips 1970:891).

In fact, other than fabric impressing (if that was intended to be a decoration) there is relatively little body decoration in the Mound B assemblage. This includes 12 sherds of Churupa Punctated, var. Boyd (Figures 4b-4e) and two sherds of Mabin Stamped, var. Cassidy Bayou (Figure 4f). Both are generally considered to be Early Woodland predecessors of the fluorescence in zoned body decoration during the Middle Woodland. Incidentally, elongated punctations and single cord impressions are quite common fillers for zoned decorations in the burial mound ceramics of the Tidwell phase (Ford 1990) of which the Mound B assemblage is a likely component.

The predominant surface finish in the South Village ceramic assemblage is cord marking. All but 5 of the 2,190 Mulberry Creek Cord Marked sherds shown in Table 1 came from that context. Bone tempering, another marker of the Middle Woodland elsewhere in the Midsouth (Jenkins 1981:157), is also found almost exclusively in the South Village. A small number of Marksville Incised and Stamped varieties along with one sherd of Churupa Punctated, var. Churupa constitute the decorated sherds from the Middle Woodland deposit in the South Village. It is fitting that the break in Table 1 between sherds that predominate in Mound B and those that are more common in the South Village occurs between Baytown Plain, var. unspecified and Baytown
Plain, var. Thomas in that this highlights one of the main distinctions between the two assemblages. Variety unspecified was used as a catchall for plain sherds with grog temper and relatively little sand. Variety Thomas includes those sherds with a substantial amount of sand in the paste. Likewise, the few examples of Mulberry Creek Cord Marked which were found in Mound B fall into the var. unspecified category which we used to distinguish cord-marked sherds with grog and relatively little sand from var. Blue Lake, the cord-marked sherds with a lot of sand in the paste. Although sand is present to some degree in almost all of the Batesville ceramics, it is relatively sparse in the Mound B sherds and is a characteristic of the South Village sherds.

The Batesville Mounds ceramics would seem to favor Evan Peacock in an ongoing debate about the importance of temper as a chronological marker in the North Central Hills of Mississippi (Fant 1996; Peacock 1996, 1997 vs Ford 1980, 1981, 1988, 1989; Johnson 1988) but a discussion of this point is beyond the scope of this paper.

What is important in terms of an evaluation of the Twin Lakes phase is that the Mound B assemblage is a near duplicate of the Zone 1 assemblage at Boyd. Twin Lakes Punctated and crude, cross-hatched rims are clearly an Early Woodland, Tchula period marker rather than early Middle Woodland types as Phillips proposed.

Conclusions

Two things stand out in this review of the short and troubled life of the Twin Lakes phase. First, it is interesting to try to understand the reasons that the Twin Lakes phase was proposed to begin with. The LMS brought together three archaeologists with a good deal of experience and different ideas about the archaeological record. They did not always agree. Phillips's (1970) candid discussions of the processes by which types, varieties, and phases came to be goes a long way toward explicating those differences. For example, we know that Phillips and Ford disagreed with Griffin on the question of whether sand temper is a useful marker for the early portion of the Woodland sequence in the Lower Valley (Phillips 1970:891). Phillips presumes that Griffin must have prevailed in the placement of the relatively sandy sherds from the Twin Lakes site in the Tchula period. It is likely that his failure to take into account the very early position of the Twin Lakes assemblage in the seriation chart reflects the fact that he, along with Griffin, placed much less reliance on this analytical technique than did Ford. The presence of cross-hatched rims in the Twin Lakes assemblage suggested to him that Twin Lakes was actually an early Marksville site. Although never stated, the absence of Twin Lakes Punctated in the test pits from Lake Cormorant, where an Early Woodland deposit was uncovered, must have made it easier for him to move that type and its varieties in the Middle Woodland. And, Phillips never mentions the small numbers of Cormorant Cord Impressed sherds from the Twin Lakes site that are plotted in the seriation chart (Connaway and McGahey 1971:29)

So, in retrospect, we can begin to understand the mistakes Phillips made in proposing the Twin Lakes phase. But how can we explain its durability? Essentially all of the data used by Brookes, Ford, and Toth in their reviews of the Twin Lakes phase were available the year after it appeared in print when Connaway and McGahey published the Boyd site report. And most of the arguments against the validity of the phase are anticipated in that report. So, why do we have 20 years of discussion? A comparison of Phillips’s (1970) two volume, 999 page monograph with its proportional type setting and beautiful line drawings with the 86 page Boyd site report (Connaway and McGahey 1971) will provide a clue to the mystery. Phillips, representing the eastern intellectual establishment, was wrong on this one point and, although Connaway and McGahey had the actual stratigraphic data and were right in their interpretation of that stratigraphy, they lacked the authority to be heard.

Regardless of whether phases are considered to be archaeological constructs or cultural “realities,” everyone agrees that they should contain roughly contemporaneous material. The Mound B assemblage from the Batesville Mounds serves only to confirm something that Mississippi archaeologists have known for a long time; Twin Lakes Punctated and crude cross-hatched rims are
Tehula period ceramics and sites that had been included in the Twin Lakes phase should better be considered part of the Tidwell phase. The Twin Lakes phase, may it rest in peace.
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Book Reviews


Reviewed by Jon L. Gibson

Finally, after thousands and thousands of years, it’s arrived—Mississippi’s very own, well-documented, well-illustrated, and handsomely crafted projectile point guide. Samuel McGahey, chief archaeologist for Mississippi Department of Archives and History, gentleman, scholar, and leading expert on Mississippi projectile points has documented seventy-nine projectile point types, including eight provisional ones. But there simply is no substance to the whispers coming out of Jackson that McGahey himself may have made and used some of the points to hunt mastodon in the loess bluffs. We have no real convincing evidence that mastodons survived into Middle Archaic times.

McGahey doesn’t debate typological matters but gets right to the point. Like compilers of earlier, similar point guides for surrounding states, McGahey regards Mississippi’s point types as historical types—distinctive physical forms with limited geographic and chronological distributions (proven or presumed). Historical types are building blocks for culture histories. They should not be expected to resolve other issues or interests, but I concur wholeheartedly with McGahey’s assessment that we need to supply space-time dimensions before we can enter archaeology’s pearly gates. Typology agnostics and young whippersnappers would be better served to let historical types do what they do best and save us old dogs from having to buy more powerful drugstore spectacles or magnifying glasses just to read tables full of dimensions, weights, and other measures only to discover that what we have learned are dimensions, weights, and other measures. If a researcher can’t tell a Grays point from a Clovis point and has no idea when they were made, I’m not convinced
that all the descriptive acumen in the world can tell us what we want to know about the Old Ones. I sincerely hope that archaeology is more than a science of material culture. Even bad history is better than no history.

