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Correspondence between James A. Ford and Henry B. Collins: Selected Letters, 1927-1941

Edited by Keith A. Baca

Abstract

Letters exchanged by the eminent prehistorians Ford and Collins document the development of ideas that have shaped the nature of archaeological inquiry in the U.S. to the present day.

Introduction

Two individuals with Mississippi roots, James A. Ford (1911-1968) and Henry B. Collins, Jr. (1899-1987), figure prominently in the history of American archaeology. Their work in the Southeast and Arctic helped to provide the foundations upon which much of the present archaeological knowledge of the regions is based. A large body of correspondence between the two men exists, offering today's reader a uniquely personal view of their achievements in the context of their times; extensive selections are presented here.

The important role that was played by native Mississippian Ford (Figure 1) in the advancement of archaeology is well known and has been widely acknowledged (e.g., Brown 1978; Johnson 1993; Lyon 1996; O'Brien and Lyman 1998, 1999; Stoltman 1973; Trigger 1989; Tushingham et al. 2002; Willey 1988; Willey and Sabloff 1995). Indeed, all archaeologists specializing in the southeastern U.S. in general and Mississippian in particular are of necessity familiar with Ford's influential work in devising the prototype prehistoric chronological sequence for the Lower Mississippi Valley, making discussion here unnecessary. Unacquainted readers are referred to the above-cited publications for overviews of Ford's work.

Crucial in helping to launch Ford's career and in providing guidance during his rise to prominence was his mentor, Collins (Figure 2). A leading Arctic specialist (Blitz 1988; Dekin 1973; Scott 1984), Collins initially did pioneering archaeological fieldwork in the Southeast during the 1920s (Blitz 1988). He was an early advocate of using ceramic sherds, found in abundance at prehistoric village sites, as a key source of data for the establishment of relative chronologies in the region (Blitz 1988; Collins 1932a,
Figure 1. James A. Ford, ca. 1938. Courtesy Museum of Natural Science, Louisiana State University.

1932b; O'Brien and Lyman 1998:40-41, 44-51). This work was taken up by Ford, who brought to fruition a chronological approach to southeastern archaeology.

Because he is likely not as well known to many readers as is Ford, a few details of Collins’s early days in Mississippi are given here. Born in Alabama and raised in Louisiana and Mississippi, Collins graduated from Millsaps College in Jackson, Miss. in 1922 with a bachelor’s degree in geology. Collins worked in 1923-24 for the Mississippi Department of Archives and History (MDAH) in Jackson, where his principal duty was to organize and catalogue the Department’s museum collection (Blitz 1988; Collins 1977). Apparently the only fieldwork done by Collins while at MDAH was paleontological, not archaeological: in March 1924, he excavated some...
fossil bones of a zeuglodon (an extinct whale) from the vicinity of Forest, Scott County, Mississippi (Collins 1924, 1977).

In the fall of 1924, Collins became a staff member of the U.S. National Museum, Smithsonian Institution. Collins maintained contact with MDAH, however, and as a result came to know Ford, who as a teenager in the late 1920s was employed by MDAH during the summers with Moreau B. Chambers to excavate artifacts from burial mounds. Collins recognized Ford's potential, and gave him his initial archaeological field training in 1929 and 1930 at Deasonville, Mississippi (Collins 1932a) and in Alaska (Collins 1937). In addition, as seen below, Collins provided advice and encouragement by correspondence, which continued as Ford's experience and expertise grew.

This correspondence documents Ford's rapid transformation from a green amateur asking simple questions about mending pottery, into one of America's foremost prehistorians. The letters begin in 1927 and continue through the late 1950s; however, the selections here terminate at 1941, after which the correspondence is sporadic. 1941 also was the year of publication of the first modern synthesis of eastern U.S. archaeology (Ford and Willey 1941), which represents the culmination of Ford's seminal work of the 1930s, thereby making a suitable ending point. For detailed context and background information, the letters may be read in conjunction with an in-depth analysis of Ford's career (O'Brien and Lyman 1998) and a reprint volume of his early publications (O'Brien and Lyman 1999).

Ford's letters to Collins and the carbon copies of Collins's letters to Ford are in the National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution; the selections here were prepared from copies of the above on deposit at MDAH (Henry Bascom Collins Papers, Zu/1981.066). Additional correspondence from Ford's papers at Louisiana State University was used in instances of material apparently missing from the Smithsonian collection.

Excerpts from the majority of the available 1927-1941 letters (93 out of a total of 121) are included here. Omitted material consists of passages or entire letters deemed excessively lengthy, tedious, repetitive, incidental, or otherwise extraneous in nature, such as some travel arrangements and itineraries; descriptions of certain archaeological sites and artifact collections; tentative plans for fieldwork never undertaken; purely personal matters, e.g., marriage plans and the birth of Collins's child, etc. Ellipses (...) indicate deletions ranging from one word to multiple paragraphs. Editorial insertions in square brackets denote letters completely omitted, as well as additions or substitutions made to improve clarity, indicate or correct errors and to provide pertinent references, names and other contextual data. A lengthy gap in the correspondence for 1928-29 is noted; whether this indicates missing letters or a period when no letters were written is uncertain. Readers will also notice that some passages appear to be responses to previous letters not printed herein; if such correspondence is not noted as being omitted, it is apparently missing from the original collections or the copies at MDAH.

These invaluable documents preserve a remarkable exchange of data, news, opinions and ideas between two of the founders of modern American archaeology, and provide an enlightening firsthand perspective of the growth of the discipline during a period of momentous change.

K.A.B.
Mr. Henry Collins  
Smithsonian Inst.  
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir:

Please tell me what material you used in filling in gaps in the pottery which is now in the Miss. Dept. of Archives museum. Chambers and I have quite a bit of pottery on hand and do not find plaster of Paris satisfactory.

Did your finds in the Nunivac [sic] Islands tend to support Dr. [Ales] Hrdlicka's theories?  

We had a very successful summer and look forward with pleasure to work with you.

Very truly yours,
J.A. Ford

Mr. J.A. Ford  
Clinton, Miss.

Dear Mr. Ford:

I have your letter of the 11th and am very glad to know that you [and] Chambers have been keeping busy with archeology this past summer. I got back from Alaska just a little too late to see [MDAH director] Dr. [Dunbar] Rowland and so learn of your diggings. I would like very much to know just what you have found. Wonder if you would mind writing me in as much detail as necessary of what you and Chambers did.

Plaster of Paris is what I used on the pottery in the museum at Jackson; it is, in fact, the only thing that can be used for filling in gaps in broken pots. We use it here and so does every other museum I know of. Perhaps you did not get the right consistency to the paste. The plaster, best grade obtainable, should be poured into a cup containing some water until the water has all been absorbed by the plaster, leaving a dense but fairly liquid mass that can be poured on.... Are you using Ambroid to put the vessels together with? It is the only really satisfactory glue....

I had a very enjoyable time in Alaska. My partner and I covered a section of Alaska that is rarely visited by white people and so we found the Eskimos in very much their original state. We made sizable collections, around two hundred skulls and skeletons, and got measurements on about 125 individuals, the first to be obtained from that part of Alaska. I don’t think that anything we found could be regarded as having any direct bearing on the question of man’s antiquity on this continent.

I am enclosing reprints of a paper I wrote on Choctaw potsherds [Collins 1927], one for yourself and one for Chambers. I would like very much to have you tell me all you can about your mound work. Call on me if at any time I can be of assistance in any way.

Very sincerely yours,

[H. B. Collins]
Mr. Henry Collins  
Smithsonian Inst.  
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir:

As you requested I shall tell you of our summer's work.

First we made a survey of Hinds [County], searching out all the mounds and village sites. We rode our horses so it took us a month to do this. This survey showed some astonishing things. We discovered in all about thirty-one mounds. Among these were small mounds, large square and round platform mounds, oblong mounds.... Among a group [sic] of four at Baldwin's Ferry on the Big Black River... [is a mound that] had the top cut up in the Civil War and these excavations (which are shallow) turned up burnt clay containing impressions of cane walls; here we may be able to learn more of the Choctaw dwellings....

We started excavating the second month at Pocahontas in the small burial mound there (there's a small and a large mound at Pocahontas [Ford 1936:123-128]). We had obtained several fine pieces of pottery [Rucker 1976:103-107] and a celt or two when we were chased out by the marshal and angry citizens. Politics! But I think Dr. Rowland has it fixed so we may return next summer.... The next two weeks we worked at Mannsdale in Madison County.... We obtained some nice pots of queer design from this mound. We also found shell beads, earplugs and pendants here....

The last month was spent at the Dupree Mound [Ford 1936:118-120, 126-128] six miles west of Raymond. This mound was twelve feet high and fifty in diameter. By this time Dr. Rowland had bought us a tent so we no longer had to sleep under the stars only.

This mound proved a gold mine. We found about 70 pots of many different shapes and decorations.... There was a remarkable absence of shell tempered pottery from this mound. One pot was so fractured as to show plainly that it was made by coiling ropes of clay....

We also found 19 greenstone celts ranging in length from one inch to 15 inches; no grooved axes were found. We discovered shell beads, and pendants, a lump of ocher.... and two masses of green clay used as paint. We also discovered two wood disks about two inches in diam[eter] covered with copper. Another copper covered object shaped like a fish accompanied these; the copper was a green powder and we were only able to save the disks.

Sixteen discoidal stones were found in this mound, all of the same general design and nearly all showed wear on the rim. I have read that discoids were not buried with the dead but were the property of the village, yet these were scattered thru [sic] the mound associated with burials. I neglected to mention that while we were conducting our survey we were able to obtain a fine jasper discoidal that was pierced. It was finely made and Dr. Rowland was very delighted over it.

In the Dupree mound we also found a shark's tooth, not fossilized. I am very sorry that we were not able to save any skulls.... All the bones we dug up were in the last stages of decay but we have about twenty individuals.

This is a short sketch of what we did this summer taken from my memory. The complete and very accurate report of our work is in the hands of Dr. Rowland and you may read it when you come down. We took numerous photographs....

I should like to hear more of your trip but I suppose I shall read it in the next [Smithsonian] explorations bulletin. I read your report of Choctaw village sites with interest and am anxious for you to see the Pocahontas village. Its [pottery] decorations seem to be slightly different from the ones you showed.

Very truly yours,

J.A. Ford

[There is no correspondence between Ford and Collins for 1928 and 1929 in the MDAH and Louisiana State University collections.]
the way; and when you consider the terrible power that lies in the hands of the type-setter it is wholly innocuous. On one occasion, for example, I was accused in the public prints as proceeding to the Louisiana coasts to make an intensive investigation of a number of large kitchen maidens [i.e., middens].

In regard to my coming Alaskan trip I wonder if Dr. Rowland would be willing to have his archæological team broken up and have one of you go along with me.... Suppose you talk it over with Dr. Rowland.

I hope you can get permission to work [at the Deasonville site] again next winter and that I may again have the pleasure of being with you. Washington is now covered with a blanket of snow, reminding me strongly of sunny Mississippi. My regards to Moreau. With best wishes,

Very sincerely yours,

[H. B. Collins]

Clinton, Mississippi
January 19, 1930

Mr. Henry Collins
National Museum
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Collins:

I read the [Deasonville] article that appeared in the papers with pleasure and amusement. It was all right except where it was all wrong.... I hope you haven't been telling Dr. Swanton or any of the other southeastern men about our "house with a veranda."

The finished [Deasonville plan] map...made the matter quite simple. Looking at the copy that is enclosed you will see that the circles are lettered from the inside out: A-B-C. The final theory that presents itself is that these circles represent buildings constructed at different periods in the order they are lettered. The roofs of "A" and "B" were supported by the numerous posts that refused to line up in the square. Comments appreciated.

As soon as our examinations are over we will send in the first shipment of [Deasonville] bones, that child [skeleton] and refuse from the fire pit. Among the other refuse I shall include your flash light and trowel. The Department gratefully accepts from the [Smithsonian] the liberal donation of a whisk broom.

Yours respectfully,

J.A. Ford

Mr. James A. Ford
Clinton, Mississippi

My dear Ford:

I was very glad to receive your latest interpretation of the concentric trenches [at Deasonville]. You are to be commended for your perspicacity. By regarding them as having been built at different times, it is possible to get around the difficulty of too many walls at places were there was apparently no real need for them.... I am enclosing measurements of post holes and trenches that I promised you. I will be glad to receive the bones and potsherds whenever you get time to send them.

You did not comment on my suggestion in regard to Alaska. Is it possible that your ardor for the Far North has cooled? My plans, as yet, are no more definite than when I wrote you [last] but I would like to know if one of you, with Dr. Rowland's consent, would be available....

With best wishes, I am,

Very truly yours,

H. B. Collins, Jr.

Clinton, Miss.
Feb. 9, 1930

Dear Mr. Collins:

Since Christmas I have been studying our collections and have evolved quite a neat hypothesis. As soon as I get my article published I will send you a copy (if and when).

We have already talked to Dr. Rowland about the Alaskan trip. He seems to be quite reconciled to parting with his bright young geinises.

We made a trip up to Pocahontas yesterday and located a house site near the larger mound. We haven't yet got permission to dig. [Deasonville site landowner] Mr. Pepper was quite pleased with your newspaper accounts, satisfied with $2.25, and cordial in his invitation to return next year.

Since I've tried [writing an archaeological paper] I've begun to appreciate what a beautiful piece of work your article on Eskimo art is.

Best of regards,

J.A. Ford
Mr. H. B. Collins  
National Museum  
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Collins:

I have just received your letter of February 8. Many thanks for the notes on the Deasonville house circles.

This short note is a frantic attempt to straighten out our correspondence and to assure you of our (Moreau's and my) continued passion for the Far North where men are men and all women beautiful. Dr. Rowland has given his consent.... When planning your Alaskan expedition remember that either Moreau or I would be delighted to go.

Sincerely,
J.A. Ford  

Mr. James A. Ford  
Clinton, Mississippi

Dear Ford:

Dr. Rowland writes me that he would be willing for you to make the Alaska trip, so if you are still in the notion please let me know as soon as possible.... The pay will be $50 a month and expenses. It will interfere to some extent with your school year [at Mississippi College] since we would have to leave the first part of May and possibly not return until the first of November. You intimated, however, that it would be possible for you to take some liberties with your curriculum, possibly more so than Moreau. Dr. Rowland spoke of arranging with your school authorities for advance examinations. Whatever time you miss from your class work would, I feel, be more than made up by your archeological activities in Alaska. Possibly you could make the authorities look on it in the same light. I wish I could have both of you this summer, but even if the funds were available I suppose it would not be proper to deprive Dr. Rowland of the services of his entire archeological force at the same time. Next year possibly things can be arranged differently.

Mr. Bushnell was around a few days ago and called my attention to his description of a Cherokee house...which seems to correspond fairly well with our Deasonville floor plan. There would very likely be certain differences in construction in the two localities, but the similarities, I feel, are really striking. The reasons you brought out as showing that the rings represent three different houses must, of course, be considered, but the fact remains that the post holes and trenches do line themselves up as a very definite structure, and since we have this historical reference to a house very similar to this it seems to me as quite possible that we have to deal with such a structure. This is for your and Moreau's consideration before deciding the matter definitely....

Very sincerely yours,
[H. B. Collins]

Clinton, Mississippi  
March 10, 1930

Mr. H. B. Collins  
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Collins:

Of course I still want to go to Alaska. As I would miss only three weeks of review I think that with Dr. Rowland's aid the examinations can be arranged. Dr. Provine...the college president, is a member of the Board of Directors, Trustees, or whatever it is that Dr. Rowland keeps under his thumb for purposes of running the Department....

I am looking forward with much pleasure to the summer's work in Alaska...

Yours sincerely,
J.A. Ford

March 17, 1930

Dear Ford:

It is settled at last; you may join me in exile on St. Lawrence Island this summer. I have just received a letter from Capt. Jones in which he gives his sailing date and itinerary. We will sail from Seattle about May 13th.... We will go by Kodiak Island, stop a few days at Unalaska, a day or two at Nunivak Island and then head for Nome. Before getting off at Gambell, on
the northwestern end of St. Lawrence Island, we will get a chance to do a little collecting at old villages around Golovin Bay. If the digging at Gambell proves as fruitful as I expect we will stay there the greater part of the season....

Sincerely,
[H. B. Collins]

Clinton, Mississippi
March 22, 1930

Dear Mr. Collins:

I was delighted to receive your latest letter. My examinations have been arranged for with the college authorities; I have applied for a [railroad] pass to Chicago; and in other ways am preparing for our expedition. I shall buy the most of my equipment in Seattle so as to have the benefit of your expert advice. Although a suitcase is all I intend to bring from home, if I return with all the souvenirs that have been requested it will be necessary to purchase two trunks and a number of packing cases in Nome....

My only regret about going to Alaska is having to leave Moreau to do this Mississippi work by himself. He, however, doesn't seem as downcast as my vanity would have him. Dr. Rowland, too, appears to be bearing this deprivation with remarkable sangfroid. The other day I expressed the hope that my absence wouldn't interfere with his Mississippi archaeological work. He said no, that he didn't think it would.

I am looking forward to your letter telling when we shall meet in Chicago, and in the meantime am diligently devoting myself to the task of shooting my honored professors a line of bull in an earnest endeavor to delude them into thinking I deserve to pass.

Very sincerely yours,
J.A. Ford

[Collins to Ford 4/21/30 omitted]

Clinton, Mississippi
April 22, 1930

Dear Mr. Collins:

My R.R. pass to Chicago has arrived. I am taking examinations now and will be through by [May] 5.

I have been reading up on the Inuit - Murdock, Turner, and Boaz

[sic; Boas]. Would it be too much trouble for you to bring some pertinent reports to Seattle so I can study some more[?] I have found only a very few books on the subject. If you have a copy of Dr. Hrdlicka's Anthropometry handy, bring that too. I've not been able to get hold of five dollars all at a time since Christmas.

Moreau and I went to Jackson today and saw Dr. Rowland. He's very interested in our trip. He's raised Moreau's salary and engaged another chap to travel with him. I'm afraid they are going to get along all right without me.

This typing is awfully bad, but I am sleepy. Good night.
J.A. Ford

April 28, 1930

Dear Ford:

... I am enclosing check for $160 which is enough to get you to Seattle in case we should miss each other at Chicago....