The closest thing to a theoretical statement that comes from McGahey's keyboard is that types are mental templates and that individual points adhere to those mental images unless knappers mess up or raw materials prevent. No, McGahey's Mississippi point guide is not a discourse on theory. It is what it is—a guide to identifying projectile points in the Magnolia state—no less but potentially much more. I say no less because I believe that's how most users will employ Sam's book. I guarantee you it won't be long before most copies take on the loose-paged, coffee-stained, dog-eared, and penciled-margin look of a vintage classic, much like its author. But there's more here, much more, for those who would delve more deeply into what meaning projectile points hold for the ancient groups who chipped them.

McGahey employs preexisting types. He doesn't change names just because points happen to lie across state lines from where types were first named and described. An Eva is an Eva, regardless of whether it comes from Mississippi or Tennessee (providing, of course, that there are no wide gaps between the geographic distributions of Mississippi and Tennessee specimens). It is worth noting that more than three-fourths of the types used to classify Mississippi's points come from the areas north and east of Mississippi. Only a handful of Louisiana's and Arkansas's types fit Mississippi points, despite the fact that only a thin, brown line separates them. But that brown line happens to be the Mississippi River, and the Big Muddy seems to have been one of the biggest barriers to cultural interaction (including point spread) that Native America ever had. Only two moments in prehistory saw the river also act as a conduit for east bank-west bank interactions, and those times—Poverty Point and Mississippian—represented occasions when river traffic peaked because of, first, exchange and, then, geopolitics.

McGahey does propose eight new (provisional) types—Geneill, Becker, Furr, Tangipahoa, Late Archaic Barbed, var. rounded base, Late Archaic Barbed, var. straight base, Wolf Lake, and Wilson—primarily because they are chronologically or spatially segregated from the types they resemble most. Even if they don't have look-alikes, chronological or spatial discontinuities are sufficient alone to warrant establishing provisional types.

The turnip greens and cornbread of McGahey's guide lies in his chronological breakdown. He introduces each chronological division with a short synthesis of land tenure—settlement patterns and adaptational modes and, importantly, sets out what rocks Mississippi knappers of the period used for their points. Even readers not interested in point identification will find much to sup on in Sam's guide. It can suffice as a stand-alone introduction to Mississippi prehistory.

Types are organized by chronological division. Stylistic and technological attributes constitute primary criteria for assignment of types to the divisions, backed up by McGahey's familiarity with limited stratigraphic associations and an impoverished radiocarbon chronology. As Sam acknowledges upfront, most data for the guide came from surface collections made by laymen. Considering what he had to work with, McGahey truly has turned water into wine. He accords 500- to 1500-year spans to most types—safe, ultraconservative estimates made in face of poor chronological control. In the final accounting, I bet McGahey's estimates will prove to be right on. I wouldn't quibble with a single one; well, maybe one just to watch his eyebrow arch.

McGahey gives length, width, and thickness summaries for each type, both averages and ranges. He does not do weights. He gives a county-by-county breakdown for Paleoindian and Early Archaic point samples, but only two later types, St. Tammany and St. Helena, both Middle Archaic types, are allocated by county. In addition, his sample data show how many points were made of local gravel and how many of exotic material.

There are thousands of stories tucked away in his distribution maps, accompanying data, and discussions. Now, somebody needs to figure out what they are. Sam already has done some of that figuring himself. His inference that Clovis Paleoindians entered the state from the north and east is a good example. Their points are made predominantly of Ft. Payne chert, which occurs
naturally in the Tennessee River Valley, north and east of Mississippi. Other obvious patterns include the increasing use of local gravel for Paleoindian points as distance from Ft. Payne deposits increases and as time passes. Overall, I think the distribution maps are crucial to investigating population movements, stimulus diffusion, exchange networks, and boundaries between ethnic, social, and political groups. From my perspective on the swampy side of Big Muddy, an interesting situation is posed by those narrow fringes of points along the eastern Mississippi Valley wall, because different contemporary types line the western wall. What means this variability? McGahey’s maps and measurements are not answers, but they help articulate the questions. Sam has lain a groundwork that will keep analysts busy for a long time.

Sam’s guide already is indispensable. In my humble abode, it goes on the same shelf with Twain’s Life on the Mississippi, Ford and Webb’s Poverty Point, and my grandpa’s bible. I suspect some users may fret if they can’t find a type for some arrow-point form (sixty-nine of the seventy-nine types discussed are pre-Woodland), but it’s not McGahey’s fault that they’re dealing with late prehistoric materials instead of the infinitely more interesting earlier materials. Criticize the guide, if you can, for what it contains, not for what it doesn’t. And it doesn’t matter what anti-typologists think. They live in their own special world anyway, one that treats typology as old-fashioned and irrelevant but then turns right around and uses it anyway to set the stage for their own strange rituals and gyrations.

Leave it to gentleman McGahey to draw attention to the error of his and the book crafter’s ways. On page 65, 5700 should read 57QQ; on page 106, Figure 96 should be Figure 97; on page 117, Figure 103 should be Figure 104; on page 124, Figures 113-115 should be Figures 114-116; and on page 141, Figure 92 should be Figure 128. Figure 139 on page 151 requires clarification. McGahey tells me that, while specimens AA, BB, CC, and DD are from the same site as the other points depicted, they should not be typed as Tangipahoa points because they lack notches. He suggests they may be stylistic or unfinished variants (Samuel McGahey, personal communication, 2001). Sam points out a few other minor snafus: on page 158, Figure 145 P and Y should be Figure 146 P and Y; on page 190, Figure 176 should be deleted; on page 192, Figure 180 should be deleted; and on page 196, Figure 134 J should be Figure 183 J. McGahey also informed me of an omission: On Figure 189, page 203, drawings of Scallorn points BB through KK were left out. They are shown below in order to get them on record.

A final point: McGahey draws real good. His plates are ten times better than those in Joel Justice’s Stone Age Spear and Arrow Points of the Midcontinental and Eastern United States, which show lines depicting flake-scar ridges but lack shading depicting the direction the flake was removed. His drawings beat photographs in type manuals like Dee Ann Suhm and Edward B. Jelks’s Handbook of Texas Archaeology: Type Descriptions, which often leave flake scars unrecognizable amid gray tones.

Mississippi Projectile Point Guide is not a guidebook for everyone, only those who would do archaeology in Mississippi and would like to know what to call all those thin, chipped, pointed rocks from Mississippi’s different eras, terrains, and ancient groups. They’re what got most of us in the business to start with.

Reviewed by Kristina A. Shuler

Numerous bioarchaeological studies from the past two decades aimed at understanding negative health consequences associated with the rise of agriculture, but fewer have examined patterns of intraregional variability once agricultural economies were well in place. Such is the purpose of *Bioarchaeological Studies of Life in the Age of Agriculture: a View from the Southeast*. This collection of papers calls for a shift away from overgeneralizations and unicausal models that associate health decline with food production. In view of the fact that archaeological studies have afforded ample support for political, economic and religious diversity among southeastern agriculturalists, the major premise in this volume is that bioarchaeology may demonstrate similar diversity through the lens of health, and nutrition. To this end, Lambert and the other authors in this text present a rich synthesis of archaeological, ecological and human skeletal data that, as a whole, envelop a substantial time span from the Archaic through Historic periods.

In the first of three chapters involving Moundville and Alabama, Mary Lucas Powell, using an historical approach, concludes that endemic non-venerale treponemal infection increased in prevalence over time in the Southeast; there was also evidence of dissimilar modes of transmission from foragers to late agriculturalists, particularly after European contact. Bridges, Jacob and Powell explore changes in trauma over time in two areas of Alabama. Type and location of injuries as well as sex of the victim support shifting patterns of interpersonal violence after the Archaic, toward increasing group warfare by the Mississippian period. In the next chapter, Schoeninger, Sattenspiel, and Schurr examine the extremely complex chronicle of population decline at Moundville during the 16th century through previously published bone chemistry and archaeological data. They paint a picture of gradually declining nutrition and health as well as change and population movement over time. Moundville data are revisited by Marianne Reeves who compares dental caries and enamel hypoplasia data from the site with similar data from the early contact Creek site of Fusiatchee to infer changing patterns maize consumption and general health over time.

Atlantic coastal plain bioarchaeology is observed in Chapters 6 through 9. Hutchinson and others test stable isotope data from skeletal remains. Data suggest that maize agriculture was implemented later in Florida than in most of the prehistoric Southeast, and that maize consumption increased in both Georgia and Florida with European contact. Nutritional adequacy in coastal to inland populations from the Georgia Bight is examined by Larsen and Sering in the following chapter. Frequency of iron deficiency anemia is used to argue for changing dietary patterns during the contact period, with possible synergistic effects of increased maize reliance, increased populations density, and decreased sanitation in the area. They reject iron deficiency anemia as an adaptive response, suggesting that at best it is an “adjustment”. Analysis of Georgia populations is continued as Matt Williamson compares degenerative joint disease of the appendicular and axial skeleton of coastal and upland inhabitants of Georgia to assess variability in lifestyle and activity. He argues that correlations between activity patterns and subsistence are most reliable within a single geographic region. In the final chapter on coastal site health, Driscoll and Weaver search the dental evidence for dependence on produced foods among prehistoric inhabitants of North Carolina. The authors examine multiple lines of evidence from stable isotope data, enamel hypoplasias, and caries to infer onsets and reliance on agriculturally produced food in this area.

Lambert moves away from the coast to the interior of North Carolina and Virginia in Chapter 10 where she examines regional
variability in health and nutrition between groups living on the periphery of the Mississippian cultural sphere. These health findings are then compared with other areas of the Southeast, particularly with the large center at Moundville. In the final chapter of the book, Debra Gold continues investigations of the Late Prehistoric of the Virginia interior through patterning of accretional burial mounds. She uses a combination of ethnohistorical reports of historical excavations as well as bioarchaeological analysis to explore variation in mortuary practices, especially as they relate to cultural and health patterns.

In summary, this volume is a new and welcome alternative to the uncomplicated portrait of globally declining health and nutrition set in motion by agriculture. Rather it speaks to the range in culture, health and nutrition that existed among food producers within a single region. Some populations, such as many whom lived along the coast, may have engaged only marginally in maize horticulture before European contact, while others supplemented food collecting with food production. Variability also existed in health and nutrition according to population size and structure; however, the patterns revealed in these chapters indicate that subsistence economies and health patterns were by no means constant between sites or regions within the Southeast.

The use of broadly synthesized data sets from archaeology, ethnohistory and physical anthropology for this wide and ecologically variable region demonstrates the predicament created by unilinear, unicausal models of agriculturalists, as Lambert points out in her introduction. Focus on health differences and degree of reliance on food production affords evidence supporting the complex interaction of health, nutrition, environment, and sociopolitical development in the late prehistoric Southeast. This volume not only complements previous works on Southeastern bioarchaeology, but also provides a fresh approach to the study of health among agriculturalists at large. Even as the theme of diversity in the health and nutrition of Southeastern agriculturalists pervades the chapters of this text, a comprehensive synthesis at the end would have unified the book even more, revealing the often unexpected conclusions that

Lambert speaks of in the introduction and offering future questions about health in the Southeast. Still, the overall message of the book remains clear throughout, and many new hypotheses are presented throughout for future studies. In sum, the volume is a wonderful contribution not only to the field of Southeastern studies, but also to bioarchaeology in general. It is a valuable addition to the shelves of North American bioarchaeologists and archaeologists alike.

Kristrina A. Shuler is a doctoral student at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.

**Ancient Monuments of the Mississippi Valley by Ephraim G. Squier and Edwin H. Davis, edited and with an introduction by David J. Meltzer; Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1998 reprint of 1848 original. Illustrations, endnotes and references to introduction, guide to original references, index. Pp. 98 (Introduction), xxix, 316. $34.95 paper.**

Reviewed by Janet Rafferty

This is without doubt one of the most appealing books reprinted in the Smithsonian Classics of Anthropology series. Despite its name, the book focuses on archaeological sites in the central Ohio River valley, with relatively few pages spent on effigy, platform, and other mounds and earthworks of the Mississippi valley proper. The text was written mostly by Squier but it and the beautiful plan maps are based on his and Davis's joint fieldwork and recording efforts, as David Meltzer's exemplary introduction informs us. The book is eminently readable as it reviews site by site the layout of a large number of geometric earthworks and associated mounds in the Scioto, Paint Creek, and Miami valleys of Ohio. Even though this may sound like a stultifying approach, the concise site descriptions, each accompanied by a striking map, are not dull. Much of the impact comes from the earthworks' complexity and precise geometric arrangement, but some of it must be attributed to Squier's plain
but impassioned scientific style. For example, he assesses earthwork design as an engineering feat:

...the builders possessed a standard of measurement, and had some means of determining angles. The most skilful engineer of the day would find it difficult, without the aid of instruments, to lay down an accurate square of the great dimensions of those above represented, measuring as they do more than four fifths of a mile in circumference. It would not, it is true, be impossible to construct circles of considerable size, without instruments; the difficulty of doing so, when we come to the construction of works five thousand five hundred feet, or over a mile in circumference, is nevertheless apparent. But we not only find accurate squares and perfect circles, but also, as we have seen, octagons of great dimensions (p. 61).