I will bring along a few Eskimo reports. If you have some subject at school that needs attention you might have time to study during the summer; I usually take along a French and German grammar, which I never look at. I am taking along a pair of boots for you to try but am afraid they are a little small. If they are I can trade them off to the Eskimos....

[H. B. Collins]

Clinton, Mississippi
December 11, 1930

Dear Collins:

Dr. Rowland has agreed to finance our Christmas efforts [the second excavation at the Deasonville site] and the car has been repaired so that it will at least run....

When you come be sure to bring the moovies [sic]. We will get a projector and you can give a lecture... So far I've successfully refused all the pressing invitations to make talks....

So long,
J.A. Ford
Jan. 8, 1931

Dear James:

... Had an uneventful trip back [to Washington from the Deasonville excavation], altho [sic] enlivened as usual by the returning college girls. Stick to your idea of writing a description of the Natchez pottery, and the Yazoo; it is well worth while.

Best wishes,

[H. B. Collins]

[Ford to Collins 1/13/31 omitted]

Clinton, Mississippi
January 16, 1931

Dear H. B.:

Three more boxes are on their way. Most of the material in these boxes is from Deasonville....

In packing the Deasonville sherds I noticed evidence of strong influence of a pottery type found near Natchez. This is what we, somewhat at a loss for an adequate name, have called the "clapboard pottery" [i.e., Coles Creek Incised]. The type, as usually found in the Deasonville collection, is characterized by lines drawn parallel to the vessel's rim one to three centimeters apart. Sometimes, but not always, the lines are incised at an angle to give the "clapboard" effect. In most cases there is a line drawn in the rim of the vessel.... Perhaps the drawings are more intelligible than this fog of words. The "clapboard" pottery has been found [at] Coles Creek bridge, between Fayette and Natchez, and fifteen miles south of Natchez on the Mazique Plantation....

Am planning a trip over to Lake George to map the large mound group [sic] there. It's a Yazoo site, somewhat older than Haynes Bluff I think.

Anything we can do to help you with the Deasonville report, let us know. I feel rather guilty about shoving this job off on you when you have so much Alaska material to attend to, but your superior ability condemns you.

Yours,

J.A. Ford

March 13, 1931

Dear James:

I am returning the product of your labor - and mine. If it was wrist breaking toil for you it was sleep taking and almost heart breaking for me. No, the last is for rhyme. It is a very good paper, you tell the story and make your points but there is plenty that has to be done to dress it up. I think I indicated everything that should be done so no use in repeating.... I will forbear mentioning inconsistencies between the table and text; perhaps you were under the influence of Prince Albert, which may also account for your quaint spelling of group to say nothing of nucleus....

As for pictures, the ones you sent will not do.... Most of them are out of focus.... Incidentally I think you could find more interesting and decorative background than the empty camera case and film package. In making your maps could you not get Moreau or someone else to do the lettering; yours are awfully shaky.

Please send me the maps of the two house rings at Deasonville before
you tackle this again. I don’t care if it is not in final shape... I haven’t been able to do any more than begin on the Deasonville thing. An unusual amount of routine lately and then too our stenographer has just gone and we are to have no one to help with cataloging at all. Just as I was congratulating myself on how much work I was going to get done this summer....

[H. B. Collins]

Clinton, Miss.
March 17, 1931

Dear Henry:

Many thanks for your careful and excellent criticisms. I shall profit by most of them – they brought out many glaring defects that had escaped my notice – but with one or two I can’t agree. Will bring my brain-child by Washington and discuss them with you....

Moreau has gotten his outfit and I’m slowly collecting mine. All set for our Northern Exposure....

With wishes for the best,

James

April 13, 1931

Dear James:

... The Deasonville paper is coming slowly, as I find time to give to it.... You and Moreau will have competition in Alaska. Dr. Hrdlicka is returning; this time to the Alaska Peninsula and Miss [Frederica] de Laguna is going to work at Cook Inlet again. So you will have to make some good finds to uphold your reputation as the No. 1 Alaska expedition.

Sincerely,

[H. B. Collins]

Clinton, Mississippi
April 17, 1931

Dear Collins:

... We have fixed a case of Eskimo material [for exhibit at MDAH]. It looks rather well – a good thing for I shouldn’t care to open the case after that auklet-skin parka had been in there a few days.... [T]he exhibit includes no lengthy – in fact no – exposition on North Alaskan harpoon head chronology....

Thanks for the warning. We are preparing to put Dr. Hrdlicka and Miss de la Goona [sic] in the shade. At the moment we are deep in a discussion as to whether a watch cap or earmuffs will best become M’s manly phiz.

Wish me luck in my exams. (I’ll need that and more.)

James

May 9, 1931

Dear James:

... One important thing I forgot to tell you. I wanted Capt. Jones to know that we had disapproved of the Alaska College’s proposed method of excavation (sluicing) and you should tell him all I told you but do not mention that A. H. [i.e., Hrdlicka] suggested the method to them or that he has had anything to do with the matter in any way. Simply that the letter was referred to me, that I recommended the proposed method be not allowed and that my recommendation was followed in the Smithsonian’s reply to the Interior Department. And of course don’t mention to anyone the chilly reception you got from the eminent doctor [Hrdlicka].

Nothing more I can think of now, except to remind you again of the responsibility you have and to trust that you will comport yourself accordingly. Bon voyage, and write to me at every opportunity [both of you] whenever there is anything to report. Good luck.

[H. B. Collins]

Seattle, Washington
May 13, 1931

Dear Collins:

Have ordered all supplies. The boat leaves in the morning....

We haven’t yet seen Dr. Ales but are keeping away from the vicinity of the Old Curiosity Shop and the Fur Exchange....

The new Exec. is a mighty nice chap. Chaney’s two men are on board but I haven’t met them yet. One is a paleontologist and the other an ornithologist who is also interested in mice. Moreau and I are to have separate state rooms. Graz-a-and, what!... Work hard and stay away from ball games, I fear they will tend to upset your mental equilibrium.

James
May 15, 1931

Dear James:

... In regard to landing at Gambell... you want by all means to take the Patterson north to Barrow, for the... added time there will be invaluable. So go up on the Patterson regardless of the length of time you will have at Gambell. For if necessary, of course, Moreau could land there and with Paul's willing help should have no difficulty in getting started. Even if you had only one day at Gambell you could show Moreau the lay of the land so that with the maps I made of the middens and culs he will have no trouble digging at the right places.... [O]ne thing you will remember, and if necessary see that others recognize, and that is that you are representing the one scientific institution in the country which by law is charged with the systematic investigation of archeological remains. This of course is something that everyone recognizes but it is well to remember it in case objection should perchance be made to your work anywhere....

[H. B. Collins]

June 1, 1931

Dear James:

There is really nothing to say just now, except to wish you bon voyage before you leave for the far north and to wish Moreau the best of luck etc. as he steps ashore at Gambell. I had a letter from Capt. Jones some time back agreeing to haul you about as requested. Be certain that you let him know that you appreciate his helping you out in so many ways...

Remember to ask at Point Barrow about snow houses. I want to know if the natives there still make or know how to make regular domed snow shelters for use on camping trips....

I hope you don't lose those pages of instructions dealing with the points you are likely to touch on the Arctic coast. Remember, you get a nice lollipop or anything else you want if you find a site with OBS (i.e., Old Bering Sea) material anywhere around Kotzebue. And remember to try and get a look at the country around the head of Marryat Inlet just back of Point Hope; there might be an older village site somewhere around there....

The best of luck to you both; I am expecting great things of you....

Sincerely,

[H. B. Collins]

Dear H. B.:

Had very calm trip up.... Not much trouble with ice....

[Otto] Geist [of the Alaska Agricultural College and School of Mines] joined us at Unalaska. We get along fine. The sluicing project has come up only once. He explained it to me and when I expressed my disapproval [he] said that he himself was undecided as to the practicability of the scheme and that if it didn't work was prepared to use a gentle stream of water from spray nozzles. The material is to be saved in levels. He does intend to use riffle boxes though. I think that after about a week of this he will give it up. With a little practical experience Geist would make a passable archaeologist (field). I should like to work with him a month or so. (Ignore the egotism displayed.)...

As you have probably guessed I haven't done any work on that Yazoo-Natchez thing - I've read it over once.

I see that Washington is getting licked pretty often so you must be getting lots of work done - you don't have to go to the games.

So long,

James

Nome, Alaska

June 5, 1931

Dear Henry:

The boat has just returned from the little jaunt down in Norton Sound.... Moreau and I dug for a few hours in the midden on Whale Island.... The midden was remarkably barren. We got an arrow head though that is undoubtedly a Thule type - no metal, the place might repay future investigation.... From [there] to Unalakleet. The old cemetery here yielded us about fifteen skeletons. I could have gotten more but they were mummified - desiccated - and besides being a very nasty job would have taken a big box apace. All had much European material with them and were wrapped in cloth, so when Geist suggested that I leave these for Dr. [Clay] Wissler to see... I jumped at the excuse....

About a mile behind the present village we found the pits of quite a large village.... The house pits are well outlined - square and deep - but
there is no timber in them and the whole site looks a little old. We dug for a whole day in this site but didn’t find a thing...but ashes and a little charcoal... Really I don’t think much of these Norton Sound sites. There seems to be nothing in them....

So long,
James Ford

Nome, Alaska
July 1, 1931

Dear H.B.:

Have just received your pep letter #1 of June 1. Moreau is safely installed at Gambell... Our [1930] cuts at Gambell have stood up very well through the winter.

All the “Old Timers” say that the [summer] season is a month late. We found the ice impenetrable north of [St. Lawrence] Island.... We...[were] south of Gambell in a dense fog... and were going along at one third speed when suddenly the bow of the ship rose high in the air... and we heard a loud grinding sound under the keel. Looking out over the starboard wing of the bridge we saw the Gambell [shore] so close I could have jumped out on it. Capt. Jones jammed her astern so hard that he almost tore the telegraph from the deck. Did you know he can cuss artistically? They landed us at Gambell and went on to Savoonga, promising to return in two days. We labored in the middens all the next day and that night I went seal hunting among the ice in Aningayou’s boat. We got out over half way to Siberia; shot several seals; got some good photos, [then] a bad fog rolled in. We were not certain of our position so ran about 4 hours to the southeast. Picked up the [St. Lawrence] coast far below the cliffs to which the Eskimos go for puffins and murrels. Got in about 6 A.M., twelve hours in the whale boat... Moreau and Silook had already gone [to work].... [Then] the Exec. walked in...[and] said that the ice was coming down and that I was to come aboard at once. Had to go without seeing Moreau but am writing him now.... Then to Diomede. Bought several pieces of O.B.S. but undecorated. Of course I heard of several “very fancy pieces” that had been lost but recently. Capt. Jones last year requested a native to get some harpoon heads from Big Diomede; the collection includes several Thule, several Punuk and one decorated O.B.S. piece. I asked several people to save stuff for me both at Diomede and [Cape Prince of] Wales....

Forgot to tell you that we ran on two polar bears, one below

St. Lawrence and one between Diomede and Wales. Capt. Jones chased both with the ship so we all got some good photos.

My fingers are tired and the brain is weary. Don’t go on too many games and keep the moths out of that moustache.

So long,
James

Aboard M. S. Patterson
Arctic Coast, Alaska
August 9, 1931

Dear H.B.:

Have been on this boat one month today. Caught it in Nome and we ran to King Island, then Diomede. Couldn’t land there so on to Point Hope. Picked up a couple of movie men - director and camera man. Went walrus hunting for the film and I shot three and harpooned one; no mistake, I was the only one with a rifle. The teacher at Wainwright showed me some harpoon heads that he had purchased from a native living at the old site of Nunakaok, 23 miles up the coast; as the sea was closed [by ice] I went by dog team. One of the heads was decidedly Punuk. Got in only four days when the boat came up and got me....

Capt. Petersen and the personnel of the Patterson have been most kind and helpful. They have been nice about letting me have boats and men and best of all are not charging the Museum a cent either for my passage or maintenance....

James

[Barrow, Alaska]
December 27, 1931

Dear H.B.:

... Write me occasionally why don’t you. Haven’t heard from you since "pep letter No. 1" reached me in Nome last spring. Got a letter from Moreau on the last mail. He had just left Gambell and reported a successful season. He reproached me for not telling him more about the sites on St. Lawrence. All last winter [in Mississippi] I tried to get him to read those Eskimo reports but he had to study. Coming up on the boat I was after him all the time but he [said he] would read them after he got on the Island.
I tried to tell him about what was there but he didn't [illegible] about it so wasn't interested. I wasn't patient enough with Moreau; perhaps I was sore at him because he wouldn't listen to [my] extended dissertations on OBS and Thule. I'm sorry. Hope he won't [illegible] about me.

So long,
J.A. Ford

Dear James:

March 26, 1932

... Let me begin by saying that Dr. Wetmore and all of us are very much pleased at the way you have been carrying on at Barrow....

I have been using the news you sent in to advantage, and when you return I am afraid you will find yourself a highly publicized individual. I have sent all the newspaper accounts to your mother....

Moreau stayed in Washington about a week, bringing with him the decorated objects and the more exceptional specimens. The whole shipment of things has not yet been unpacked, with the exception of the birds, skeletal material and a box of your things from Nunavaak. My 1930 collection was only yesterday completed (i.e., numbered), so I thought it best to delay unpacking this lot until the place was cleared off. Moreau seems to have done a good job of his excavating, kept adequate records, etc.... I am going to try and have Paul [Silook] commissioned to dig for us at the old sites you found at S.W. Cape and at the older section of Kinneapolk, between there and Gambell. Moreau went there with Paul and Maskin and got some fairly old stuff in a certain section of the midden.

Separately I am sending [a reprint of] my Deasonville paper [Collins 1932a]. I was not able to come to any very definite conclusions... the circles might have been either a single complex house or the remains of several; so it probably please[s] no one.... I have unpacked only one small box with material from Nunavaak, containing however, quite a large number of specimens. The harpoon heads are Thule and a couple of fresh modern ones.... Please, in your letters, tell us all you can, for I should not have to tell you that I am deeply interested in your activities....

Sincerely,
[H. B. Collins]

Dear James:

June 18, 1932

Your wire was received yesterday.... I [am] delighted...to know that you [are] at work...at Birnirk. I would give almost anything to be up there with you grubbing in the middens. Strange how fascinating that is in retrospect....

Dr. Rowland applied to the Bureau [of American Ethnology] for funds to engage in further cooperative work and I got to Stirling just in time to get his promise of the last penny available in the fund ($160). Dr. Swanton and I want Moreau to locate and collect from more historic village sites, especially from...the Tunka-Yaoo-Ofo country, and then to tackle the Chickasaw sites if possible.... My plan of having Silook work at the old site south of Gambell fell through. Dr. Wetmore did not want to put money into such a project to be undertaken by a native. As you know money is pretty scarce now. In fact our principal interest in life now is wondering just how much Congress is going to cut our appropriations.... I am very glad you have taken up your Mississippi report again. You really must get in on record. Already our archeologists here are talking learnedly of Natchez pottery and I want you to get your paper ready, showing the establishment of the type....

Well, this time it is your turn to play Santa Claus to the Museum in general. The mammal people and Dr. Wetmore are tickled over the whale skull.... Any crustacea that you might be able to get would be welcome. Also any marine shells, particularly gastropods (snail type), I told Cummins you would have hand and foot prints from the Eskimos so you will have to come across....

I sent your walrus skull home so by now [brother] David [Ford] may have it over the fireplace awaiting your return....

Sincerely,
[H. B. Collins]

[Ford to Collins 8/4/32 omitted]

Barrow, Alaska
August 18, 1932

Dear H.B.:

... I can count on only two more weeks work here at Barrow.... Will try to locate that site about Kotzebue on the way down and earn the sugar plum you promised me.... I have spent the whole summer at Birnirk and
Utqiavik [Ford 1959] as the unbroken sequence is there and that was what we wanted...

Well, so long,  
J.A. Ford

Jan. 9, 1933

Dear James:

I suppose Dr. Wetmore has written you of his decision concerning Alaska for this year. He called me in a few days ago and said he thought it best to let the far north work go over for a year. The main reason of course was money, but he found an additional excuse in the fact that you should finish up your college work. In that, of course, I had to concur... [Y]ou had better take advantage of the opportunity to get your college work completed...

[H. B. Collins]

Jan. 31, 1933

Dear James:

... With regard to Moreau's request, I saw Stirling about an appropriation for you and him to use for work in Mississippi... [L]uckily there is a small sum, $336.57, left over. And in some way there is on the books the amount of $29.99 left over from the Miss. Dept. of A & H last year. Stirling would like for you and Moreau to have those left over sums (which is more than anyone will get) to continue the work that you have so well begun on village site location....

Very sincerely,  
[H. B. Collins]

Feb. 28, 1933

Dear James:

... [W]hat are the plans that Dr. Rowland has for you and Moreau? That is, is the Dept. going to make application for the residual sum in the states cooperative fund about which I wrote some time back[?]... But now that there appears to be some doubt about this, let me outline another project that Dr. Swanton is fathering. Miss [Caroline] Dormon is very anxious that a Smithsonian representative come down there (eastern [Louisiana]) to [do some work]. I can't go... and the Smithsonian has no funds to advance toward the project. However, there is a possibility that a grant, possibly around $500, might be received from the National Research Council.... Application for it must be made by the 15th of March, so... should you care to undertake the Louisiana work, arrangements would have to be made quickly... [Y]ou cannot do the Miss. work and care to take on the Louisiana job, write me as soon as possible concerning the application....

Sincerely,

[H. B. Collins]

[Ford to Collins undated (c. 3/33) omitted]

Clinton, Miss.  
March 1, 1933

Dear H. B.:

Recently I have been going to school [at Mississippi College] and making attempts to work out a satisfactory method of classifying our village site collections. Have just discarded three weeks hard work to make a new start....

So long,  
James

Clinton, Mississippi  
March 3, 1933

Dear H. B.:

Thanks a lot for your efforts in my behalf... I would like a chance to look around in Louisiana. Some of those potsherd collections [Winslow] Walker got at Larto Lake and elsewhere look very interesting... So, if a shadow of a salary is possible from any source, [I will] apply for that $500....