The authors' respect for the accomplishments of the mound builders is evident in many parts of the book and it feeds the reader's appreciation.

The main sections of the book cover hill forts, geometric enclosures, and mounds. Hill forts are composed of earthen and stone embankments, mainly enclosing areas of from 10-30 acres, while a few, like Fort Hill (43 acres) and Fort Ancient (ca. 150+ acres with four miles of embankments) surround larger areas. The earthworks follow the top edges of terrace remnants and often include a wall across a neck of land that isolates it. On at least three sides are steep river bluffs. Upwards of 20 hill forts are reported for the central Ohio valley, with scale maps showing configuration, basic topography, cross-sections of embankments, and location of springs. These maps and others in the book are beautiful examples of nineteenth century science at its best—reflecting indefatigable and mostly accurate recording over a large area of rugged countryside. Whether the hill forts were built for defense, as Squier and Davis believed, it a still-unresolved question, although their scale and numerous breaks in the walls of the larger ones (Fort Ancient has over 70) makes it doubtful. They are now believed to be mostly of Hopewell age (200 B.C.-A.D. 400).

Equally intriguing are the geometric earthworks that Squier and Davis call sacred enclosures. The number and size of these are impressive, especially the ones made up of several huge embankments, such as Newark, Marietta, and High Bank. High Bank had a circle enclosing 20 acres, five other smaller circles, a mile of linear embankments, and an octagon enclosing 18 acres. It, along with Hopeton, Hopewell, Seip, and Mound City, is preserved now by the National Park Service as Hopewell Culture National Historic Park, near Chillicothe, Ohio. One amazing set of five sites is composed in each case of a square and two circles, with the squares enclosing 27 acres and with one larger and one smaller circle, all interconnected. These also are located near Chillicothe. These complex earthworks also are assigned to the Hopewell period, while the single small circles are more likely to be affiliated with the partly earlier Adena phase (1000 B.C.-A.D. 200). Meltzer, in the introduction, says that the accuracy of Squier and Davis's maps has been questioned, especially by Gerard Fowke in his 1902 Archaeological History of Ohio. It seems likely that modern systematic reassessments of the earthworks' plans exist, though Meltzer doesn't mention any.

Mounds are more familiar to readers of Mississippi Archaeology, since they are widespread and common outside the Ohio valley. Squier and Davis (p. 142) divide them into altar mounds, mounds of sepulture, temple mounds, and anomalous mounds. The first two types receive most extensive discussion, based partly on excavations, especially at Mound City. This embankment, in the shape of the square with rounded corners, had within it 24 mounds, all of which Squier and Davis partly excavated. Spectacular finds have continued to be made at the site in later excavations, in particular outside the center of the mounds, which is where Squier and Davis expended most of their energies digging shafts.

Altar mounds are characterized as having fired clay basins that frequently contained large numbers of artifacts, often of one main type—stone animal effigy pipes, mica, well-made decorated pottery, obsidian, quartz, copper—usually burned and made of exotic materials. Mounds of sepulture were used for burial, often with a central log tomb and one skeleton. The authors discerned that both kinds of mounds commonly had later burials intruded
into them, representing, as they thought, recent Indians. Well-preserved skeletal material representing the mound builders was rarely found—in the chapter on crania they found only three that could be measured.

Squier and Davis treat the mound builders as separate from the Indians. In a sense, they were right to do so, since 1000 years separates the end of the Hopewell tradition from the earliest historic contact. Meltzer discusses extensively Squier and Davis's views of the mound builders vis à vis historic Indians. He also covers the methods they used and gives a detailed account of how they came to produce Ancient Monuments, how they fell out over the volume and over reviews treating it as Squier's work, and their later lives. Davis returned to his work as a medical doctor, first in Chillicothe and then in New York, while the far more ambitious Squier continued to pursue archaeology, as well as railroad ventures and publishing. He and Davis died within a few months of each other in 1888. Meltzer has succeeded admirably in writing a concise but detailed history of Squier and Davis and the production and fate of their premier work. He also has tracked down nearly all the published works they refer to in the text and produced an index. His introduction can be read profitably at least twice, before and after reading Ancient Monuments itself: before for the history and after for the analysis of their accomplishments.

I noticed only one major error in the reprint: there are two copies of Plate VII and Plate VIII is missing. I haven't checked whether this is a fault stemming from the original. The Smithsonian Institution has done an excellent service for archaeologists and anyone interested in American archaeology in reprinting this classic work. David Meltzer's thoroughly researched introduction puts the original accomplishment in both historical and contemporary perspective. One leaves the book with a desire to go to Ohio and walk the earthworks, Squier and Davis's book in hand.

Janet Rafferty is Professor of Anthropology at Mississippi State University.


Reviewed by Evan Peacock

It is not often that one gets a chance to review a site report, which is too bad. The combination of culture-historical overviews, detailed descriptions of natural settings, artifact descriptions, and specialist analyses make any good CRM report well worth reading. Reviews also help address the perennial problem with all "gray literature"—its relatively low visibility—by letting researchers outside the immediate study area know that the work has been done and that a report exists. When the report being reviewed contains a clear research design and consequent problem-oriented analyses, it has the potential to do what all good commercial archaeology should be capable of doing: moving the discipline forward on any number of scientific fronts. In such regards, this report on Phase III excavations at the Skaggs site succeeds at some levels and fails at others; it is a mix of very ambitious specialist work and attempts at generalization that struggle against the nature of the site itself.

The site, located beside Holman Creek in northwestern Arkansas, was mitigated prior to construction of a bridge by the state highway department. Phase II testing had suggested that intact Paleoindian and Early Archaic deposits were present below later artifact-bearing strata. The Phase III excavations revealed evidence of long-term site use. Artifacts ranging from Clovis to Late Woodland in affiliation were recovered, with an apparent peak in site use during the Late Archaic period. This in itself is a significant contribution toward understanding prehistoric human adaptations in the Ozark Plateaus physiographic province.