So long,  
James

March 7, 1933

Dear James:

... Yesterday I called Dr. Poffenberger [of the National Research Council] and asked him to mail you an application blank.... For the purpose of the application your project should be stated as "Archeological
investigation of Indian mounds and village sites in La Salle, Catahoula, Rapides, Grant and Franklin Parishes, Louisiana. *Now here is the Louisiana situation.... [T]here are [various sites] all through that part of the state and you would simply look around and pick out the most likely prospects. At present this would seem to be some of those around Lakes Catahoula and Larto. I believe you will be able to get some definite idea as to the place of the Hopewell pottery down there by looking into these sites.... [I]t will be through [Miss Dormon] that you will get to the Larto and Catahoula [sites]...these are controlled by Dr. and Mrs. Evans; however Miss Dormon thinks they will be willing to have them worked scientifically. The point of all this is that you will have to use a certain amount of tact and diplomacy, that you will have to cooperate with these people. It is in this very respect that [Winslow] Walker got us in such a mess, by antagonizing the local people....

Better send in the [NRC grant application form] soon as possible.

[H. B. Collins]

Clinton, Mississippi
March 23, 1933

Dear H. B.:

I am presenting the results of my last two months work for your approval. Like Archimedes I think I can say Eureka! Enclosed is a chart showing the chronological positions of twelve villages. I have gone over the collections of thirty others that tell the same thing – they all fit somewhere in this scale. Man. Is it nice and simple. They all dovetail like a jig saw puzzle. The pottery types I have treated here are only the most outstanding. There are sixty in all....

[J.A. Ford]

Clinton, Miss.
[undated; c. March-April 1933]

Dear H. B.:

I [have gotten] to the point where I [can] be certain of the chronology and [am] in a hurry to let you know. Really the thing is beautiful! And simple as all beautiful things are.... [T]here is no shell tempering in the lower ("Hopewell") sites while it is abundant in the Haynes Bluff horizon. Don't you see where Deasonville fits in? It's so clear. It comes about the middle with cord marked pottery; overhanging; painted pottery; no Tunica or Natchez and [only] one sherd of true Hopewell [i.e., Marksville]....

I wish you could come down and look this thing over. It's too good to keep to myself.... Forgive my somewhat disjointed letters. Have had my nose in dusty pottery for the last ten weeks and am taking this opportunity to blow off a little....

Well, so long,

James

April 11, 1933

Dear James:

Congratulations on bringing some order into Mississippi potsherds! The scheme looks good and is undoubtedly along the line that must be followed in trying to get at the meaning of SE archaeology.... I am sending a reprint of [Frank] Setzler's Hopewell paper; this is not the main article but a preliminary one published in the Washington Acad. of Sciences Journal [Setzler 1933]. From the last sentence you can see the way he still feels in a sort of subjective fashion. The significance of the whole thing, as I have labored to demonstrate to him, is that [Ohio] Hopewell-like decoration belongs in the South....

We are all hopeful that the grant from the NRC will materialize.... I am hopeful that you will get the award....

Sincerely,

[H. B. Collins]

Clinton, Miss.
April 21, 1933

Dear H. B.:

...That paper on pottery type horizons is coming along fine. The more sites I examine the better satisfied I become....

Now that I can see this Miss. chronology it is easy to recognize a lot of work that should be done here in Miss. and am going to try to steer moreau in that direction. I am somewhat consoled by the fact that Walker's collections show similar conditions in La....

Did I write making the suggestion that you compare the roulette decorated ware of Florida and Hopewell? Also look at the distribution of platform pipes and their associations. Shell tempering begins about the
middle of the Miss. chronology.

What do you think of calling the latest stage, which presents the same essentials in Miss., Alabama, Florida, La., when found with European material, Muskogean? Shall I go so far as to apply Hopewell to the first stage?

The sequence you found in east Miss. of cord marked and check stamped under Choctaw is nice. Please let me have representative photos of that material and of the sequence you found at Pecan Island [Louisiana] in 1926.

Yours for the increase and confusion of knowledge.

J.A. Ford

May 5, 1933

Dear James:

... I do not think much of calling any southern pottery type Muskogean until you know what that type is. Natchez and Tunica are very divergent Muskogean (something like Rooseveltian fifth cousins) and of the three basic Muskogean groups, the Creeks, Chickasaw and Choctaw, the pottery of the first two is unknown and that of the Choctaw of such a specialized late variety that it plays no important part. It will be much safer to use a tribal label where the relationship is definite than a linguistic one which may include a dozen different tribes. For the prehistoric types, give a geographical name. I would not use the word Hopewell: that has been accepted as meaning a certain combination of design elements (with regard to pottery) and we would be no more warranted in calling our sherds with smooth and widely incised lines and bands of rouletting Hopewell than in calling all scrolls Natchez... Give it a name of some sort and then with its position and affiliations known the real Hopewell will fit into the scheme easily enough.

I will look up my prints and send you samples of the Louisiana coast pottery I got in 1926. I did not get check stamped ware in E. Miss. in 1925; it was curvilinear, in addition to cord marked and basketry imprinted.

[H. B. Collins]
Am writing Miss Dormon today to tell her I will be over [to Louisiana] some time next week. I think I will first go down there and look around until the water goes down and work at Lake View Plantation can be started. . . .

David and Moreau are down on the [Miss.] coast. They report that there is not much there but they are making the necessary big noise in the papers and are trying to improve their daily average in the number of senators and representatives interviewed. . . .

So long,

James

May 26, 1933

Dear James:

It does seem strange that the National Research Council had not notified you that you had been awarded the grant. However, I suppose you have received word by this time. . . . The Louisiana project. . . . will depend altogether on your judgment of what appears to be the necessary procedure. But remember, Miss Dormon engineered the thing in the beginning and you are expected to co-operate with her to the fullest extent. . . . She knows local people and has permission to work at certain places; naturally she wants to see the work being done since she is so interested in it, so be agreeable there. You know, that's how Walker got in bad with her: [he] went down and began work without communicating with her in any way after she had introduced him around the year before and gone over the sites to be worked.

If Moreau gets up into the northern part of [Mississippi] I hope he will look up Mr. Lewis E. Long, Dept. of Agricultural Economics at A & M who has been corresponding with me and sending me samples of material from village sites around Starkville. As I mentioned before, I think, the pottery is mostly plain, cord-marked, basketry-marked, with a few incised decorations. There is one Hopewell-like sherd. I have written him that I hoped that you and Moreau would be able to meet him this summer. . . .

Sincerely,

[H. B. Collins]

[Collins to Ford 6/13/33 omitted]

Sicily Island, La.

June 18, 1933

Dear H. B.:

Pardon the tardiness of this answer to your last letter but I have been running my head off over here in La. Am getting along O.K. with Miss D. and the Evanses. I think, though, that my youth has disappointed them a little. The material we are getting resembles [that of] Miss. . . .

Have located - thru [sic] Evans - several historic sites in Avoyelles [Parish] near Alexandria but am afraid they date about 1780 (from coins found by treasure seekers). . . .

So long,

James
June 24, 1933

Dear James:

PLEASE don't give any newspaper interviews. The Evanses have just sent Setzler a clipping from the [New Orleans] Times Picayune which related that three men, W.M. Crawford, W.W. Knight, and Dr. E.A. Breithaupt, investigating Indian mounds, etc. for the Smithsonian Institute in cooperation with yourself and Lovell, had made the usual discoveries of 7 foot skeletons whose massed remains indicated a great massacre. The unfortunate consequences of such publicity are two-fold. First, as I mentioned before, the Smithsonian has shut down tight on publicity; we are under instructions not to say anything about any kind of investigations and particularly archeology. The reason is not hard to see; our appropriation has been cut drastically and no field work is to be allowed, so that if reports of field work appear in the press it gives some of our Congressional critics a chance to say things. The other aspect is that publicity has the baneful effect of encouraging pot hunting. The Evanses are fearful that this may result down there, since the exact region was mentioned, around Lake Tarto. I know the ways of the press sufficiently to know that in all probability you do not personally have anything to do with this account, but I hope that you will take unusual precautions that news hunters be discouraged. Stress the potsherd collecting and don't mention the name of the Smithsonian. I know how hard it is to keep off some of these newspaper people but I think you can manage it.

Sincerely,

[H. B. Collins]

Clinton, Miss.
July 2, 1933

Dear Henry:

This is just a note to tell you of the success of our work in a...midden... near Sicily Island [i.e., Peck Village (Ford 1935a)]. We have found stratigraphy! It was very nice -- just as we would, in Alaska, have expected stratigraphy in a midden yielding O.B.S. and Early Puuk. I expected it from this midden yielding Early Coles Creek, painted pottery, and Hopewell. The deposit is about two feet deep. Taking it down in 3 or 4 inch levels we found in the first foot painted, E. CC, and Hopewell. The lower foot of refuse contained only Hopewell. This has happened in two cuts and we have started a third that promises the same results. [See O'Brien and

Lyman (1998:73-82) for discussion of the significance of this work - ed.]

I am home over the fourth. Next week we expect to finish at Sicily Island and will go back to Alexandria. Don't be afraid that we will infringe on Setzler's territory. We are mainly interested in some historic sites in the vicinity....

So long,

James

July 14, 1933

Dear James:

I was delighted to have your news of discovering stratigraphy. Did it remind you somewhat of finding the OBS hillside village? And what a satisfying feeling it is when such a find bears out one’s hypotheses! This hit of stratigraphy incorporated in your paper will add greatly to its conviction. I hope you will be able to find other site[s] where a check may be obtained....

[H. B. Collins]

[Ford to Collins 7/14/33 and 8/8/33 omitted]

Marksville, La.
Sept. 2, 1933

Dear H. B.:

Am at Marksville grubbing in the dirt with Setzler. How nice it is to sit under the shade of a little bush (especially transplanted for the purpose) and watch twenty Frenchmen work. You should come down and try it. Plenty of labor and lots to be done....

Nothing remarkable has yet developed in our excavations. Are just getting well started -- Frank dissecting Mound 4 while I am putting a 20' trench thru Mound 6....

So long,

James

[Collins to Ford 9/7/33, 11/16/33 and Ford to Collins 11/30/33 omitted]
Macon, Ga.
December 28, 1933

Dear Henry:

After about ten days of frantic organization, we finally got started excavating here at Macon....

So far we have only found a few sample sherds of pottery, but they seem to compare well with Etohah and in a general way with my early Tunica horizon....

I like [project director] Arthur Kelly fine. He seems to have substantial ideas on the subject of archaeology and not to be too much perverted by his Harvard training....

Most sincerely,
James

Macon, Georgia
January 12, 1934

Dear Henry:

After five weeks of hard work, we have an organization that performs like clock work.... We have everything that a man could wish for: good engineers, draftsmen, stenographers, police, men, time-keepers, laboratory men, catalogue men, foremen, artists and photographers, besides all...[the] equipment we can possibly use. Results, I think, will prove worthy of this exceptional organization....

Kelly has charge of excavation of the two mounds near the city limits of Macon and entertains all of the visitors Visitors - My God - there are thousands of them, and last Sunday they had to send a police riot squad to take care of them. I, however, am much more fortunate. My dig is at the end of a very rough three-mile road, and it's only the most frantic of sightseers who bother us. With fifty men for 10 hours a day, I am going through one quarter of a large pyramidal mound, and at the same time, excavating some nearby house sites.... The [pottery] coming from this house...compares very closely with Etohah....

So long,
James Ford

Macon, Georgia
Jan. 22, 1934

Dear Henry:

The main idea of writing you this letter is to boast over the beautiful house that we have recently uncovered in Ocmulgee fields.... It was a house that had been destroyed by fire.... This is the nicest house that I have seen in the Southeast. It must have had a rather thick sod roof to have charred these posts and beams so completely. We found no European material in the house....

Sincerely,
James

Macon, Georgia
Jan. 31, 1934

Dear Henry:

Fred Kniffen [of Louisiana State University] is suggesting that we start some archaeology in Louisiana immediately. I would like to do this as it would be in line with previous work we have done down there and would help develop and clarify the lower Mississippi Valley scramble.

The work we are doing here is very interesting but...my main interest, at the present, is in the possibility of [defining] the lower Mississippi Valley potsherd chronology. Kelly does not seem any too enthusiastic about my going back down there; in fact, he thinks the lower Mississippi Valley...is rather out of the general picture which, of course, I tell him is merely an indication of his ignorance on the subject....

Sincerely,
James

Feb. 3, 1934

Dear James:

...I am delighted that you have found such good house sites.... I have the same feeling that you do about the comparative importance of Lower Miss Valley and Georgia pottery: from what little I know of the latter I do not see that it has the possibilities of the Louisiana and Mississippi material. There seems to be a discouraging similarity about all the stuff in that particular section....

Sincerely,
[H. B. Collins]
August 12, 1934

Clanton, Miss.

Dear Harry,

I am quite a sight to see after leaving Macon. I took my last photograph there in the fall of 1932. I am sorry that I did not take more photographs, but it was impossible to do so due to the time of day and the light conditions. I was able to take a few shots before I left Macon and before I arrived in Atlanta.

I spent several days planning an Indian village for the Southeastern Fair. I must admit that I was quite surprised to see the amount of time and effort that went into building the village.

The results of the work done there were quite good. I believe that the village architecture will be of interest to those who visit the fair. The people of the village were very friendly and cooperative, and they made the work much easier.

I must say that I enjoyed my stay in Atlanta. The city is quite large and has many interesting places to visit. I hope to return soon.

Looking forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

James Ford

May 31, 1934

Brunswick, Georgia

Dear James,

I have passed off another semester college work with flying colors! I have a nice collection of surface items that I collected on my recent field trip to the southeastern United States. I have a few interesting stories to share with you about my experiences.

I hope to meet you soon and discuss these findings in person.

Best wishes,

[Signature]
of terse text[?]. It seems to me that the relationships could have been brought out much more clearly if you had offered some explanations. I am still wondering if you could not work up a short but adequate summary of your potsherd chronology so that the essential features could be known to those interested in the SE. It would be well to get such a paper out now that this field is coming into its own.... [See O'Brien and Lyman (1998:70-73) for discussion of the resulting revision and expansion made to the paper as published (Ford 1955b) - ed.]

There are one or two points concerning your pottery atlas I would like to mention. On p.7 you say that the cord marked ware from Deasonville is "rough, friable, fibre temp." Those which I examined and reported on had no fibre tempering, but small particles of fire-burned clay which I interpreted and listed as "potsherd tempering".... Next, on p.8 you speak of Coles Creek being grit tempered. What does that word mean? The only definition of grit that I know of is sand or gravel, but you didn’t mean that did you? At any [rate] the Deasonville "overhanging" [i.e., Coles Creek Incised] type had ground up potsherd for tempering just as the cord marked ware. Now for a more basic query. I notice that Coles Creek is overflowing its banks and spreading to the Florida Keys. Now don’t you think it would be wiser to restrict the name to the type of pottery found at those key sites in Mississippi?[?]. In that way you will be proceeding step by step and the word will have a clear and definite meaning. If you include it in another type of pottery typical of the Gulf Coast you will have the somewhat paradoxical situation where some Gulf Coast site is purer Coles Creek than Coles Creek itself because it contains all the elements while the type site in Mississippi only has the "overhanging lines" etc. Good methodology would have the type site stand out in clear relief. Step by step you would carry it back (or up, rather) showing its relationship with other pottery types of Mississippi and central Louisiana. Your discovery that it was contemporaneous with the dominant Gulf Coast pottery would then assume its proper significance; to my mind it is a backward step, one opposed to clarification, to suddenly diffuse Coles Creek until the word becomes a catch-all for a whole pottery complex stretching from the Texas border to the tip of Florida....

Well, anyway you keep at the problem and sooner or later it will begin to clear up. I don’t think it an exaggeration [for you] to compare the work you have in mind with that done by Nelson and Kidder; the only thing is that it is much more difficult, for all they had to do was dig trenches in refuse heaps and note the different types of pottery. The work loomed up as highly significant mainly because a generation or more of rather slow witted specimen collectors had up to that time occupied the field alone....

Maybe you can get the SE cleared up by 1936 and resume the Barrow work....

Sincerely,

[H. B. Collins]  
Geol. Dept., L.S.U.  
March 9, 1935

Dear Henry:

Was glad to receive your advice on that mimeographed outline. When your letter came I had almost completed...revising it for publication in the Conservation Review. The corrections you suggested were included and when it appears [Ford 1935b] in a few weeks will send you a copy....

Another more technical article on the stratified sequence of Marksville-Coles Creek in the [Peck] village midden near Sicily Island, La. is almost ready and will go out as a Conservation Dept. Bulletin [Ford 1935a]....

What do you think of my use of the term “Marksville” for the Hopewell pottery complex here in the south? Am explaining that it is used merely because it is yet uncertain that the other Hopewell elements found at Marksville accompany that type of pottery at all sites where it is found in village site collections....

Fifty-five village site collections from Miss. and La. (totaling about 5,000 decorated sherds) have already been classified and this summer should bring the total up to one hundred sites. That should be enough for a final paper on the area considered [Ford 1936]....

That, for a while, will wind up most of my investments in Lower Mississippi Valley archeology. Will also have a B.A. This brings us to your fascinating last paragraph. Are you serious? There is nothing I would like better than to stick my nose into a stinking cut in Piegul midden and smell the sweet essence of rotten baleen mixed with old rancid blubber. If the possibility of another season’s work really exists I’m still in favor of the plan of flying into Kotzebue and taking a bunch of pups up the coast to get in a long summer of work....

So long,

James
Dear H. B.:  

The political situation locally is up in the air since the death of the kingfish. No one knows what is to happen. Now that [governor] Huey Long is dead most of the people - even those who disliked and feared him, are sorry.... LSU is bound to suffer. So far it has been [Long's] political pet.... However the present situation will very likely continue for at least a year yet so personally there is nothing to fear....

I notice that [Therkel] Mathiassen...in the July issue of Geographical Review...has finally...begun...to get western Eskimo archaeology straight altho [sic] he doesn't yet seem to realize that Thule grew out of OBS.

Best of luck on the St. Lawrence paper.

Regards to Carolyn,

James

[Ford to Collins 12/6/35 omitted]

Jan. 13, 1936

Dear James:

Are you in a mood to think about Alaska?... When...Morgan was here a month or so ago he told me that your excavations [at Barrow] were still being protected, so we may hope that when you do get back things will be as you left them.... [An additional] project...has materialized,...an expedition to Bering Strait. The immediate question is, do you wish to go along as an assistant? I plan to make [Cape Prince of Wales] the central headquarters...there is plenty of Eskimo archaeology to be done...there; in fact, we greatly need to know more about cultural sequences, even those which are relatively late, at Wales and the Bering Strait region generally.... If you care to go your remuneration would be $150 per month and expenses....