Margaret Guccione's chapter on geomorphology contains a lot of valuable information. The site is located on a small terrace adjacent to a low order stream, in a situation where significant Holocene flooding and sediment deposition was possible, evidently a fairly rare occurrence in the Ozarks. Sediment
analysis indicated that about 60 cm of overbank deposits have accumulated at the site since ca. 8,000 B.C. According to Guccione, there is little evidence of bioturbation, and the site has been disturbed only minimally by low-level plowing. There are well-developed soil horizons, indicating general stability for the last several thousand years. All of this information contributes to a major conundrum, which is that, in this apparently stable setting with evident potential for good stratification, the vertical distribution of diagnostic artifacts could accurately be described as "higgledy-piggledy." Early Archaic points nestle side-by-side with Late Archaic and Woodland points amidst clusters of burned sandstone; Paleoindian through Woodland period artifacts are present in the thin plowzone. Mainfort notes this apparent mingling and the resultant problems for interpretation several times:

 Recovered diagnostic lithics...span over 10,000 years of prehistory. Stratigraphic separation of the various components represented at the Skaggs site in the undifferentiated upper soil horizons is problematic, although intact prehistoric cultural features dating to several distinct time periods were disclosed. Vertical distribution of point styles does not provide compelling agreement between likely age (based on point morphology) and depth below surface. Interpretation of prehistoric occupation at the Skaggs site is therefore based primarily on specialized analyses of recovered materials (p. 1-2).

 It became apparent during fieldwork, and subsequently was confirmed during analysis, that cultural stratigraphy at the Skaggs site is very compressed...artifacts representing roughly 10,000 years of prehistory are co-mingled within the uppermost soil horizons. This phenomenon cannot be attributed to agricultural plowing or other recent disturbances (p. 28).

 The features mentioned by Mainfort are mostly concentrations of burned sandstone and artifacts. Painstaking piece-planning of these objects compensates for the fact that the site was excavated in arbitrary 10 cm levels. Mainfort provides a brief but excellent overview of burned rock features in the Southeast, ultimately concluding that a "limited range of activities (probably nut processing)" is represented by the burned rock features at the Skaggs site.

 Artifact descriptions are quite brief and use standard typological/functional nomenclature. Presumably because of the apparent "compression" of deposits, artifacts were not actually tabulated by unit or level, so spatial associations can only be determined for those associated with the features, which are described in detail. Apparently, only formal tools and modified flakes were analyzed: no analysis of debitage is presented, despite that fact that most of the 19,329 artifacts recovered from the excavations fall into that category (p.41).

 Marvin Kay undertook an ambitious, high-power microscopic use-wear analysis of nearly 70 points and other stone tools from the site. Point types were assigned to cultural periods based on the relevant literature, allowing for some temporal control. I would disagree with his assertion that the one full-grooved stone axe examined "can be readily assigned to the Early Archaic period prior to about 8,000 B.P." (p. 52), as such axes continue well into the Middle Archaic period in many parts of the Southeast. Kay was able to distinguish microscopic use-wear on many of the artifacts, and the report contains numerous photomicrographs that are very clear and which are accompanied by good descriptive captions. Most interesting is clear evidence for the changing function of tools, as recognized from crosscutting striae that provide a sort of stratigraphic sequence of the direction of tool use through time (e.g., Fig. 28). For those interested in use-wear analysis, these figures and Kay's descriptions are enough to warrant obtaining a copy of the report. Ultimately, though, despite Kay's assertion that "microscopic use-wear studies empirically evaluate that which is often unknown and unknowable [?] about stone artifacts" (p. 81), his conclusions are limited to generalizations that will provide no surprises for lithic analysts. For example, some stone tools were produced for immediate use, while others were designed to be curated (i.e., to have a long use-life via recycling). The latter tend to be more formal and multifunctional. Preforms (broken or whole) were occasionally used as tools. The use of serrated blade edges ceased following the Early Archaic period. And so on.
While the quality of his methods cannot be questioned, much more focused problem-orientation is needed if high-level microscopic use wear is indeed to show us things that are “unknowable” via macroscopic or low level microscopic observations.

Margaret E. Newman conducted protein residue analysis of extracts from "pitted ground stone artifacts" and “ground stone artifacts” from the site. Her discussion of the method and various techniques serves as a good introduction to this relatively new application of molecular biology in archaeology, although the jargon is laid on a bit thick for the uninitiated. Her results seem to unequivocally show that rabbit blood residues were present on two of the artifacts examined, walnut or pecan residue on one, and chenopodiaceae residue on two. These exciting results would have been enhanced if the actual artifacts producing the residues had been illustrated.

Andrea A. Hunter’s ethnobotanical analysis was limited by the contextual difficulties already discussed. One securely dated Middle Archaic feature was interpreted as a “hearth in which [hickory] nutshell was used for fuel” (p. 98). This is a welcome addition to the list of Middle Archaic features throughout the Southeast that contain large amounts of hickory nutshell, an indication of the importance of that resource during the Hypsithermal climatic optimum. This chapter could have used some heavier editing to remove the many redundancies and syntactical errors.

In his concluding comments, Mainfort once again notes that a “lack of stratigraphic separation precludes strong inferences about the range of material culture and subsistence remains associated with inferred components at the Skagg site” (p. 106). While no explanation for this phenomenon was offered in the report, I would suggest that the site has, in fact been altered by bioturbation, albeit bioturbation of a very particular kind. Donald Johnson, in a number of works (e.g., Johnson 1990), has described what he calls a “floralmantle.” A floralmantle is a homogenized upper soil horizon created by repeated tree throws over time. Evidence for a floralmantle being present at the Skagg site is in the report, if one chooses to interpret the data in that fashion. Although the site area proper is “relatively flat,” the terrace does in fact slope gently to the south and east and this slope could have contributed to the instability of large trees. Both historical and archaeobotanical data suggest an oak-hickory tree cover for the site; these trees do not set down tap roots but rather large, spreading root mats that upend as circular disks of sediment when trees go down. Soil structure is weakly developed in the upper 50 cm of the solum, as would be expected in a homogenized stratum created by long-term, continuous massive disturbance. Clay content is lowest in the upper 30 cm, a situation common to floralmantles due to differential wind transport of clay-sized sediments brought to the surface in stream bars (Johnson 1990). Most of the features at the site were recorded as occurring at the base of the A horizon, as would be expected if the A horizon was a disturbed layer overlaying what was left of the intact archaeology. Archaeomagnetic data presented in a chapter by Wulf A. Gose imply that two of the three concentrations of sandstone investigated “represent a random accumulation or rocks, either a severely disturbed fireplace or discard material”; the third such feature was interpreted as “a moderately disturbed fireplace” (p. 84). Shallow-rooted trees overturning above the features could explain such disturbance. Finally, some “features” at the site were discounted as tree throw depressions following excavation (p. 28), so there is physical evidence that the solum was being disturbed in this way. It’s easy, of course, to be an armchair geomorphologist, and it may be that this scenario was considered and dismissed by the researchers. If so, that is not evident in the report.