Sincerely,

[H. B. Collins]

January 16, 1936

Dear Henry:

Will I go? What an absurd question. Naturally I shall be delighted.... Am glad that the excavations at Barrow are still open. Think that they well deserve [further] attention. It's more the drop in the price of ivory and curios than respect for their dear departed that is keeping the natives out of my diggings....

Digging at Wales should be worth while as that is in a sense our "missing link" in the older cultures....

The remuneration you offer is more than liberal. This little expedition will set me up financially for a master's degree. You know that it was more bait than you need offer - thanks a lot.

Will be glad to see you when you come south. Hurrah for the Frozen Arctic....

So long,

James

[Collins to Ford 2/27/36 omitted]

February 29, 1936

Dear H. B.:

The article [Ford 1936] is coming along slowly. Have drawn twenty plates and have only three more to go. Have most of the writing done....

School is O.K. Made three B's (in Sociology); and two C's. Went around and thanked the Soci. prof for those undeserved favors. It almost floored the old boy....

Am looking forward to seeing you and to the beginning of another "Northern Exposure."

Sincerely,

James

[Ford to Collins 3/8/36 omitted]
March 17, 1936

Dear James:

... Had a rather pleasant surprise [yesterday]...to find that a paper I had submitted on the origin of Eskimo culture in response to a prize competition sponsored by the Royal Academy of Arts and Sciences of Denmark had been awarded the prize, 1000 gold crowns (but only $200 U.S.) and the gold medal of the Academy. The paper I submitted was a rather lengthy condensation of the report I am still working on and which is about completed [Collins 1937]. I am awfully pleased that the Danes, who have always taken such an active interest in the Eskimo question, should have thus recognized an outsider....

I have an idea that with the publications you already have out and with the one now in process, you will be in more or less constant demand whenever it comes to a question of Southeastern cultural sequences....

Sincerely,
[H. B. Collins]

March 23, 1936

Dear Henry:

Hurrah for the Danish Academy of Arts and Sciences! I feel as proud of your honor as if I had won it myself. No longer can Mathiassen ignore the comments that you are forced to make about his ideas on the chronological position of Thule. [Old Bering Sea] stock is due for a sudden rise....

Sincerely,
James

[Collins to Ford 4/7/36, 5/19/36, 5/20/36, 8/9/36, Ford to Collins 9/30/36 and Collins to Ford 3/8/37 omitted]

July 26, 1937

Dear H. B.:

Have just returned [to Louisiana] from Georgia where I have been amusing myself reconstructing the roof details of the ceremonial chamber at Ocmulgee National Monument. Had a very good time and am a little proud of the results....

About Friday am planning to leave for Chaco Canyon where the month of August will be devoted to slavery in the chain gang of the U. of New Mexico [field school]. Following that a couple of weeks of recuperation then the mental drudgery of a year at the University of Michigan. Looks as tho [sic] I might get a master's in a year....

James Ford

Aug. 24, 1937

Dear James:

... I had no idea you were going to the Southwest. It's a fun place to be. I wonder if you will fall under its spell as almost everyone does. But you must not desert the Southeast. Your report [Ford 1936] really opens up that field and you should continue. I'm also glad that you are going to Michigan....

The Gambell report [Collins 1937] is finally out.... Will send you a copy....

Sincerely,
Henry

Baton Rouge, Louisiana
September 5, 1937

Dear Henry:

... Ethel and I have just returned from a month...in Chaco Canyon, where we lived in the shadow of Pueblo Bonito and dug in one of the smaller Pueblo II-III ruins across the canyon.... Spent our spare time prowling through the ruins, and I particularly admired the deep rooms from which you once slung the dirt [in the early 1920s (see Blitz 1988:2)]. Am delighted that the Gambell report is finally out. Please send a copy...to Ocmulgee National Monument, Macon, Georgia. Am going over there in a couple of days to finish reconstructing the council chamber - they are having a little trouble as the mud walls refuse to dry out....

You need not worry about the Southwest attracting [my] interest from the Southeast. The climate is delightful, but the dust is awful. No mosquitoes but millions of flies. I have no objection to the flora except the cactus, and the fauna meets both Ethel's and my approval except for a few examples of the Harvard attitude.

With best regards,
J.A. Ford
Macon, Georgia
September 24, 1937

Dear Henry:

I have read your report on the St. Lawrence dig [Collins 1937] with a lot of pleasure. You have done a fine piece of work and have made the most of the beautiful setup we found there....

[Preston] Holder, Kelly, [Gordon] Willey and I had a "brain wave" and are all enthused on the matter of naming southeastern pottery. We hope to take in [Matthew] Stirling’s work in Florida and [William S.] Webb’s in Tennessee, as well as my own, and in the first publication encircle the Southeast with a ring of precedence which must be followed by anyone else working in the area. At the same time we are setting up a board of censors and types that don’t pass won’t be published. If you’re interested ask Stirling to see the letter I have sent him explaining the scheme more closely.

I will leave here tomorrow to return to Louisiana and will be in Ann Arbor by the first of October.

Sincerely,
James

Oct. 10, 1937

Dear H. B.:

At present I find myself a student of a week’s standing at the dear old U. of Michigan.... Six times per week I have to look [Leslie] White in the face and listen to him make monkeys out of indiscreet students with lots of relish.... Actually I like the place fine. My class schedule is not hard. Have only four formal courses this semester and there will be even fewer next. There is no doubt about securing a master’s degree in one year. Am having a fine time arguing with [James B.] Griffin. Between us we have very nicely outlined Eastern archology. Griffin has given me office space in his lab so I feel that I am part of the department and am not at loose ends as I was afraid would be the case....

So long,
James

Oct. 21, 1937

Dear James:

Am glad to know that you are safely settled down and hot on the trail of academic knowledge. It is particularly fortunate that there is such a keen interest in Miss. Valley archeology there [at the University of Michigan] and that you have the ceramic laboratory to work in. It should be a mutually advantageous arrangement, with you there to give them the southern viewpoint and you to receive theirs....

All is quiet in these parts... I am having a great time burrowing down in routine, discoursing learnedly with a constant stream of visitors on the subjects of old violins, chinaware, Spanish lace and other treasures they want identified. Hrdlicka is in a frenzy of preparation for the November exhibition in the foyer. It is to be a Hrdlicka show, with all of his loot laid out.... [He]... found a fine, rich midden on Agattu and got some beautiful material; but since his previous work has given him an intuitive insight, it was unnecessary to keep depth records of any kind.... But why am I off on this subject? Sufficient to say that the eminent doctor is becoming more and more of a problem. Just recently he has entered the field of Eastern archology and has told the owner of a fine village site with ossuary that the Museum would send someone out immediately to help them by sluicing the place. I must admit that it is somewhat comforting to hear the groans emanating from other parts of the Museum.

I know you are missing Ethel. It was fine of her to let you go so far away just to get some “larning.” Please give my best regards to Guthe, Titiev, Griffin and the rest.

Sincerely,
[H. B. Collins]

[Ford to Collins undated (c.1937-38 and c.1/38) omitted]

Ann Arbor, Mich.
January 25, 1938

Dear Henry:

... School is as usual. Nothing seems to happen. Apparently I am getting along all right in class work. White didn’t quite like my plans for a sociological study of Point Barrow as a thesis.... The present thesis subject has
to do with the classification of pottery – how it has been done and why. Nice subject for bull. Hope it will get me by. Am picking up a lot of information on Northeastern archeology from Griffin.

Oh yes. I forgot to tell that we are getting a new Geology building at LSU... in addition to the old one. Archeological research is to have a complete wing on the second floor. It is being built according to the wishes of Fred [Kniffen] and myself. Will be more space than we can use right now but think we can hang on to it...

So long,
James

[Collins to Ford 4/15/38 omitted]

Ann Arbor, Mich. April 18, 1938

Dear Henry:

... Since writing you last the WPA has made known... that they would like to spend $100,000 in [Louisiana] archeology. They want to transport the men and furnish the white collar laborers as well as some experienced archeological supervisors of our choosing – the project to be set up for a year. We are prepared to sacrifice ourselves on the altar of patriotism and take a hand in this.

Ethel is up here for two weeks now and is typing my thesis - a wordy blurb on the subject of “Some Theories and Practices of Ceramic Classification.” Seems that I shall slide through a master’s with my accustomed ease and aplomb. So I hope. I shall be back in LA after about June 10th....

Am glad that finally you are getting over to Europe.... Hope that you have a good time and can succeed in obtaining permission to work on the Siberian coast. Trim off your mustache and you will look less like an international spy...

So long,
James

Dear Henry:

... At present, I am busy with the statewide WPA project. It is proving to be a lot of fun and keeps me running around. Among other things, we are excavating the northern half of the Marksville site – the [mound] group up on the Greenhouse place [Ford 1951]....

So long,
J.A. Ford

Ann Arbor, Mich. April 18, 1938

Dear Henry:

As usual, Ethel and I spent Christmas vacation in Jackson.... Saw Moreau and heard a little about your recent work at Ackia - if you have found Ackia. [Collins found no conclusive evidence to support the notion that this historic period Chickasaw site in Lee County, Mississippi (MLc14/22Le524) was Ackia, the fortified village attacked by the French in 1736 (Atkinson 1985:54; Blitz 1988:9) - ed.] Moreau tells me that you took the material which you recovered with you back to Washington....

Our work is going along very nicely although it is a little wet in the field right now. We have a very smooth working organization and the laboratory is keeping very close behind the field... We are getting some very interesting data on the evolution of Coles Creek material out of Marksville. Evidently it is a case of evolution and not of replacement. In the Greenhouse site we are finding large pits 7’ long, 3’ wide and 5’ deep, which look very much like crematory basins of a peculiar sort....

So long,
J.A. Ford

Ann Arbor, Mich. April 18, 1938

Dear Henry:

At the moment we are interested in a horizon which precedes Marksville in the lower valley...[to] which we have given the curious name “Tchefuncte” [Ford and Quimby 1945]. This horizon shows many features similar to the fibre-tempered horizon to the eastward, and has such
things as vessels with 4 legs; crude pottery; bone projectile points; tubular pipes; grooved plummets; boat-stones; the people are uniformly long-haired; and, only lacking to complete the picture is bone atlatl hooks. I seem to remember that while investigating "Louisiana kitchen maidens" you found an atlatl hook. I should like to know something about the context in which this was discovered....

Sincerely,

J.A. Ford

Oct. 6, 1939

Dear James:

I was glad to get your letter of the 29th.... At last you are putting a punch in your nomenclature: "Tchefuncte" is incomparably better than Pete Smith's place, even though your non-Cajun public may not agree. However, my liking for Tchefuncte is not because it defies either spelling or pronunciation, but because it is the best fishing ground in St. Tammany Parish [Louisiana]. My boyhood days were spent largely fishing in Bogue Falaya, but when we really wanted to catch fish, we went to Tchefuncte [River].

The "atlatl" you refer to came from the Coppell field, a burial ground, on Pecan Island [Louisiana].... I will certainly not guarantee it. I remember that Dr. Kiddler said he would call it such. It may be, but it may only be a netting tool....

Sincerely,

[H. B. Collins]

10/10/39

Dear Henry:

... You will be interested to know that [the Coppell site] appears to resemble the other sites of the Tchefuncte complex in every way. It provides us with the one additional trait which we have needed badly, the bone atlatl head. There is no doubt that this is an atlatl head - compare with Webb's report on Wheeler Basin. Tchefuncte ties up very closely with the pre-pottery and fibre-tempered pottery horizons of Wheeler Basin, Pickwick Basin, Stallings Island, and a number of other [similar] sites which Tono Waring has found near Savannah....

We are in the process of moving the lab from New Orleans to the new building at LSU. Are things in a mess? It is going to take some time to break in a new gang here and am afraid we will not have as good a choice as in N.O. George Quimby arrived last week to take Willey's place running the lab. As you know he is just back from Hudson's Bay....

Best wishes,

James

PS. Our Crooks Site report (Marksville period) is now in press [Ford and Willey 1940]. Will send you a copy in a few weeks....

[Collins to Ford 10/23/39, 11/1/39 and Ford to Collins 10/26/39 omitted]

Parkin, Arkansas
March 31, 1940

Dear Henry:

... At present I am on this Central Mississippi Valley survey.... The present work is going nicely. It [sic] is composed of Griffin, Philip Phillips... and myself. We use two trucks and are getting a lot of good work done. Have gotten about 80 sites so far — maps, collections etc. Have covered territory from Arkansas R. to this far north.... Are finding Deasonville-like complex beneath M.M. [i.e., Middle Mississippi] but have so far gotten very little Marksville.... Are slightly puzzled about that....

James Ford

June 8, 1940

Dear James:

I don't know whether you plan to use the measurements of Pecan Island crania I sent you, but if so I would like to ask that you do not. Hrdlicka's catalog of crania has just appeared and these skulls are included. My measurements check quite closely with his but are not identical and since the catalog is official there is nothing to be gained in having two sets of measurements in print for one series. I may write a note... calling attention to the cultural significance of the series as revealed by your recent work [on Tchefuncte] and also removing from the list as published by Hrdlicka a few skulls not of the Copell group [Collins 1941]. The list as
Dear Henry:

It is with great sadness that I learn of the recent hitch in the use of the Tchefuncte skeletal data. As a matter of fact we were planning to use this data and it is already incorporated in a paper by Charley Snow of the Birmingham lab. Snow repaired and measured the six crania we were able to provide and compared them with your series. Was very much pleased to note resemblance and suggestions of relationships with other early physical types. Am including a copy of Snow’s paper. You can see that taking your series out will knock the blocks out from under Charley [see Jacobi 2002:57].

...The two months raid into Arkansas were [sic] very successful and a pleasant time was had by all. Located, mapped, and got ample collections from 150 sites. Finally gave up using small bags and put sherds in gunny sacks. Think we have some interesting data on [Middle Mississippi]. It is too early to say yet. Preliminary classification is almost complete but the final study is going to take some time [Phillips et al. 1951]...

Don’t think that I have told you that I was lucky enough to get a Rosenwald grant which will be used to attend Columbia next winter. In any event will see you as we come through Washington.

Am planning to spend the summer here. So many things to do I don’t seem to get much done on any one thing. What do you think would be the chance of getting the army to finance a couple of experts in the digging of rifle pits at prominent points along the unprotected Alaska coast? Think that we could qualify? Alaska with a broken radio is my idea of the sort of place to be right now. 

So long,

James Ford

Keith A. Baca

Nov. 6, 1940

Dear James:

Enclosed is a copy of a letter I wrote Quimby when I returned his and your manuscript on the Tchefuncte culture [Ford and Quimby 1945]. As a whole, the paper is splendid and will be a further credit to your efforts. Together with the Crooks report (which is equally fine) it will show once and for all that far more satisfactory results are to be obtained and in a far shorter time by the chronological approach than by that followed up the river [i.e., the Midwestern Taxonomic Method (O’Brien and Lyman 2001:50-62)].

Am feeling a bit groggy after celebrating the [presidential] election last night. We gathered together a fair number of the none too large company of individuals around here who had not succumbed to the beguilements of the young Lochinvar from Wall Street and had a swell time.

I hope that the pursuit of knowledge is progressing nicely and that you and Ethel are enjoying New York.

Sincerely,

[H.B. Collins]

New York, N.Y.

Nov. 7, 1940

Heil Roosevelt!

Dear Henry:

...Am getting along all right in [doctoral] class work [at Columbia]. Doing a bit of reading on the side. Afraid I am in the way of becoming a thorn in the pants of the members of the department by indoctrinating students with [K]arl Pearson’s philosophy of Science — as applied to anthropology. There is nothing which serves as a better antidote to Boas[ian] philosophy and it is a hell of a lot of fun.

Ethel and I are limiting ourselves to only one night club per week.

Best regards,

James

[Ford to Collins 11/9/40 omitted]
Dear Henry:

Am enclosing a paper by myself and Gordon Willey which we propose to publish in the near future in one of the professional journals [Ford and Willey 1941]. It is a sort of opening gun in the campaign of outlining the prehistory of the East which I have been planning for a long time [see O’Brien and Lyman (1998:140-146)]. Would appreciate it very much if both you and Dr. Swanton would read it over and give us some criticisms. Better now than after such a thing as this is in print....

James Ford

March 31, 1941

Dear James:

I have read over your and Willey’s paper carefully and with much interest and am enclosing a few comments and criticisms. I agree, on principle, that papers of this kind [are] highly desirable and serve their purpose even though details may have to be altered with later developments; and I feel that you and Willey have done a splendid job of bringing together into a coherent and orderly picture the rapidly accumulating, but rather fugitive mass of data on Southeastern archeology. As you will observe, my criticism is directed toward two points: the rather arbitrary nature of the selected list of reference sites and the failure to define in a helpful manner some of the new periods or complexes. Each of the comments I have made in these connections has been the result of an inability to get a perfectly clear picture of the conditions you are describing. If the paper is actually a “key” to Southeastern archeology rather than a mere statement of your opinion you will surely wish to cite references that the reader can find in print. Admitting that many of these unpublished digs may have provided you with chronological insight necessary to the present statement, you should also cite the older published accounts if only to show the types of pottery, etc. to which you are referring.... My other complaint is much the same, that you should actually define new periods or complexes in terms of those already in print. This, of course, is standard procedure in scientific literature; merely to introduce new terms with no clear statement as to where they stand in relation to those displaced or changed, makes for confusion rather than enlightenment. It seems to me that these few additions could be made in a couple of pages.

Sincerely,

[H. B. Collins]

New York, N.Y.
April 3, 1941

Dear Henry:

Many thanks for the very careful and detailed critique of our paper. The suggestions are most helpful and we can do something about correcting the errors and filling in a few of the faulty references. Must plead guilt to your main thesis – that the paper and its references are not adequate to give a convincing picture of the processes we attempt to describe. Too much of the pertinent data is not in print – and we have had to reinterpret some of that which is in print. However the evidence does exist and will be out in time – I hope. As much as anything we are trying to jar Mississippi Valley archeologists into looking at their problems from a “three dimensional” point of view instead of worrying about whether their material is “Woodland” or “Mississippian”...

This damn thing is a sort of advance summary. There is material for a rather comprehensive and rather well-connected outline for eastern archeology which I hope to write in the next five years or so....