Geomorphology, microwear analysis, protein residues, ethnobotany, archaeomagnetism – there is something for everyone in this report. While those expecting masses of tabulated data or quibbles about phases or other culture-historical units will be disappointed, the application of so many innovative methods makes the Phase III effort at the Skagg site a worthy one. Any future CRM work conducted in the Ozarks – or, for that matter, anywhere in the Southeast – could profitably start with a review of the Skagg site report and the compiling of a list of research questions that can build on the analytical base established therein.
References
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Evan Peacock is Assistant Professor of Anthropology at Mississippi State University.


Reviewed by Sam Brookes

This festschrift volume is very appropriate as it honors two longtime contributors to the archaeology of the state of Arkansas. Dan and Phyllis Morse have worked out of the Jonesboro office for thirty years. Their retirement in 1997 truly marked the end of an era in Arkansas archaeology. Mary L. Kwas discusses their career in chapter one. The Morse’s major works are well known to Southeastern archaeologists and several of them are classics in the field: Zebree, Parkin, Brand (along with Al Goodyear), and Sloan. In addition they have published a number of shorter articles in numerous state and national journals and most of these are listed in a Selected Bibliography presented by Kwas. One of their greatest achievements was the 1983 synthesis, *Archaeology of the Central Mississippi Valley*, published by Academic Press. While the Morse’s are known for their archaeological excavation and reporting, they are known for other talents as well. Dan and Phyllis were an important part of the Mid South Archaeological Conference. Dan was a participant at the first conference organized by Gerald Smith in 1969. Dan organized and chaired the second meeting in 1971. This meeting, held in Jonesboro, was the first to have formally presented papers organized around a central topic, a format that persists to this day. Mary’s chapter is a good, but brief, summation of the careers of these two fine archaeologists. In addition, Mary had several archaeologists write brief memoirs of their association with the Morse’s.

The second chapter of the book is “Late Quaternary Vegetation Dynamics in the Central Mississippi Valley” by Paul and Hazel Delcourt and the late Roger Saucier. Those familiar with the work of these scientists will find this quite a useful summation of work they have carried out for years. Many people are aware of the tremendous changes that occurred at the end of the Pleistocene, with the melting of the ice caps and the extinction of the megafauna. This however was just the beginning as not only animals but also plants moved into ranges previously occupied by other species. The Hypsithermal interval of 6000 B.C. to 3000 B.C. is discussed with its concomitant shift in settlement patterns and land use. Just as informative is their discussion of the deforestation and conversion of bottomland hardwoods to agricultural lands that began around A.D. 700 and continued until very recent times. This date seems early to me and I only wish the chapter had covered the Yazoo Basin in Mississippi, where we do not have evidence of maize agriculture until around A.D. 1100.

Chapter three concerns itself with the Saline River drainage and is coauthored by Marvin Jeter and Ann Early. This chapter provides a thorough summary of the prehistory of the region. The Paleo Indian period is divided into two sub-periods, not the early, middle and late tripartite division used in Mississippi. Instead the authors employ early (Clovis and fluted points), and late (Dalton). San Patrice is the next period, though the authors suggest it could be related to Dalton and may overlap it in time. Following the Early Archaic period is the Scottsbluff Intrusion, dated 7000 - 6000 B.C. The impetus for this intrusion is the eastward expansion of prairie environments, and bison, due to the onset of the Hypsithermal climatic interval. Further evidence of the Hypsithermal is offered in the Middle Archaic time period. Little cultural material is noted for this period and the authors cite the Morse’s Central Mississippi Valley volume for an explanation. Dan and Phyllis are strong proponents of the Hypsithermal and its effect on native peoples. The Big Creek
culture is one of the dominant Middle Archaic cultures in the region. Characterized by Evans points and clay blocks, it is also the time when the earliest mounds in America were constructed. To make matters confusing, following the Big Creek culture is the Williams Point complex of the Late Archaic. Williams points and the related Big Creek points are the diagnostics for this time period, dating between 3000 - 600 B.C. That's right, Big Creek points are not part of the Big Creek culture. Here I have to take issue with the authors concerning the dating of these points. They state that Schambach has found them associated with and earlier than Evans points. With that in mind the authors consider them coeval and slightly later than Evans points. They state that this is done on the basis of the Morse's data, yet the Morse's assign them dates of 4000-3000 B.C. The remainder of this chapter is a very good summary of the later time periods in the Saline River.

David Anderson, a student of the Morse's, authored a chapter on the L'Anguille River Basin. This study is a significant scientific sample of sites in the region and is well known among a small circle of scholars. As it was conducted as a cultural resource management study, only about 25 copies were printed. To be sure there are a great many poor quality copies floating around, but here is an excellent summation of a rare study. Anderson does his usual thorough job of detailing the methods employed in this venture. Again, his is an excellent overview of the prehistoric cultures in the region. Anderson has a table that lists projectile point types recovered during the survey (Table 4.2). This is quite a good device as projectile points are the index artifacts for a great part of the periods under discussion, and until the appearance of ceramics are the only reliable markers. My only caveat here is the placement of Cache River points in the Middle Archaic, when they are among the earliest of the Early Archaic forms everywhere else they are found. This confusion probably arises from the fact that side notched points appear immediately after Dalton, only to be quickly replaced by corner notched forms throughout most of the Southeast. Side-notched forms then reappear in the Middle Archaic where they seem to be carried southward by peoples moving in as a result of the Hypsithermal climatic event. Thus there are two side notched horizons in the Southeast separated by a period of about 3500 years or more.

J. Christopher Gilliam has an interesting chapter on Paleoindian Settlement in Northeastern Arkansas. This chapter is an expanded version of the one he did for the Plains Anthropologist. However I much prefer the methodology, or maybe I should just say typology, he employed in his chapter in the Anderson and Sassaman volume published by the University Alabama Press. The current chapter, while excellent, discusses Paleo Indian and Dalton. You see the problem. Here in Mississippi we use a tripartite system with Dalton being the last part. Gilliam, in this chapter, lumps all fluted points into Paleo. In his chapter of the Alabama volume he discusses the Middle Paleo points, of which there are a number. I feel lumping them into a generalized Paleo time period is begging the question. Let me be the first to say there are lots of questions about these Middle Paleo points.

Dr. Martha Rolinsong has a nice chapter on the Toltec mound group, where she has been station archaeologist for a number of years. Martha has done some pioneering work on ceramics from this site, especially utilizing modes of design elements when faced with large collections of “undecorated” sherds. Her work at Toltec has had great influence on ceramic classification in the Mississippi Valley. Martha's chapter deals with the history of the site in the 19th century when it was known as the Knapp Group of mounds. This chapter is an intriguing history of both fieldwork and speculation about the site.

Dr. Frank Schambach's chapter on Tunicas and Spiro is an informative reassessment of archaeological work in Oklahoma, Arkansas and Mississippi. This is an enhancement of his ideas on Tunica history put forth in the Stephen Williams festschrift volume (MDAH Archaeological Report # 25). Schambach is essentially arguing that the Tunica, who were renowned traders of horses and salt in historic times, were descended from the inhabitants of the famed Spiro site and other sites in the area. Schambach further postulates that this trade system had been established by at least as early as A.D. 1000. Schambach's work on the subject has come to be known as the "maximum Tunica
hypothesis," and here he takes it even further. This chapter is very thoughtful reading and is one of my favorite chapters in the book. I daresay this chapter will generate a lot of discussion in the future.

Leslie Stewart-Abernathy has an engaging chapter on historical archaeology. Skip, as he is known to his many friends, discusses the development of historical archaeology in the Mid South. Skip discusses historic archaeology in Mississippi and speaks at length about Jack Elliot of MDAH who for years was the only full time historic archaeologist in the state. Skip also mentions the work of Dr. Amy Young and her students at USM, a great boon to the state of Mississippi. Skip covers work done by the National Forests in Mississippi and graciously mentions my name. Here I get to set the record straight: work done on historic sites in Mississippi National Forests is not due to anything I have ever done. Instead all credit should go to Robert Reams, Melissa Taworski, David Fant, Robert Bryan, Joel Dukes, Evan Peacock, and Amy Young and her students.

The final chapter is by Dr. Michael P. Hoffman and has the wonderful title, “Ancient Races of Giants, Moundbuilders, and Hero Collectors: Newspaper Accounts of Arkansas Archaeology, 1870-1930.” The chapter is as much fun to read as the title suggests. If you enjoyed Steve Williams’s Fantastic Archaeology you will love this chapter. Things such as sensationalism, frauds, and enigmatic characters are a part of archaeology and this chapter is loaded with them. However, I must admit that while it is fun to read about this sort of thing, it is always more fun when it happens to someone else in their state. I have been involved with a couple of nuts and it is anything but funny when it happens to you.

The one chapter I have not mentioned is Bob Mainfort’s “Late Period Phases in the Central Mississippi Valley: A Multivariate Approach”. Let me say right off the bat that it does not have the catchiest title. Further, I can barely spell multivariate and do not even intend to get into the statistical aspect of this chapter, my favorite in the book. I have to review this scientific chapter as an old fashioned cultural materialist, who has no expertise in late prehistory. So why bother you ask? Because it deals with so much that is used by archaeologists in the Mississippi Valley, from binomial ceramic classification, to phases and ethnic identification. This chapter deals with the very stuff that is late period archaeology in Mississippi (and of course Arkansas). Philip Phillips defined archaeological phases using groups of ceramic types. These groups were placed in spatial units and called phases, it was theorized that they delineated local polities. Through the years numerous archaeologists have attempted to equate the late phases with the provinces described in the DeSoto narratives. This equating of potsherds with provinces has formed the basis for much speculation about the route of Hernando DeSoto and his army through the Mississippi Valley. We have precious little in the way of diagnostics for this period. The Sclater halberds have always been questionable and now, with John Connaway’s work on bells, we have lost yet another “Spanish” diagnostic. All that is left to us in Mississippi are beads and metal tools and these are practically nonexistent. Thus the burden of tracking DeSoto falls on our studies of American Indian ceramics. Mainfort may have thrown cold water on that with this analysis of late ceramics. The multivariate analysis has shown that there is a great potential for further analysis of sites in the region to provide a better set of data to work with. Here, the work that Martha Rolingos did at Toltec comes to mind, especially her fine tuned analysis of modes of decoration. However, Mainfort found that while some of the phases had different ceramic counts, especially the percentages of two different types of plainware, most shared a remarkable similarity of decorated ceramic types. In other words the different provinces mentioned by DeSoto do not show up in ceramics. Mainfort mentions that the dialects of the provinces were mutually intelligible, so perhaps it is not surprising that the ceramics show a great similarity. The sites do form groups that have a valid statistical nature, but the four phases (Walls, Parkin, Kent and Nodena) became eight clusters of sites. I am sure this means something, but exactly what escapes me for the moment. Mainfort’s main contribution is that his statistically derived phases are superior to the intuitive phases of earlier researchers. Here one remembers the Marksville study done by Alan Toth (MDAH
Archaeological Report # 21), Toth's ceramic study did not find much evidence of interaction between Hopewell in the north and Marksville in the south. When his volume was published only two sherds from the Lower Mississippi Valley appeared to be Hopewell imports. Indeed it was a study of the lithics from these sites that yielded imported raw materials, including Cobden, Burlington and Mill Creek chert; as well as non-local artifact types, specifically Snyders points, Northern flint blades and uniface tools, that demonstrated the interaction Toth had sought. Perhaps we are placing too much emphasis on ceramics to tell us about social organization in the prehistoric and early historic periods. It is generally assumed that the women were the potters and that the men made stone tools. It is also generally assumed that the men were the driving forces behind these polities. Can we then expect to study women's artifacts and learn about the political structure of the men? I realize I will be called a sexist for even raising this issue, but if we are to ever find DeSoto and unravel the message of the sherds we must consider every consequence of our analysis. Perhaps if we begin to take a closer look at the various modes and finer points of ceramic analysis we will be able to more easily differentiate groups of ceramics made by people in different provinces. Mainfort has provided us a thought-provoking document that is sure to be refined and employed in the search for the DeSoto entrada.

This festschrift is a great tribute to two very fine archaeologists by a number of their talented colleagues. This is a great overview of Arkansas Archaeology by a Who's Who of Arkansas Archaeologists. If you have any interest in Arkansas archaeology this book belongs on your shelf.

*Samuel O. Brookes is an archaeologist with the U.S. Forest Service, Jackson.*

---


Reviewed by Jeffrey M. Mitchem

Some archaeologists (mainly those who have nothing new to contribute to early contact studies) have said that de Soto has been "done to death." While a lot of drivel has been written, published, and said about the expedition in recent decades, a few substantial works of scholarship have resulted from the focus of historians and anthropologists on the expedition and its effects. Several of the papers in this book fall into this latter category, and are significant contributions.