Thanks again and best regards,

James

April 11, 1941

Dear James:

Here is the paper, nicked here and there by [Waldo] Wedel, Setzler and myself, but still intact.... To a considerable extent it appears that we are all yelling about the same thing; a plea for just a few more references in order that we may check on statements made and a little more information where you state that “certain influences” have been felt or “certain traits” are had in common or “resemblances” between such and such stages have been noted....

It has been clear since the appearance of your first publications on Louisiana & Mississippi archeology that the northern workers would eventually have to adopt the common sense methods therein followed.
Mississippi Valley archaeology cannot exist half slave and half free, the upper half hog-tied but happy in their typological fetters, the lower half progressing step by step in determining the time relations of cultural manifestations in one area after another. The light from the south will inevitably penetrate the northern darkness. I anticipate that when you and Willey do this Prometheus job there will be quite a bit of dismayed blinking of Northern eyes accustomed only to the twilight; and to continue the parallel I fear there may be a concerted pecking and scratching at your collective vitals. Therefore, to protect your hides and tummies this initial offering should be as free from bugs as possible. As far as I am able to see the general scheme is unassailable. My only criticism is that under the plea of limitation of space and rush of time you fail to make clear some points that are essential to my following the argument; and if I may say so there are rather too many indications of haste in general, some examples of which I pointed out before. It is because I believe so thoroughly in the soundness and timeliness of the paper as a whole that I fear that these mechanical flaws will be seized upon and perhaps elaborated upon by those who can find nothing more substantial to criticize. I do think you should change the title: a "key" is a word with a definite meaning in natural history, and this is not quite that; "[a] chronology" or "basis for a chronology" would seem to me to be more accurate. [Ford's coauthor Willey also disliked the original title, and changed the word "key" to "interpretation" (Willey 1969:67) - ed.] And now one final objection. Coming from you and Willey and under the aegis of Duncan [Strong] I would expect to find a little more outright recognition of the [direct historic][a] approach" [O'Brien and Lyman 2001] and "from the known to the unknown." It is obvious of course that the entire chronology has been arrived at by following these principles, but nothing of it appears in the form as presented. People not familiar with the region will want to know why you assign a historic date for certain sites and periods. Why not simply state that these late stages show such and such a degree of white contact. And as I mentioned before it would be very helpful to have a statement as to when the first evidences of white contact appear in the several areas. So, at last, I will close my homily....

Sincerely,

[H. B. Collins]
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Excavations at the Colclough Farmstead: Exploring Rural Life in Nineteenth and Twentieth-Century Northeastern Mississippi

Lynn Marie Pietak and Jeffrey L. Holland

Abstract

Historic documents and archaeological evidence produced by investigations of the Colclough Farmstead in Oktibbeha County, Mississippi, shed new light on economic strategies, farmstead layout, and consumer practices on moderately sized farms in the antebellum and postbellum Upland South.

Introduction

During the last two decades, the focus of many historical archaeologists working in the South has turned from the visually and socially compelling plantation site to the widespread yet less understood farmstead. For generations, and until World War II, the majority of Southerners lived and worked on small or medium-sized farms. The establishment of such farms, from the East Coast westward, was both the impetus and foundation for the settlement of many regions, including sections of northeastern Mississippi. The lifestyle and daily routines of the early settlers and pioneer farmers of this region are generally understudied. Excavation and subsequent analysis of the Colclough Farmstead, 22O973, by TRC Garrow Associates, Inc. under contract with the Mississippi Department of Transportation, was a Phase III data recovery project required by the National Historic Preservation Act (Pietak, Holland, and Bentley 1999). The research has contributed significant information regarding the area’s culture history, and provides a database for comparative research with other regions of the South.

The site, now on land belonging to the Noxubee National Wildlife Refuge, was a farmstead and, later, tenant housing, occupied between ca. 1840-1940 (Figure 1). It was identified in 1997 by Mississippi Department of Transportation (MDOT) archaeologists during a Phase I archaeological survey undertaken prior to the proposed widening of Mississippi Highway 25 (Carr and Bruce 1997; Carr et al. 1998). Subsequent limited testing by
Farmstead Archaeology

The literature on the archaeology and history of farmsteads has grown markedly in the last two decades, spurred on by the recognition that in many parts of the United States settlement and subsequent regional development were the consequence of the creation and operation of family farms, the articulation of these socioeconomic units with the surrounding community, and their ties with the broader regional settlement system. The Colclough Farmstead, established at the time that northeastern Mississippi was part of the American frontier in the 1830s and 1840s, offers an opportunity to elucidate new details about farm layout and daily life in this early period. For a period of roughly 60 years, from the 1850s through the first decade of the twentieth century, the farmstead was owned by a single family. Its history reflects changes in farming strategies needed to accommodate changes in market conditions. The owners were neither large plantation owners with many slaves nor small tenant farmers that lacked slaves and land, but rather represent a class of farmers in between these extremes. Their lifestyle and business operations as revealed by the archaeological and historical research highlight a successful approach to using the available resources. This success allowed the Colclough family to expand into other businesses, relying less on farming for their livelihood in the Postbellum period, a time when the South was undergoing radical economic changes.

Studies of historic farmsteads by archaeologists typically concentrate on specific themes or research issues, often derived from prehistoric archaeology. These issues include settlement systems (Grass and Brooks 1997; McNerney 1989; Price and Price 1981; Smith 1997), subsistence (Price 1985; Price and Price 1981), access to trade networks (Stewart-Abernathy 1985, 1986; Stine 1989), and farmstead layout (Cabak and Inkrot 1997; Joseph and Reed 1997; Young 1994).

One important research concern is the configuration of the settlement system in relatively remote areas with dispersed populations. How were farmsteads arranged on the regional landscape? This issue is tied to considerations of the relationships and interactions of farmsteads with local communities, towns, and market economies. Were early farmsteads truly independent components of the westward-moving frontier? What was the source of the goods used on the farmstead, and how did these farmers interact with local, territorial, or state authorities and with their social counterparts living in town? Were the farmsteads self-sufficient or were cash crops and subsistence crops raised simultaneously?
The economic activities pursued on the farmstead are directly related to the subsistence and dietary practices reflected in the archaeological record. Price (1985) examined faunal remains from the Widow Harris site in Missouri and demonstrated that their differential distribution was based on regional patterns of meat processing and consumption. For the American South, Reitz (1995) has argued that despite the widespread impression that pork was the major constituent of the regional diet, zooarchaeological data suggests that more beef was actually consumed. She suggests pork may have symbolic connotations for Southerners that has perpetuated this impression.

An examination of farmstead plans and how these layouts are reflected in the archaeological record is an important research concern. Archaeologists have adopted models first proposed by historians or cultural geographers (Kniffin 1965; Newton 1974) to interpret their archaeological data and to understand how ethnicity (Young 1994), social class (Joseph and Reed 1997; Stine 1990), and gender-specific activities (McMurry 1988) affected farmstead plans. Archaeologists have also made use of oral histories and ethnoarchaeological information to supplement and expand the data collected from the archaeological record (Carlson and Holland 1990) and provide them with new and testable hypotheses concerning spatial patterning.

### History of the Colclough Farmstead

Euro-American settlement of what is now Oktibbeha County began about 1820, although at that time the land was still part of the Choctaw territory. In 1816, the Choctaw ceded all of their lands east of the Tombigbee River, about 25 miles east of the site. A few traders and trappers were permitted to use the area, and some of these intermarried with Choctaw women. Although the Choctaw had a peaceful relationship with the white settlers and had begun to adopt Western ways, most Mississippians could not abide their presence. In 1830, at the Treaty of Dancing Rabbit Creek, the Choctaw were forced to accept relocation to the Oklahoma territory to avoid being subject to white rule in Mississippi. Although the treaty stipulated that any Choctaw who had made improvements to the land and wished to remain in Mississippi could file a claim for the land, the Indian Agent refused to process most of them, and only about 60 of the mixed-bloods and more prominent full-bloods received their lands (Carroll 1931:12–16).

A few settlers began to move into what is now Oktibbeha County immediately after the treaty was signed, despite the facts that no government had been organized and it would be 1832 before the land was surveyed. In 1832, the new territory was surveyed. The survey maps show no roads in the area of the site (Downing and Edrington 1832). By the end of 1833, perhaps 100 families had settled in Oktibbeha County, which was officially created in December of 1833 (Carroll 1931:24–27).

The first record of the sale of the tract on which the site is located is from James Simpson to Alexander Keeton in 1841 (Oktibbeha County Chancery Court [OCCC] 1841: Deed Book [DB] 6:644). The deed conveys 39.15 acres and all appurtenances, suggesting improvements may have been made to the property. No deed could be found indicating when Keeton sold the property to William Anderson Moss, who owned a total of 354 acres including the area of the site (Oktibbeha County Tax Records [OCTR] 1853; U.S. Bureau of the Census 1850). Moss owned two slaves in 1844 and 1847. Among his holdings in 1847 were at least 500 cattle (OCTR 1844, 1847). He likely brought most of the cattle with him to Mississippi, a common practice of settlers of the Upland South moving farther west to take advantage of cheap grazing land and open spaces (McWhorter 1975; Otto 1985). The original homeplace, a log cabin, may have been constructed by Moss.

The population, agriculture, and slave schedules of the 1850 census (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1850) provide a great deal of information about Anderson Moss’s family and farm. Moss and his wife, Jane, both born in Virginia, had lived since 1828 in Alabama where their first six children were born. They moved to Mississippi about 1843, where their seventh child was born. Also listed in the household was Hilliard G. Colclough, a 21-year-old farmer from North Carolina. Colclough’s connection with the family is not clear. He apparently became involved with them in Alabama, where Colclough’s mother, brothers, and sisters had moved from North Carolina (Cole Papers n.d.). He is not listed in the 1847 tax returns (OCTR 1847), so he apparently arrived in Mississippi independently of the Mosses between 1847 and 1850. Moss gave his occupation as farmer in the 1850 census, as did Colclough. Moss’s estate was valued at $900 and included seven slaves. Hilliard Colclough owned four slaves as well.

The agricultural schedule of the census reports that Moss owned 360 acres, of which 100 acres were improved. This was more than the county average of 77.5 acres of improved land. His farming implements and machinery were valued at $400, a considerable sum. The average value among twenty of his neighbors was $94, and only one of those had a more
valuable collection. Moss's livestock had grown to include 400 cattle, 25 milk cows, 80 hogs, seven horses, and eight oxen. His cattle herd was easily the largest in the county; no other farmer owned more than 100. He produced 11 bales of ginned cotton in 1849, along with 500 bushels of corn, 150 bushels of sweet potatoes, 100 bushels of Irish potatoes, 500 pounds of butter, and small amounts of peas, beans, rye, and oats.

Moss's cotton production was more than most farmers in the county, but not particularly high compared to some large plantations with greater slave populations. Corn production was relatively low, but was inadequate for self-sufficiency, based on Bond's (1994:220–221) method of calculating livestock and human consumption. However, using Bond's figures for meat production, Moss's herd would have generated about 37,400 pounds of meat, enough to feed his entire household, including his own and Colclough's slaves, and provide a surplus sufficient to feed almost 200 people for a year. The sale of this meat would have provided plenty of cash or bartering power to make up any grain deficiency. Although not a member of the planter elite, Moss had significant resources and appears to have developed an efficient operation in a short period of time on land that had not been extensively improved. He may have begun to add to his slave labor force as he added new components to his diversified cattle and cotton operation.

Moss's production strategy reflects an "accumulation first" approach to agriculture (Bond 1994:218–219), by emphasizing market goods, with foodstuffs providing a back-up system rather than the foundation for a stable farm. Such an approach focused on accumulation of capital that could be invested in expanding the operation or purchasing luxury items, rather than on self-sufficiency, a strategy that had the potential to result in enduring poverty. Bond (1994:222) found that farmers with less than 100 acres were most efficient at producing meat for home consumption rather than grain, and Anderson Moss clearly pursued livestock production over grains. His relatively small labor pool also favored livestock production over a dependence on row crops.

Hilliard Colclough married Anderson Moss's daughter, Mary, about 1852, based on the age of their first child recorded by the 1860 Census. Tax returns for personal property in 1853 show that Hilliard Colclough owned 15 slaves, while Anderson Moss held only three, indicating that Moss may have sold or given some of his slaves to his son-in-law and daughter soon after their marriage. In 1854, Hilliard Colclough purchased the 360 acres previously owned by Moss. He purchased 80 acres from his father-in-law for $250, and the remaining 280 acres he purchased from William Hance, who must have held the tract only briefly, since it was recorded under Anderson Moss's name in 1853 (OCCC 1854: DB 11:248, 378; OCTR 1853).

Hilliard and Mary had one daughter, Louisiana, born in 1852. According to family tradition, Hilliard died in Texas prior to 1856, possibly of malaria. His brother, James, married his widow in 1856, took up residence on the farmstead, and paid off the note on the property (Cole Papers n.d.; OCCC 1900: Will Book 1). James was four years older than his brother and apparently came to Okibobo County after his brother's death, perhaps to settle his estate and look after Hilliard's young family. Anderson Moss probably died about this time as well, since he does not appear on the 1856 tax assessment (OCTR 1856).

The first details about James Colclough's family and farm come from the 1860 census (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1860), which recorded him as operating the same farm previously owned by his brother and father-in-law. Colclough, 36 years old in 1860, and Mary, 28, had a daughter Mary, 3, in addition to Louisiana who was then 8. Listing his occupation as farmer, he owned $3,200 worth of real estate and his personal estate was valued at $20,000, the majority of which was represented by slaves. He owned 18 slaves in 1856, but that number had decreased to 15 by 1860. Based on records of age, gender, and race (black versus mulatto), James Colclough does not appear to have acquired any of his brother's or Anderson Moss's slaves. Instead, he appears to have sought out slaves of prime working age as field hands.

James Colclough's slaveholdings reflect a shift from raising livestock to cotton production that may have begun with Anderson and continued by Hilliard Colclough. Hilliard or James also brought more acreage into production, going from 100 improved acres in 1850 to 160 acres in 1860, with an additional 160 acres of unimproved land reported. The farm was valued at $3,200, considerably more than the $900 appraisal in 1850. This likely reflects the construction of a new house to replace the original Moss home, since the increase in improved land would not account for such a rise.

Colclough produced 28 bales of ginned cotton in 1859, somewhat less than the average produced by cotton growers in the county. In addition, he produced 1,000 bushels of corn, 150 bushels of wheat, 250 bushels of
sweet potatoes, 25 bushels of Irish potatoes, 350 pounds of butter, and 50 pounds of wool. His livestock included four horses, four mules, eight milk cows, 30 other cattle, 25 sheep, and 100 swine, all valued at $2,200. His livestock was typical for a relatively prosperous cotton farmer with a slave force to feed and clothe. The Colcloughs apparently disposed of Moss’s large cattle herd, probably after his death, because herding was no longer profitable or practical in Okitibeha County. By 1860, fewer than five percent of the county’s farmers owned more than thirty head. Overall, the census numbers indicate a modest, well-diversified farm with cotton as the principal cash crop. Colclough was typical of Mississippi farmers in the antebellum period (Bond 1994). His cotton production was sufficient to bring in extra cash, while his grain and meat production were enough to feed his family and slaves. Colclough had more than doubled cotton production and increased the slave labor force from four to nine working-age individuals.

Colclough served in two separate Mississippi units during the Civil War and in the Atlanta Campaign during the summer of 1864 (Compiled Service Records n.d.). On December 1, 1864, he was admitted to Ocmulgee Hospital in Macon, Georgia. He was furloughed and discharged on January 19, 1865, for “haemorrhoids” (Compiled Service Records n.d.) and eventually returned to Okitibeha County. Letters sent home indicate that his farm continued to operate, with some difficulties, during the war. In his study of Meadow Woods plantation, located about four miles east of the site, Cockrell (1989:81) found that plantation operations continued relatively undisturbed by the events of the war. Smaller farms likely suffered greater privations, however, as a result of lost labor from male family members serving in the war and the lack of a complex support system (gardens, orchards, skilled craftsmen, political connections) that would help them survive problems of supply and credit. Most plantation owners reported few problems in keeping slaves at work, since the plantation provided relative security and sense of community during a turbulent time. Colclough appears to have fallen between these extremes. Letters home suggest he worried about the well being of his farm and his slaves taking advantage of the lack of supervision.

The 1872 property tax assessment includes an inventory of Colclough’s livestock, which reflects a decline from his pre-war stock holdings (OCTR 1872). His cattle, including milk cows, numbered only 18 and swine reduced to 40. He also owned one less horse than before the war. Nevertheless, Colclough was far from destitute. He still owned two carriages and had invested $1,500 in manufacturing with the purchase or construction of a sawmill on Chinchahoma Creek (Mr. Wellborn Cole, personal communication 5 August, 1998). About 1876, Colclough constructed a house in the town of Starkville and took up residence there soon after. Colclough (Figure 2) appears as a resident of Starkville in the 1880 census (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1880). His occupation is given as farmer and his large household included his wife, five children aged 22 to 9 years, and an 80-year-old African-American laborer named George Colclough, apparently a former slave of the family. He farmed 13 acres in Starkville where he raised milk cows, swine, poultry, and corn. His sawmill was valued at $4,500. He employed as many as eight workers during 11 months of the year and produced 600,000 board feet of lumber. The mill had a steam-powered, 25-horsepower engine that operated one circular saw.

Colclough’s stepdaughter, Louisiana, married Amos Ward in 1871. Although the record is unclear on this point, they apparently moved into the Colclough homestead and Ward operated the sawmill after James Colclough moved to Starkville (Murray 1991; U.S. Bureau of the Census 1880). Ward reported his occupation as a miller in 1880. The 1888 tax assessment for Okitibeha County provides the only certain information on the actual occupants of the Colclough farm during the late nineteenth century, which included Ned Valentine, Jim Gillespie, and Sam Lowry, all tenants (OCTR 1888, 1890). Amos Ward is not listed as Colclough’s tenant in 1888, although he may have continued to live on the property. By 1890, Lowry no longer appeared on the district tax roles. The frequent movements of tenant farmers makes it difficult to establish occupational histories of tenant dwellings (Page 1982).

Regardless of how long Ward and his family lived in the old Colclough homeplace, it does not appear that he was engaged in extensive farm operations. By 1900, Ward and his wife had moved back to Starkville and were living just down the road from James Colclough on Washington Street. Ward was listed as a miller and cotton gin owner. The 75-year-old Colclough gave his occupation in 1900 as landlord. Two of his daughters and their husbands, and one unmarried daughter lived with him in the house. His wife, Mary, had died in 1891 (Oktibeha County Genealogical Society 1993). James Colclough died July 16, 1900, soon after the census was taken.

In his will, James Colclough left to his stepdaughter, Louisiana Ward, the 360 acres he had acquired from his brother. His remaining land was divided among his other children (OCCC 1900:Will Book 1). An appraisal and
Ward conveyed his one-third interest in the property, as Louisiana’s heir-at-law, to his two children, Mary and James. Two years later, James Ward and Mary Ward sold the property to W.W. Magruder, Jr., for $4,320 (OCCC 1915: DB 136:163, 1917: DB 139:439). Magruder owned extensive property in the county but did not reside on the land. The Colclough homeplace likely continued to be occupied by tenants.

Magruder mortgaged the property several times (OCCC 1917: DB 142:358, 1926: DB 167:215, 1930: DB 186:75) and sold timber rights to D. S. Pate Lumber Company in 1924 and 1931 (OCCC 1924: DB 160:42, 1931: DB 172:432). Tenants probably continued to rent cleared land on the farm during this period. In 1927, one of these, Joseph Rice, purchased from Magruder 6.32 acres “lying north of the Starkville and Louisville rock road as it is now being surveyed and constructed” (OCCC 1927:169:592). This parcel apparently included 220k973. In 1928, another probable tenant, Desro Collins, purchased from Magruder much of the surrounding property except the 6.32 acres owned by Rice. In 1929, T.A. Patterson and his wife purchased Rice’s 6.32-acre parcel. The Pattisons purchased the Desro Collins property in 1936, essentially reassembling the old Colclough farm. That same year they sold the entire 320 acres to the United States of America as part of the Land Resettlement Act (OCCC 1936: DB 197:71, 72; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service [USFWS] 1940).

The federal government began acquiring land in the area in 1936 through the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), for development as the Noxubee National Wildlife Refuge (NNWR). Though NNWR reports indicate that most of the structures on the refuge property were destroyed in early 1940, an aerial photograph taken in 1944, on file at the NNWR, shows that a house and outbuildings were still extant at the Colclough Farmstead in that year (Figure 3). A farm road led to the house, which was set back slightly from the road. Two outbuildings are visible on either side of the road behind the house. Beyond the house was a large barn. Cleared fields and pasture were located around the house, primarily to the north and west. The area in front of the house appears to be scrub or lawn.

The Colclough farm apparently was one of the few that continued to operate after 1940, under cooperative farming agreements made with the USFWS. Farmers harvested a portion of their crop and provided a portion to be used to attract wildlife to the refuge. In 1942, there were 15 such agreements, increasing to 34 in 1943. Unfortunately, USFWS records do not give the locations of these farms or the names of those with whom the agreements were made (USFWS 1940-1943).
By 1952, the house appears to have been destroyed (USDA 1952). Track scars and damage to features suggest that a bulldozer was used for the demolition. The NNWR reports from 1940, when approximately 100 buildings were removed from the government land, indicate that salvageable materials were removed first and piled on the roads for removal. The remaining debris was burned. A similar method may have been used at the site.

Field Investigations

A metal detector survey, shovel testing, unit excavation, machine-assisted scraping, and feature excavation were undertaken at the Colclough Farmstead. The metal detector survey yielded a total of 110 “hits;” shovel tests were subsequently excavated at 65 of these locations (Figure 4). Artifacts were recovered from 57 shovel tests. Soil and artifact data from the shovel tests were used to isolate areas of possible intact cultural deposits and/or cultural features. As a result, blocks of units were placed in Areas 1, 2, 4, and 5. Units 19, 22, and 25 were placed along the eastern and western edges of the project area to examine soils and artifact concentrations. A total of 26 test units were excavated. Stripping exposed approximately 9500 square feet. Features were identified in test units and during mechanical stripping.

Features

Summary information for each is presented in Table 1. Excavated features were assigned to four occupation periods—antebellum, postbellum, twentieth century, and modern. All types of artifacts were used as chronological markers. The chronological categories are broad, and it is generally impossible to separate short-term occupations of the individual families known to have lived on the property. The antebellum category, for example, includes features that clearly date to the mid-nineteenth century and are interpreted to be associated with the initial occupation by the Moss family. The postbellum chronological assignment includes the Colclough family occupation beginning with the construction of the frame farmhouse, as well as later tenant occupations of the farm. However, as noted above, the house was most likely built by Hillyard or James Colclough between 1852 and 1860. It proved impossible to associate individual features with James Colclough's operation of the farm, with Louisiana and
Table 1. Chronological Assessment and Function of Features at the Colclough Farmstead.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antebellum Fea. # Function</th>
<th>Postbellum Fea. # Function</th>
<th>20th Century Fea. # Function</th>
<th>Modern Fea. # Function</th>
<th>Unexcavated Fea. # Probable Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 smokehouse</td>
<td>7-11 posts</td>
<td>23 bottle dump</td>
<td>6 pit</td>
<td>21 post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 fence post</td>
<td>14 post</td>
<td>84 well</td>
<td>18 tire rut</td>
<td>33 post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 fence post</td>
<td>22 brick scatter</td>
<td>86 pier or post</td>
<td>37 tire rut</td>
<td>34 post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 fence post</td>
<td>24, 25 posts</td>
<td>49, 50 road</td>
<td>40 unknown</td>
<td>35 post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 dripline</td>
<td>27 post</td>
<td></td>
<td>47 disturbed pier</td>
<td>64 post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 refuse pit</td>
<td>29-32 posts</td>
<td></td>
<td>53 shovel test</td>
<td>68 post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 fence post</td>
<td>36 pier</td>
<td></td>
<td>61 tire rut</td>
<td>90-100 posts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 fence post</td>
<td>39 pier</td>
<td></td>
<td>104 tire rut</td>
<td>120 post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 fence post</td>
<td>46 pier</td>
<td></td>
<td>113, 114 tire rats</td>
<td>123 post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 fence post</td>
<td>49, 50 road</td>
<td></td>
<td>115 tire rut</td>
<td>124 post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 dripline</td>
<td>62 refuse pit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>121 post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49, 50 road</td>
<td>65 post</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>122 post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 borrow/refuse pit</td>
<td>67 post</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 borrow pit for chimney</td>
<td>74 refuse pit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 post in Feature 1</td>
<td>75 pier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 root cellar</td>
<td>79 pit/depression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-60 fence posts</td>
<td>80 post</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 post in Feature 55</td>
<td>82, 83 post</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Amos Ward's or with some of the tenants who later occupied the farmstead. Three features clearly date to the twentieth century (a bottle dump, well, and pier), and several (modern) are associated with the final demolition of the farmstead.

**Antebellum Features**

Four antebellum features (1, 51, 52, and 55) produced artifact assemblages of sufficient size to warrant comparison (Table 2). A close consideration of the quantities and categories of artifacts recovered from each of these features confirms the interpretation of function, and suggests their treatment when the log cabin was dismantled and the larger farmhouse was built.

Feature 52 is interpreted as a borrow pit or chimney base for the antebellum log cabin. The Mean Ceramic Date (MCD) is 1841, but is based on only seven sherds and could be too early. However, the chimney and fireplace would have effectively sealed the feature, accounting for the relatively small amount of material recovered. In addition, the range of artifact types recovered from Feature 52 is the smallest in the group of four features. Only ceramics, glass, architectural materials, brick and mortar, one piece of unidentified metal, and bone were found.

In contrast, Feature 51, a borrow pit for chimney construction that was subsequently used for trash disposal, yielded the highest number of artifacts and greatest range of artifact types. The MCD for the feature falls in the 1850s. All categories of artifacts recovered from Feature 52 were found, plus a variety of household, farmstead, and miscellaneous items such as candle holder fragments, a piece of a steatite pipe, and barrel fragments. The accumulation suggests it was used for domestic refuse disposal during the entire time the cabin was occupied. Feature 51 also contained the largest concentration of brick among the four features, indicating that when the cabin was dismantled, architectural debris may have been deposited in the pit before it was closed.

Features 1 and 55 are interpreted as the remains of a smokehouse and a root cellar, respectively. The MCD for Feature 1 is 1847, while that for Feature 55 places its use in the early 1850s. These features represent farmstead features that were used routinely for domestic and subsistence activities. Feature 55 yielded twice as many artifacts as Feature 1, although the quantity of brick and mortar and bone recovered from Feature 1 was significantly higher. The large amount of bone reflects Feature 1's function as a smokehouse where meat preservation and storage were the primary activities. Other foodstuffs were probably stored as well, indicated by the
The quantity of ceramic sherds recovered from Feature 1 is roughly half that Feature 55 yielded. Almost no (n = 4) bottle glass was found in Feature 1 suggesting liquids were stored elsewhere, perhaps in the root cellar. Since only a relatively small quantity of bottle glass was recovered from any of the nineteenth century features, bottles were likely reused rather than discarded. The large quantity of brick in Feature 1 probably derived from dismantling the original domicile. The brick rubble could also indicate that the smokehouse had a brick foundation. Cabak and Inkrot (1997:121) noted that some of the smokehouses in their South Carolina study area had brick foundations.

The root cellar (Feature 55; Figure 5), where foodstuffs other than meat were stored, produced more bottle glass fragments and ceramic sherds than other features. These may represent storage containers that broke while in use. The root cellar appears to have been inside the antebellum log cabin. Regular cleaning and sweeping appears to have contributed to the accumulation of artifacts, which, in addition to broken glass and ceramics, included beads and buttons, lead shot, two English gunflints, lamp glass, and unidentified metal. It is also possible that the root cellar was used as a trash pit when the cabin was dismantled.

Results of the Zooarchaeological Analysis

Relatively little faunal material was recovered from the Colelough site. The fragmented condition and element distribution indicates that poor preservation is the most likely explanation for the paucity of faunal remains. Poor preservation of bone is likely due to the tendency of the site's soils to retain water; a trait noted during two days of heavy rain while in the field. Twenty-one features yielded bone and contained only 360 specimens, out of which 262 were identifiable beyond general mammal/animal bone categories. Features 1, 51, and 102, all dating to the antebellum period, contained 52, 166, and 43 bones, respectively, warranting some individual discussion. The remaining 18 features yielded insufficient material to interpret and are included only in the combined feature totals for the site.

Looking first at the entire assemblage, medium-bodied mammals dominate (73%), followed by large mammals (20%). Small-bodied mammals comprise the next largest group (10%) while birds make up 0% of the feature assemblage. Fish make up only 1% of the collection, and turtle comprises less than 1% of the identifiable material (Table 3). Element distribution of large and medium mammal taxa reveals that cranial elements of
both deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*) and pig (*Sus scrofa*) are better represented than other parts of the skeleton (Table 4). Teeth, which are often preserved when other parts of the skeleton are not, are a large percentage of the remains. Medium mammal remains are dominated by long bone shaft fragments (82%), indicating either the affects of bone processing or more likely post-deposition destruction of the "spongy" ends of these elements (Marean and Bartino 1994). Cow (*Bos taurus*) shows a more even distribution of elements. Rib shaft fragments are the most common large mammal element category.

Relatively large samples from three features (1, 51, 102) provide some indications of subsistence strategies during the antebellum period (Table 5). Medium mammal remains, largely long bone shaft fragments and probably representing either deer or pig, dominate all three. Pig is the most commonly identified single species and is the only taxon present in all three features. Deer, followed by cow, are the next most commonly identified species. The only other mammal species identified is squirrel in Feature 51. Birds were identified only in Feature 51, and include turkey-sized, chicken-sized, and songbird-sizes specimens; the larger-sized birds could represent domestic poultry. Two fish pharyngeal plates could be freshwater drum or alternatively a species of sunfish.

**Table 3. Combined Faunal Materials for All Features.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium Mammal</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Mammal</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow 104</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Mammal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray Squirrel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passeriforme</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turtle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>less than 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egg Shell</td>
<td></td>
<td>present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>262</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Butchery evidence includes cut marks on two deer elements from Feature 1 and saw marks on an antler fragment and a cow tibia from Feature 51. Carnivore gnawing was recorded for one deer element from Feature 1. Burning was noted on five specimens from Feature 102.

It is notable that all of the features yielding well-pre-
served faunal remains date to the antebellum occupation of the farmstead. This is partially due to how the features were closed and preserved (i.e., purposely and over a relatively short period of time). Feature 1, for example, was preserved beneath the later farmhouse. Area 3, where Features 51 and 102 were found, did not exhibit intensive use after the cabin was dismantled based on the fact that no later features were identified and few artifacts were recovered during stripping. However, the preservation of faunal material may also be related to changes in refuse disposal patterns over time. There is some evidence that during the antebellum period, trash was placed in designated areas (i.e., Features 51 and 102), while during the postbellum occupation, it was burned or discarded in a less concentrated manner.

Table 4. Faunal Element distribution by Taxa for Combined Features.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Pig</th>
<th>Cow</th>
<th>Deer</th>
<th>Medium Mammal</th>
<th>Large Mammal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count %</td>
<td>Count %</td>
<td>Count %</td>
<td>Count %</td>
<td>Count %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranial</td>
<td>11 21</td>
<td>1 10</td>
<td>7 35</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teeth</td>
<td>20 38</td>
<td>1 10</td>
<td>9 45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertebra</td>
<td>1  2</td>
<td>11 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innominate</td>
<td>2  4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scapula</td>
<td>4  8</td>
<td>1 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humerus</td>
<td>1  2</td>
<td>2 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulna</td>
<td></td>
<td>1  5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femur</td>
<td>1  10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibia</td>
<td>1  10</td>
<td>1  5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metapodial</td>
<td>1  10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot</td>
<td>6  12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patella</td>
<td>1  10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rib</td>
<td></td>
<td>9  8</td>
<td>38 88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Bone Shaft Fragment</td>
<td>7 13</td>
<td>2 20</td>
<td>97 82</td>
<td>5 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>52 10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of the Ethnobotanical Analysis

The plant remains recovered from the Colclough Farmstead consisted of noncarbonized and carbonized plant materials. It is difficult to determine the age (or context) of noncarbonized plant remains from historic sites, and therefore these are usually considered modern intrusions. Some plant materials from features are considered "in context," and could have been growing in the vicinity at the time of occupation. Taxa identified include tulip poplar, peach, chinaberry, hackberry, pokeweed, wild bean, lespedeza, maypops, and grapes. The wood recovered was identified as pine, both carbonized and noncarbonized.

All but three of the taxa are native to the United States. Chinaberry, peach, and lespedeza are Asian and were introduced to the United States in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In sum, the analysis documented several tree species planted by the Colclough's or other occupants around the farmstead. Some were preferred for their ornamental qualities, and others for their fruit, as in the cases of the peach and chinaberry trees. The maypop, pokeweed, and wild bean remains recovered are weedy plants that grow in disturbed areas and may be the result of the area being disturbed over time by various land used activities.

Table 5. Faunal Remains Recovered from Antebellum Features.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature 1</th>
<th>Feature 51</th>
<th>Feature 102</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Count (%) MNI</td>
<td>Count (%) MNI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Bone</td>
<td>15 (29)</td>
<td>27 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD. Mammal</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>11 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD. Large Mammal</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD. Medium Mammal</td>
<td>16 (31)</td>
<td>75 (45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD Small Mammal</td>
<td>6 (4)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>13 (25)</td>
<td>7 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>3 (6)</td>
<td>31 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow</td>
<td>2 (4)</td>
<td>7 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Gray Squirrel</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Bird</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Bird</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Bird</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD. Fish</td>
<td>2 (4)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clam Shell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egg Shell</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Antler
Artifacts

Ceramic Assemblage

The ceramic assemblage recovered from the Coldclough Farmstead is highly fragmented and little cross-mending was possible. As a result, minimum ceramic vessel counts could not be calculated. Therefore, Miller's (1980, 1991) ceramic cost indices could not be used to evaluate consumer choices and social and economic status. The ceramics recovered from the site are most valuable in dating unit and feature contexts.

In Table 6, ware types recovered from antebellum and postbellum features are compared. The ware types and decorative styles within ware types are considerably more varied during the antebellum period than the postbellum occupation, at least partially a consequence of the significantly different sample sizes. The antebellum assemblage includes a small amount of pearlware, a significant amount of late refined earthenware (LRE) including cream-colored ware, various ironstones, some stoneware, and very little redware. The postbellum assemblage contains a small amount of LRE, various ironstones, semi-vitreous, stoneware, and one sherd of redware. It is notable that utilitarian stonewares or redwares are not well represented in either assemblage; a total of 24 sherds were recovered from antebellum features and 11 sherds from postbellum features. It may be that other types of containers, perhaps metal buckets or baskets were typically used to store certain foods.

Glass Container Assemblage

As in the case of the ceramic assemblage, the fragmented nature of the glass assemblage prohibited the reconstruction of vessels. A few relatively large pieces of glass were recovered from several of the large antebellum features. In contrast, the majority of glass recovered from postbellum features was small. One twenty-first-century bottle dump (Feature 23) produced several whole bottles, but this feature appears to date to the tenant occupancy of the farmstead, possibly just prior to acquisition by the government. Overall, it appears that trash was deposited in specific locations during the antebellum period; the absence of cross-mended artifacts suggests that not all of these locations were identified. In contrast, the postbellum features identified were smaller, contained more fragmented artifacts, and had often been disturbed by modern activities. The latter, in particular, may account for the fragmented condition of the glass and ceramic assemblages.

Table 6. Ceramics Recovered from Antebellum and Postbellum Features.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramic type</th>
<th>Antebellum</th>
<th>Postbellum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEARLWARE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain Pearlware</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annullar Pearlware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monochorme Pearlware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand Painted Pearlware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATE REFINED EARTHENWARE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Print LRE</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Transfer Print LRE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annullar LRE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain Cream-Colored Ware</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand-painted LRE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monochorme LRE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polychrome LRE</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponged LRE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molded LRE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embossed Patterns Edgeware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unscalloped, Impressed Rim LRE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaloped Rim, Impressed Straight-Line LRE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaloped Rim, Impressed Curved Line LRE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unscalloped, Impressed Rim Edgeware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unscalloped, Unmolded Edgeware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molded and Scaloped LRE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embossed Patterns Edgeware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UID* Edge Type LRE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UID* Decorated LRE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UID* LRE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRONSTONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain White Ironstone</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand Painted Ironstone</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponged Ironstone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molded White Ironstone</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molded Blue Ironstone</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Window Glass

Window glass can be used to date cultural deposits and features. The method, first described by Roenkne (1978:166) and refined by Orser et al. (1987:543), was based on the fact that thicker window glass was produced through time and that large collections of window glass can be dated by determining average glass thicknesses by proveniences and comparing those thicknesses to predetermined date ranges. Garwood (1998:48) reworked these data based on his excavations at a site in Memphis, the M&O Railroad Structure (Table 7). Regional variability in age estimates suggests that local sequences need to be developed. To that end, window glass data was assembled for features excavated at the Collough Farmstead (Table 8), and although counts are low, provisional determinations are compared with feature dates estimated with other artifact classes.