The volume is divided into four sections, each containing between three and six papers. The first section is entitled "The Sources." The five essays focus on the expedition narratives, critically examining each from the historian's viewpoint. Ida Altman's paper reviews the Bedma account, noting events that were recorded by this representative of the Spanish Crown, as well as those he omitted. The next two chapters, by Patricia Galloway and Martin Malcolm Elbl and Ivana Elbl, focus primarily on the accounts of Rodrigo Ranjel and the anonymous knight or gentleman of Elvas. The published Ranjel account comes to us through the multivolume history of the Indies by Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo y Valdés, and Galloway makes a strong case that Oviedo probably altered or embellished the narrative prior to publication. Both papers also provide convincing arguments that much of the Elvas narrative was borrowed from Oviedo's Ranjel account. The Elbls consider the possibility that the Elvas work was actually written by the printer who published it, but conclude that it is unlikely. Their prime candidate would be a Portuguese student, someone not even remotely connected to the expedition! Nevertheless, they conclude that the Elvas narrative should be considered as valuable as Oviedo's Ranjel report.

Galloway's paper also criticizes the long, flowery work of
Garcilaso de la Vega, which is the subject of the final two chapters in this section, by Lee Dowling and David Henige. Many problems with the Garcilaso work have been pointed out for years. Galloway proposes that Garcilaso used the Elvas account to fill in some of the blanks from the testimony on which he supposedly based his account. Dowling examines Garcilaso's literary sources, and shows similarities of structure and content to a number of older texts to which he had been exposed, while also pointing out the influences of the style and conventions of writing history at that time. She mentions (as do the other authors) his failure to name his primary informants (most believe it was Gonzalo Silvestre). Dowling also considers the effects of Garcilaso's mestizo standing in society and the effects of being what she terms a “marginalized intellectual.” Henige's paper considers Garcilaso's style and how some researchers have misused it in attempts to define the expedition route.

The second section includes six papers on the subject of “The Expedition.” The first two, by Curt Lamar and Ignacio Avelaned a, provide a brief biography of Hernando de Soto and describe his preparations and gathering of personnel for the expedition. The next two chapters, by Robert S. Weddle and Ross Hassig, discuss matters of navigation, maps, identifying the landing place, and the estimates of distances given in the narratives. The many factors that affected measures of distance indicate that it is probably impossible to rely on the number of leagues traveled as recorded in the accounts. The essay by Jack D. Elliott, Jr. uses the Mississippi example of why we cannot confidently identify sixteenth-century Indian trails based on locations of modern roads. The examples he cites are convincing, and we will probably never even be able to locate the exact routes traveled between known villages. The final chapter in this section is by Ann F. Ramenofsky and Patricia Galloway. This interesting paper identifies the diseases that might have been carried by people or domestic animals on the expedition. They also consider how infectious each is, and come up with a list of about 12 that were likely transported to the southeastern Native Americans.

The third section consists of three chapters under the heading “The Expedition and Indian History.” The first essay, by Patricia Galloway, is a valuable contribution that summarizes the problems with the misuse of the expedition narratives, specifically by anthropologists. In a welcome shift from the entirely negative tone of so many critics, she discusses suggestions of how they can be used, but only for examining the origins of changes after contact, not for a reliable view of the situation before contact. Her discussion of the Direct Historical Approach and the naive application of incomplete historical methodologies by archaeologists is eye-opening, and should be read by any researcher looking at early European expeditions to the New World.

The other two papers in this section are by anthropologists. Jay K. Johnson discusses archaeological evidence of the “devolution” of the Chickasaws in northeast Mississippi. He compares evidence from the Moundville area, the Lubbock Creek site, and northeast Mississippi, and is able to show convincingly that changes in settlement patterns and social organization among the Chickasaw were well underway prior to contact with Spanish explorers. Johnson provides a good example of how ethnohistory and archaeology can interact to the benefit of both. Charles Hudson explains the historical significance of mapping exploration routes to define areas occupied by different aboriginal groups, as well as the possibility of identifying specific towns. He argues for the usefulness of the narratives, disagreeing with some of the criticisms put forth by other authors in this volume.

The final section is entitled “The Expedition and Euro-American History.” The first paper, by Ralph H. Vigil, provides an overview of Spanish laws and policies and their evolution from the time of Columbus until Soto's death. He also includes a lot of biographical information and recounts events leading up to the expedition. This is followed by a quick run-through of the expedition, primarily a listing of atrocities committed by the Spaniards, using all four of the accounts, including Garcilaso. A short paper by Lawrence J. Goodman and John R. Wunder then relates the story of Soto's illegitimate daughter Leonor and her quest for a share of his estate. The authors explain some of the complicated aspects of the Spanish legal system in the sixteenth
century. The next chapter, by Juan Bautista de Avalle-Arce, is a short biography of Oviedo, focusing on how he came to write his history of the Indies and his inclusion of the Ranjel account. The essay by José Rabasa is a discussion of the Black Legend (the idea that the Spaniards were more bloodthirsty and cruel than other European groups) and of incidents of violence recounted in the narratives. He tries to draw parallels to violence against indigenous communities today. The book concludes with a chapter by Patricia Galloway, in which she discusses the history of both scholarship on the expedition and the public perception of it, as well as the many “commemorations” and constituencies that have a stake in how the expedition and its effects are presented. It is interesting to see the ideas and perceptions through the years, the political influences on study of the expedition, and some of the downright weird people and ideas that seem to get attracted to the expedition like moths to a flame. It is ironic that the motivations of some of these people are not that different from those that brought Hernando de Soto here in the first place.

Many of these essays are not easy reading, and some of the authors apparently believe that people will think they’re real smart if they use lots of obscure terms and jargon. Instead, those writers come off as pompous. Several authors also push political agendas or have chips on their shoulders that only detract from the otherwise valuable information in the papers. I have only one minor technical complaint, and that concerns a few errors I noted in the endnotes, both typographical errors and incorrect citations.

As editor Galloway notes in her preface, this book should serve as one of the basic references for future studies of the Hernando de Soto expedition. Many of the papers in the volume are essential reading for those interested in the narratives and their interpretation, and would be most valuable if read before one gets too far into the narratives. I came away with a deeper understanding of the problems with the various accounts, and found that careful reading of the essays enlightened me on several important issues, some of which I had never considered. Let us hope that a more affordable paperback edition will be forthcoming.

Jeffrey M. Mitchem is Associate Archaeologist with the Arkansas Archeological Survey and Associate Professor of Anthropology at the University of Arkansas.
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