Feature 51, with an MCD of 1850, yielded 14 pieces of window glass with an average thickness of 2.1 mm. A mid-nineteenth century date is projected by Roenkne's (1978) original estimates, while transformed Orser et al. (1987) and Garwood (1998) dates are too late. This would suggest that Roenkne's scheme is applicable to historic sites in Mississippi.

Other features, however, suggest that the Roenkne scheme predicts dates that are too early while the transformed estimates are too late, although as noted sample size is a problem. Feature 1, the antebellum smokehouse, yielded only two pieces of window glass with a mean of 1.85 mm. Compared with the feature MCD of 1847, Roenkne (1978) data estimates a date range from late 1830s to early 1840s. The largest sample of window glass came from Feature 40, which averaged 2.2 mm (n=49), projecting an early 1850s date using the Roenkne correlation. This is somewhat earlier than the mid-to-late-nineteenth-century ironstones and soft paste porcelains with which the glass was associated. Glass from Feature 48, a drierline associated with the smokehouse dating to the early 1850s, yielded an age estimate in the 1840s, again probably somewhat early based on small sample size.

### Nail Assemblage

Young (1994), using ethnoarchaeological observations and archaeological data from the Gibbs site in Knox County, Tennessee, proposed ratios that can be used as guidelines to interpret the spatial patterning of nail concentrations on historic sites. She (1994:58) hypothesized that a building intentionally torn down by hand would exhibit a nail frequency ratio of 3:3:1 (three unaltered and three pulled nails to every one clinched

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramic type</th>
<th>Antebellum</th>
<th>Postbellum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scallop and Molded Ironstone</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revival Transfer Print Ironstone</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Print Molded Ironstone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEMI-VITREOUS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain Semi-Vitreous</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molded and Scallop Semi-Vitreous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLAIN HARD PASTE PORCELAIN</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STONEWARE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain Salt-Glazed Stoneware</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Glazed ex., Unglazed int.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray Glazed ex., Unglazed int.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Glazed int., Albany ext.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray Salt Glazed Stoneware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray Salt Glazed ext., Clear int.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Slip ex., Bristol int.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany Slip</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Slip</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alkaline on Stoneware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnt Stoneware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REDWARE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Glazed Redware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UID Redware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MISCELLANEOUS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnt White-Bodied Ceramic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inderm. Decorated White-Bodied Ceramic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inderm. Plain White-Bodied Ceramic</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Plain White-Bodied Ceramic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate Ceramic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>269</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*unidentified
nail). In contrast, refuse disposal sites, which would have contained nails, lumber, and other architectural debris, would exhibit a ratio of 1.3:1. Data was assembled from the Colcough Farmstead by both area and feature. The results for each area are discussed in their respective sections below.

Data for the features are given in Table 9.

Table 7. Glass Thickness Dating and Transformed Dates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glass Thickness (mm)</th>
<th>Orser et al. Transformed Dates*</th>
<th>M&amp;O Transformed Dates**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1804.22</td>
<td>1857.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0-1.2</td>
<td>1804.22-1812.51</td>
<td>1857.97-1866.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3-1.4</td>
<td>1816.66-1820.80</td>
<td>1870.41-1874.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5-1.6</td>
<td>1824.95-1829.10</td>
<td>1878.70-1882.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7-1.8</td>
<td>1835.24-1837.39</td>
<td>1886.99-1891.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9-2.0</td>
<td>1841.53-1845.68</td>
<td>1895.28-1899.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1-2.2</td>
<td>1849.83-1853.97</td>
<td>1903.58-1907.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3-2.4</td>
<td>1858.12-1862.26</td>
<td>1911.87-1916.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5-2.6</td>
<td>1866.41-1870.56</td>
<td>1920.16-1924.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7-2.8</td>
<td>1874.70-1878.85</td>
<td>1928.45-1932.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9-3.0</td>
<td>1882.99-1887.14</td>
<td>1936.74-1940.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10-1.1</td>
<td>891.29</td>
<td>1945.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Roenne 1978:166; Orser et al. 1987:543
**Transformed by adding 53.75 years to the Roenne dates
***Transformed by adding 26.89 years to the Roenne dates

Table 8. Glass Thickness Averages by Feature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature #</th>
<th>Thickness, mm (n = 2)</th>
<th>Feature #</th>
<th>Thickness, mm (n = 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The data from individual features are not particularly useful except in a few cases. The ratio for Feature 51, the antebellum borrow/refuse pit, is 4.8:3.2:1, which suggests that the cabin was torn down by hand. The addition of the small amount of data from Features 51 and 55 further supports this interpretation.

Features 108, 109, and 110 are interpreted as forming the remains of an outbuilding or activity area that was used repeatedly during both the antebellum and postbellum periods. No clinched nails were recovered, only two unaltered and six pulled. Perhaps a lightly-built shed was in this area that was torn down by hand.

Feature 86 contained a relatively large concentration of nails. The feature appears to be a large post/pier. The ratio was calculated as 0.7:1.5:1. The high number of clinched nails (n = 26) may suggest that a large building, such as a barn, stood in the area.

Area 2 produced 128 wire nails, 213 machine-cut nails, and 784 unidentifiable nails. Of these, 80 were unaltered, 129 were pulled, 55 were clinched, 527 could not be classified or were fragments. The resulting ratio is 1.4:2.3:1. This roughly corresponds with Young's (1994) ratio for a refuse disposal site. The mixture of nail types suggests a post-1890 date for the area.

Nails from Area 3 included 217 machine cut nails and 22 that could not be classified. Of these, 66 nails were unaltered, 42 were pulled, 13 were clinched, and a total of 123 could be not categorized or were fragments. The resulting ratio is 5.3:2.1, which approximates Young's (1994) ratio of 3:3:1 for a building intentionally torn down by hand.
The Moss/Colclough Antebellum Occupation

The “Upland South” model has been proposed as a means of interpreting and understanding southeastern cultural orientations and farmstead layouts. The Upland South tradition has been traced by geographers Fred B. Kniffen and Milton Newton to the backcountry of the southern colonies of Maryland, Virginia, the Carolinas, and Georgia, which were settled from 1725-1775 (Otto 1985:184). These backcountry groups later migrated across the Southern frontier, eventually settling areas like northern Mississippi.

Otto (1985:185-186) outlines several broad socio-cultural characteristics of Upland South groups. They tended to live in dispersed settlements whose residents were often related by blood or marriage. Scattered mills and stores met their commercial needs. County courthouses were their governmental units, and they were members of dissenting British religious sects like the Baptists and Presbyterians. These settlers raised subsistence crops including corn, beans, squash, tobacco, grains, and root crops, and allowed their livestock to forage on an “open” range. Log cabins and split-rail fences were common farmstead constructions. This stockmen-farmer-hunter economy was easily adaptable to the southern frontier woodlands (Otto 1985:188), and, in part, accounted for its rapid spread across the region. For families like the Colcloughs, with few possessions and little capital, cattle raising was a good means to earn a living because it substituted readily available land in underpopulated areas such as northern Mississippi for labor and equipment. Cattle could range in woodlands where farms had not been established. However, as population increased in areas like Starkville, the availability of cheap land for ranging cattle declined, thus explaining the Colclough’s eventual shift to cotton farming. Otto (1985:196) has suggested that inheritance patterns and the need to provide land for children resulted in changes to the traditional system. It is notable that in the period 1850-1860, when the population of Okrribbeha County grew rapidly, the Colclough brothers altered their economic strategy from cattle raising to cotton growing; instead of moving westward they remained in the area. In addition, the possibility of slave ownership in areas like northern Mississippi facilitated this change to cotton growing.

The layout and order of Upland South farmsteads have been described as “determined by the owner’s changing conceptions of convenience” (Newton 1974:151); that is, the layout evolved over time and reflected the economic and domestic strategies of the individual farmstead owner. Their relative prosperity (or lack of) also clearly influenced the organization of their holdings. These farmsteads were often found on ridge tops and public “roads developed freely as the demands of users and the terrain indicated” (Newton 1974:151). In addition, the grouping of outbuildings was supposedly based on a division of labor by gender (McMurry 1988).

Antebellum Farmstead Layout

Significant information regarding the layout of the earliest occupation of the farmstead was collected during excavations (Figure 6). Except for the probable existence of a residence on this property, the documentary record offers few details regarding the form and layout of the antebellum farmstead. These records note only that the land was improved, providing no details on the types of structures present. The outbuildings and activity areas (and information regarding their function, and sometimes, reuse) uncovered during the excavation document the regular tasks of the family and therefore provide insights into the routine, daily pursuits of these early settlers and farmers.

The majority of the antebellum features were found in Area 3 where the original farmhouse was located. The main residence was a log cabin with a mud and stick chimney (Feature 52) and interior root cellars (Feature 55). Although local informants suggested that root cellars were not commonly used in the area during the twentieth century, the evidence from the Colclough Farmstead indicates their use in the mid-nineteenth century. A borrow pit, probably for chimney construction, was later used for reuse disposal (Feature 51). Another small refuse pit was identified in Area 3 (Feature 102). Several posts from a fence line were identified that apparently enclosed the cabin (Features 89, 107, 112, 116-117). The cabin was facing a road (Features 49 and 50) that ran roughly east-west from the main road, now known as Highway 25.

Other outbuildings or activity areas associated with the antebellum occupation were identified in Areas 1, 2, and 5. The smokehouse (Feature 49) in Area 5, was located closer to the main road than the residence, but also apparently faced the east-west farm road represented by Features 49 and 50. One post (Feature 54) may represent the remains of a rack used to dry meat.
inside the smokehouse. A fence line (Features 3-5, 42, 44, and 56-60) enclosed the smokehouse. Features 56-58 and 60 specifically appear to have been gateposts, indicating that the door of the smokehouse faced the farm road. Feature 48, slightly north of Feature 1, appears to have been a drill point from the smokehouse’s roof. A refuse pit (Feature 19) associated with the smokehouse was uncovered slightly to the west.

In Area 2, two features appear to have been associated with the antebellum occupation. Feature 13 is a drill point from a lightly-built shed that was constructed in this location. It was probably related to the operations of the farm as opposed to subsistence or domestic activities, but could have been used to store farm tools or house animals. Feature 45, a post, was identified within Feature 13, and is also related to that shed.

A third mid-nineteenth-century outbuilding or activity area is represented by a cluster of features including Features 108-110 in Area 5. As a group, the function of Features 108-110 is not clear, but their proximity and overall northwest-southeast orientation suggests they were related. Based on their artifact content, they appear to represent an activity area maintained through both the antebellum and postbellum occupations. The location of this cluster south of both the log cabin and later farmhouse also suggests the outbuilding and associated activity area could have been maintained throughout both occupation periods. One fence post (Feature 111) west of this cluster also appears to date to the antebellum occupation.

At the Coldough Farmstead, the cabin and outbuildings were constructed on a ridge top with fields and woods surrounding them. The overall plan from the mid-nineteenth-century farmstead seems to center on the cabin, and the outbuildings and fields were arranged around it. The outbuildings identified during excavations were found east of the log cabin, and therefore closer to the road that later became Highway 25. (It is possible that other antebellum outbuildings located west of the cabin were not identified because they were outside the project area.) Notably, the cabin and smokehouse faced the farm road that ran east-west; they did not face the main road that provided access to the outside world. In fact, the smokehouse was located closer to the public road than the cabin. The focus of the antebellum farmstead layout was therefore inward, on the internal workings of the farmstead. Domestic life and activities were markedly separated from the public sphere.

As in the case of the Coldough site, Newton (1974:151) noted that older farmsteads were often bisected by roads; “the road often widened to
form a 'stomp'; the house, barns, gardens, and stock pens arrayed around it." Weaver and Doster (1982:64) described several "Upland South" farmsteads in the Tombigbee River drainage:

Outbuildings are oriented so as to face the dwelling from the rear, sides and sometimes the front. Usually the smaller structures, including storage sheds, well, smokehouse, and small animal pens, were closer to the house than farm equipment storage, corn crib, or barn. Occasionally the barn or crib may be opposite, across the road, but most often the larger structures are to the rear or at one side of the dwelling at a greater distance than most of the small structures. These locations suggest that the most necessary domestic functions are represented by the structures near the dwelling. Some of these were also those usually performed by women—obtaining water, storing canned vegetables, feeding chickens, and the like. Farm equipment maintenance, vehicles, plows, livery, as well as feed, fodder and animal storage, are normally non-domestic household activities performed by men. These structures are more distant and access to them is commonly around rather than through the immediate house yard.

Although no barn dating to this mid-nineteenth-century occupation was identified, making it impossible to speculate on whether agricultural outbuildings surrounded it, it is apparent that domestic outbuildings and activity areas were focused on the cabin and were situated around its periphery. For example, a large refuse area was immediately adjacent to the cabin and household trash was conveniently disposed of there. The smokehouse was a short walk down the farm road. It is also characteristic of the Upland South pattern that outbuildings had multiple functions, for instance the smokehouse appears also to have been used as a second root cellar.

Two other antebellum outbuilding or activity areas were identified in Areas 2 and 5. Features 108–110 in Area 5 yielded domestic refuse, and it is possible that this feature complex was related to domestic activities at the site. The remains of Features 13 and 45 in Area 2 appear to represent a lightly-built shed and could indicate either a farm outbuilding or perhaps an animal pen. On the one hand, this area is relatively far from the log cabin and located closer to the main road; on the other hand, the farm road and the main road form an L-shaped area that partitions this part of the farmstead from the fields and apparently the barn and other farm buildings. It may be that the barn was located further west along the farm road, and west of the cabin, but outside the project area.

McMurry (1988) has suggested that the concentration of domestically-oriented buildings around the residence is a characteristic of the Upland South pattern, the farmstead layout of which is based on a division of labor by gender. As Glassie (1975:174) stated, "the old farm had two centers, the house and the barn, around which smaller dependencies were dropped. Beside the house are the outbuildings needed by the woman in order to get food on the table; beside the barn are the outbuildings needed by the man to keep the cattle fat." Others have observed that farmstead boundaries between domestic and public or feminine and masculine spheres may have been more fluid. Stine (1991:498) reported that in twentieth-century interviews of farm women, most related that they were also at least periodically involved in field work traditionally associated with men, and that men often performed so-called feminine tasks through choice or necessity. Stine (1992) also suggested that the appearance of smokehouses in house yards indicates a degree of gender crossover in the use of domestic and agricultural space. If so, the layout of the Colclough Farmstead may be interpreted to reflect some mixing of responsibilities in mid-nineteenth-century Oktibbeha County.

Some information on antebellum refuse disposal patterns was also gathered. For this occupation, a major domestic refuse disposal location was on the west side of the log cabin in a borrow pit probably originally excavated to construct the house's chimney. Trash was apparently burned in this pit so it was probably in use for a relatively long period of time. Other refuse pits include Feature 19 on the west side of the smokehouse and Feature 110 (perhaps a refuse-filled depression) associated with Area 5. Finally, the sheet middens that covered the majority of the site included a mixture of nineteenth- and twentieth-century material, some of which clearly dated to the earliest occupation. Following South's (1979) refuse disposal model, at least two patterns are apparent for the antebellum occupation. The first is a "central refuse pattern" in which large and small refuse is tossed beneath (in this case, beside) the house. The second is an "adjacent refuse pattern" composed of small fragments in areas that are sometimes swept. As Joseph and Reed (1997:93–94) have noted, "sheet middens appear on late-eighteenth- and antebellum nineteenth-century farmsteads and reflect a system of sanitation which recognized the need to remove trash from the area of the immediate household (perhaps because of the malodorous conditions of such refuse), although not entirely disposing of such remains." The antebellum disposal areas identified at the Colclough Farmstead suggest that individual activity areas each had specific locations for refuse disposal indicating that the overall sanitation conditions of the farmstead were of interest to its occupants.
Antebellum Ethnobotanical and Faunal Remains

Some ethnobotanical and faunal data were gathered from features associated with the early occupation. Plant remains include peach pits collected from the smokehouse, wild bean seeds from Features 52 and 112, pokeweed and a pea seed from Feature 48 (a dripline associated with the smokehouse), wild bean seeds from Feature 109, a pokeweed seed from Feature 43, and a grape seed collected from Feature 117 (a post remnant in Area 3). These items could represent subsistence items; with the exception of the peach tree they are wild species that were probably collected from the area nearby. It is notable that no cultivars were recovered from these features, although good information is available from historic records regarding the crops grown on the farmstead.

As noted earlier, the majority of the identified faunal remains were collected from three antebellum features. Large- and medium-sized mammals, including pig, cow and deer, are represented with pig the most plentiful single taxon. Domestic poultry may be represented by large- and medium-sized bird remains. Wild taxa include squirrel and fish. Clam and egg shell were also recovered. Historic records document that the Colcloughs raised cows and pigs, and clearly hunting supplemented the diet.

Reitz (1995) hypothesized that, counter to southern tradition, cow was consumed more regularly than pig. The data from the Colclough Farmstead as a whole disputes her contention, although preservation and sample size may be mitigating factors. It appears that pig was consumed more regularly than cow even at the Colclough farmstead when cattle were being raised for market. Hilliard (1969) claimed that this was the case for the entire United States and not just the South. However, Hilliard also noted that beef consumption rose during the summer months, suggesting that differences in feature content might reflect seasonal differences. Because the Colclough’s were raising cattle for the market, perhaps they tended not to consume their commodity except on special occasions.

Household Inventory and Market Relations

Historic records indicate that Anderson Moss and the Colclough brothers were producing goods on their farmstead for market. At first, the emphasis was on cattle. Later, cotton growing was precipitated. The antebellum artifact assemblage contains refined decorated ceramics, metal household utensils, beads, buttons, metal candle holder fragments, and barrel hoops, all of which were probably purchased from a local general store. Imported items include refined ceramics from England, which is typical of the period, and two English gunflints. Some of the cash the Moss and Colclough families received from raising cattle was used to buy goods they could not produce on the farmstead. The variety of decorated ware types recovered from antebellum features suggests that small quantities of ceramics were purchased over time instead of buying a large, expensive matching set.

The Postbellum Occupation

Increased prosperity due to a switch from cattle raising to cotton growing appears to have been the major impetus for the construction of a new farmhouse and changes made to the farmstead layout generally. In addition, it appears the Colclough family made a conscious decision to remain in the Starkville area and pursued an alternative economic strategy in order to do so. As discussed earlier, either Hilliard or James Colclough initiated these changes. By 1860, the list of farm products suggests a modest but well-diversified operation with cotton as the principal cash crop. The cotton production of the farm was significant enough to bring in cash to purchase certain items while the grain and meat production was sufficient to feed the Colclough family and slaves. The success of James Colclough in particular is indicated by his probable construction of a house on site and, later, another in Starkville, by his financing of a sawmill, and by his financial support of his family and their spouses.

Postbellum Farmstead Layout

As mentioned above, the major change to the layout of the farmstead in the mid-nineteenth century was the construction of a new residence (Figure 7). The new farmhouse, represented archaeologically by several piers (Features 36, 39, 46, and 103) in Area 1, faced the main road. The east-west running farm road (Features 49 and 50) continued to be used during this period. Slightly west of the farmhouse, Feature 22, brick rubble from the disturbed foundation of a structure, and Feature 74, a shallow refuse-filled depression, represent the remains of a nearby outbuilding and associated activity area built and utilized during the postbellum period. The structure's
function is unclear, but is presumed to have been domestic in nature, perhaps a dairy house or a new smokehouse.

Other postbellum features and activity areas identified in Area 5 appear to be related to farming as opposed to domestic activities. It appears that a barn (perhaps represented by Feature 75) stood in Area 5, and was probably oriented to the east-west running farm road. Features interpreted as a drien line (85 and 87) and a post (88), suggest a lightly built shed or perhaps a chicken coop, that stood behind the barn. A second outbuilding (Features 108-110), which had been used during the antebellum occupation as well, was southwest of this shed. Two posts, Features 101 and 105, also found in Area 5, are probably remnants of a fence line that once enclosed the area.

Area 2 was an important activity area during the postbellum occupation although no definite structural remains dating to this period were found. Features consisted of numerous posts and two refuse-filled depressions or pits (62 and 79). Fencelines or possibly lightly built shed(s) are indicated by the large number of posts that were set into the ground. Four posts (Features 7, 9, and 10-11), all in close proximity to each other, appear to have been driven into the ground. Perhaps a small animal pen or chicken coop rested on these posts. Features 90, 96, and 98-99, which were not excavated, form an irregular square that may represent an animal pen. Given the large quantity of burned artifacts recovered from Area 2, it appears it was a locus for both trash disposal and animal-keeping activities during the postbellum period.

By the 1850s the Colclough family was doing well financially, resulting in the family’s decision to remain in the area and to construct a new large, probably two-story, frame house. When this larger residence was constructed, either Hilliard or James Colclough chose to orient it to the main road and the outside world, visible to people riding or walking by. In this way, the Colclough family emphasized their economic prosperity to the outside world. The layout of their farmstead with this emphasis on the road-facing residence also highlighted the fruits of their farming labors. The actual workplaces were placed in the background, away from the road. The manner in which they achieved this prosperity, the ownership of slaves, was also kept in the background. Given that no slave residences were identified, they were apparently located away from the family’s domestic areas, suggesting a distinct boundary between the domestic activities of slaveowners and slaves.

Other aspects of the farmstead’s spatial organization remained in place after the larger house was built, reflecting aspects of the Upland South
pattern. The farmstead road, for example, was maintained, and other farm buildings were placed along it. Domestic functions were still associated with the main residence, and associated outbuildings, such as that represented by Features 22 and 74, remained in close proximity to the house.

One important change in the layout of the farmstead is associated with the placement of the barn. There is some evidence that the barn was located along the east-west running road, on its south side, behind the new farmhouse. Archaeological evidence of the antebellum location of the barn was not found. During this period, the barn may have been west of the cabin, in a location outside the project area.

Refuse disposal patterns differ from those of the antebellum occupation. In the vicinity of Area 2, trash was tossed and apparently burned. Joseph and Reed (1997:94) note that “trash burning appears to have become prominent during the second half of the nineteenth century, most likely in response to the sanitary movement and concerns with trash disposal and public health.” While trash had been burned routinely during the antebellum occupation of the farmstead, it occurred adjacent to the cabin, rather than away from domestic activities. The shift in the location of trash burning may indicate a response to health and sanitation concerns.

During the postbellum occupation, trash appears to have been typically disposed along the periphery of the farmstead instead of in refuse pits located near the residence, outbuildings, or activity areas. Area 4, located downslope from the ridge top, and north of the residence, is another area where trash was apparently tossed during this period. The sloping topography of this area made it difficult to construct an outbuilding there or to use it for other routine farmstead activities; it was therefore a good place for trash disposal. These general patterns emulate Drucker et al.’s (1982) Piedmont Refuse Disposal Pattern, in which trash was thrown downslope into gullies; and South’s (1979) peripheral refuse pattern. The limited evidence collected from Features 23, the bottle dump, and 84, the well, suggest these twentieth-century features marked the southern or southwestern edge of the farmstead. Joseph and Reed (1997:94) suggest that the appearance of bottle dumps by the late nineteenth century reflects changes in material culture, specifically the replacement of traditional, often reused containers by mass-produced and therefore inexpensive bottles. Since bottle glass would not burn in a typical refuse fire, they were thrown into “unusable portions of the landscape” (Joseph and Reed 1997:94). Finally, the sheet midden, which covered the majority of the site, included a mixture of nineteenth- and twentieth-century material, some of which clearly dated to the postbellum occupation. Apparently some refuse was swept from primary living areas as it had been during the antebellum occupation.

Postbellum Ethnobotanical and Faunal Remains

Some ethnobotanical data were collected from late-nineteenth-century features. The majority of these remains came from ornamental plants, which include a maypop seed (a passion flower), tulip seeds, and chinberry seeds, reflecting the landscape of the farmstead. Wild taxa included blackberry and pokeweed seeds. Grape may have been wild or cultivated. None of the features associated with the postbellum occupation yielded significant quantities of faunal remains. Preservation factors but also refuse disposal patterns clearly influenced this result as suggested by the small amount of bones from Area 4 and from Area 2 where trash was burned. Burning may have been the typical means of disposing of such waste.

Household Inventory and the Changing Market

Near the end of the nineteenth century, the mass production of certain categories of material culture began to affect the household inventory, how objects were cared for and used, and whether or not they were reused. One example of this is the twentieth-century bottle dump. With regard to ceramics, unlike the antebellum period assemblage, which is comprised of a wide range of mostly English wares, the postbellum assemblage is typified by wares produced in the United States. Although sample size differences complicate comparison, the earlier assemblage suggests the purchase of a small number of pieces at a time resulting in a rich assortment of different wares. The later homogeneity may indicate fewer purchases of large sets of ceramics.

Conclusion

At the Colclough Farmstead, important data regarding farmstead layout and organization, subsistence, and household inventory were gathered during excavations, information that was not present in the documentary record. The combination of historic research and archaeological data from the antebellum and postbellum periods provides insights into how a mid-sized family farm operation negotiated the changing Southern economy of the mid-to-late nineteenth century in northeastern
Mississippi. Many similar farmstead sites, located away from a major highway, and therefore better preserved since their abandonment, are present on federal lands. These sites need to be protected so that the information they contain can be used to investigate and document the social and cultural history of a neglected region and the day-to-day lives of its understudied inhabitants.
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Book Reviews


Reviewed by Ian W. Brown

In 1976 I attended the Southeastern Archaeological Conference meeting in Tuscaloosa, in part in honor of David DeJarnette’s long career in the archaeology of Alabama. At that same meeting a reprint of the Conference on Southern Prehistory was distributed to current members. That particular conference was held up the road in Birmingham, 44 years previous. Jimmy Griffin advised all of us at the business meeting to be sure to read this document carefully as it is a startling reminder of just where the profession was in 1932 and how far we have come in the intervening years. Sad to say, I did not take Griffin’s advice. Although I “read at it” numerous times in the past quarter of a century, extracting information that I needed, I never read through it, cover to cover, in considering it as a historical document. In reviewing Setting the Agenda for American Archaeology, I finally got to follow Griffin’s sage advice. This critical conference on southeastern U.S. archaeology is sandwiched between two other National Research Council (NRC) archaeological conferences, one held in 1929 in St. Louis, and the other in Indianapolis in 1935. These meetings, which represent the culmination of work conducted by the Committee on State Archaeological Surveys (CSAS), are brought together in a single volume, edited and introduced by Michael J. O’Brien and R. Lee Lyman. For the first time one can sit down and march through six tempestuous years of archaeology as old and new minds wrestled with the problems of preserving and organizing the vast archaeological resources of the eastern United States. The heroes of the story are many, including Clark Wissler, Frederick W. Hodge, Carl Guthrie, Roland Dixon, A. V. Kidder, John R. Swanton, W. C. McKern, Fay–Cooper Cole, and a myriad of newcomers like Henry B. Collins, James B. Griffin, and James A. Ford. There are many others too, most of whom are discussed in O’Brien and Lyman’s masterful introduction to the volume.
The introductory essay, 83 pages long, can easily stand alone, and should be mandatory reading for students interested in eastern Woodlands prehistory or in the history of archaeology in general. These authors not only provide excellent descriptions of the objectives and content of these three very different conferences, but they provide context and background on the committee’s years of service. The story starts well before 1916, the year in which the National Research Council was created. O’Brien and Lyman begin in the nineteenth century when archaeology was first becoming a profession, and figures such as Frederic Ward Putnam and Cyrus Thomas loom large in their discussion. Moreover, the story does not end when the CSAS was dissolved in 1937, because the individuals who were so critical in conducting the conferences made sure that their many efforts would not be in vain. The Society for American Archaeology, established in 1934, was a direct outgrowth of the CSAS work, both spiritually and financially.

The first meeting, that which was held in St. Louis in 1929, was called the Conference on Midwestern Archaeology. The report on this meeting reveals its tripartite structure. The first set of papers were devoted to emphasizing the needs of education and conservation in protecting and preserving the archaeological resources of the Midwest. Although there were a few southerners at the conference, including Peter Brannon, Calvin Brown, and John R. Fordyce, the majority of its participants were from the Midwest. Of great importance is that the participants were evenly divided between professionals and amateurs. The democratic nature of this gathering distinguished the St. Louis conference from subsequent ones. Although each of the papers in the first section of the report contains valuable insights, two deserve to be highlighted because of their similar theme. The principal message in the papers by A. C. Parker and Clark Wissler is that state surveys should be run out of state museums. Often the comments that succeed the various papers are as interesting as the formal presentations.

Mathew Stirling, for example, made a big plug for the application of the Direct Historical Approach in structuring research. Also contained in his comments is a rather amusing story on how an Indian medicine man named Chief Deer Foot managed to “convince” all of the private collectors from Macon, Georgia to relinquish their objects to him (pp. 111-112). This is prime reading for NAGPRA enthusiasts.

Part II of the Midwestern Conference contains more substantive presentations, again followed by ample discussion. W. C. McKern gave a talk on the Hopewell-related Nicholls Mound in Wisconsin, Peter A. Brannon spoke about urn burials in Alabama, and John R. Fordyce discussed “Tracking DeSoto.” As these last two papers deal with more “southerly” subjects, it is worth giving a bit more information here. Brannon argued for Choctaw connections for the urn burials and provided an interesting discussion on the differences between the vessels used for bottoms as compared to those used for tops. He also offered a fascinating description of a single mortuary event that involved the placement of nine urns around a central one. Good details are provided on the preparation of the ground surface prior to the placement of the urns and what happened in the rest of the mortuary ritual. Fordyce’s paper on DeSoto is a nicely written account that correlates DeSoto’s peregrinations with both landscape and archaeology. An engineer by vocation, he conducted his study over a twenty-five year period and traveled to all the places that he spoke of. Most of his discussion focused on DeSoto in the Lower Mississippi Valley, with the state of Mississippi receiving ample attention. For what it’s worth, he targeted Clarksdale as the site of the famous river crossing. Mississippi overall does not get a great deal of mention at this particular conference, but one somewhat ironic reference to the state should be mentioned. In speaking of the problems with site destruction in Mississippi, Calvin Brown mentioned the Nanih Waiya mound as a prime candidate for preservation. Unfortunately, the typist of the original conference document was not well versed in the Muskogean language and listed the site as “Nana Highway Mound.” Rather ironically, the emphasis of the message remains the same.

Warren K. Moorehead delivered an interesting but now very outdated discussion of “Mound areas in the Mississippi Valley and the South” in his essay. He discussed various Hopewell and Mississippian sites and offered a curious scale in which to measure the cultural status of mound-building peoples. Hopewell sat at the top of his scale, which may not be all that surprising considering that Moorehead built a good portion of his reputation on the discovery of Hopewell objects. He did not feel that Hopewell evolved in Ohio, but instead, argued for its origin in eastern Iowa.

Two methodological papers were presented in Part II of the Midwestern Conference, one by Samuel A. Barrett and the other by Emerson E. Greenman. Barrett’s work is of historical interest in that it shows the kind of efforts that personnel in the Milwaukee Public Museum were making in trying to bring order to archaeology in the Midwest. His paper is largely a discussion of basic
paper forms that were currently being used in Wisconsin to record sites. Greenman's paper, on the other hand, dealt with a formal classification of an artifact type. He offered a rather convoluted scheme to classify projectile points and knives. Far more edifying was the follow-up comments Nels Nelson, in which he presented a much more logical and simpler system that he had created at the American Museum of Natural History.

The last part of the Midwestern Conference consisted of dinner addresses. Apparently some of these, perhaps all, were transmitted as radio addresses. Twelve people participated in this part of the program. Most of the deliveries were appeals to education and preservation. Three presentations merit recognition here, because they are timeless pieces. Carl E. Guthrie presented two of them. In one address he offered a nice summary statement on the history, goals, and accomplishments of the Committee on State Archaeological Surveys, and in the other he applauded the amateurs and the important role that they play in collecting and preserving local prehistory. The other address, by Warren K. Moorehead is of interest historically as he offers an interesting tale of just how he was able to "convince" the people of Illinois to make a state park of Cahokia. According to Moorehead, this switch from almost total disinterest to overwhelming support occurred over a period of forty-eight hours. It's worth reading (p. 181).

The 1932 Conference on Southern Pre-History, held in Birmingham, was critical in that it set the stage for the Southeastern Archaeological Conference. A number of the participants were so excited about all that had been accomplished that they arranged to meet the following year to hold similar conferences. The structure of the Birmingham conference is very interesting. Although it was balanced between locals and outsiders, the latter dominated. The Smithsonian Institution was particularly well represented and there is a sense that one of their main roles was to educate the southerners—and that they did, but it was always done in a nice way, thus avoiding alienation. The preeminent Smithsonian scholar was John R. Swanton, who gave two addresses at the conference. His first essay was a concise summary of Southeast Indian culture, both material and non-material. He also provided a history of contact with Europeans, which remains today an excellent introduction to the topic. In his second presentation Swanton offered a detailed discussion of the DeSoto route, correlating it with tribal identifications and sites. He also discussed tribal migrations in some detail, showing the utter complexity of it all.

He encouraged archaeologists to employ the Direct Historical Approach and provided a list of sites as a start (see Figure 6), but somehow I just do not get the feeling that Swanton was all that hopeful of success. Perhaps he had been around long enough to start losing hope. Historical sources had been exhausted, or at least everyone was leaving it up to Swanton (see p. 315), so now it was up to the archaeologists. Swanton sounds as if he is passing the torch, but I do not get the sense that he felt the torch was in good hands.

Matthew Stirling gave an excellent presentation of prehistoric material culture (especially pottery) by area in his paper. He focused on spatial distributions because, as of 1932, that is still really all that the Southeast had. He was cognizant of the absence of time and, as with most of the other contributors, he promoted the use of the Direct Historical Approach to control it. S.C. Dellinger presented an elegant description of the Ozark Bluff dwellers of Arkansas in his paper. Even in 1932 these people were considered the oldest culture in the Southeast. There were rumbles from Folsom in the west, of course, but Stirling cautioned that connections with extinct forms of life still had not been convincingly demonstrated in the Southeast.

Walter B. Jones and David L. DeJarnette's offering was a brief statement of Moundville, its culture, and its external relationships. Just to show how far we have come, Moundville was said by them to be the oldest known culture in Alabama (p. 259). Talks were then given on the archaeology of Mississippi by Henry B. Collins, Louisiana by W.M. Walker, Tennessee by Charles K. Peacock, and Texas by James E. Pearce. Collins continued Sterling's plea for chronological control and, again, indicated the Direct Historical Approach was the best way to obtain it. Pottery was the key, he argued, and he gave his own Choctaw studies as an example as to how it can be used. As the trainer of both James A. Ford and Moreau B. Chambers, who were in attendance at the meeting, Collins certainly made a profound impact on the archaeology of the Southeast. Unfortunately, the cold Arctic air soon drew him away. Walker discussed three prehistoric culture areas in Louisiana, with the Caddo area having received a lot of attention. He believed that a recently discovered site in Natchitoches [the Fish Hatchery site] was perfect for the use of the Direct Historical Approach for the Caddo. He doubted that dendrochronology would ever be of much use in the Southeast, but he called on geographers and geologists to work out river channel dating. Fred Kniffen, another conference participant, must have nodded knowingly.
Peacock offered only a sketchy view of archaeological work in Tennessee. He gave an abbreviated history of archaeology in the state, somehow managing to leave out Frederic Ward Putnam and Edwin Curtiss altogether, but he did provide some interesting site information. Pearce's essay reveals just how little was known of Texas archaeology in 1932. He focused on east Texas, where he himself had done most of his work. He also had some interesting thoughts concerning coastal archaeology, making note that developments in Louisiana were far more similar to Florida than to Texas. He also felt that there was no evidence for Mesoamerican-Southeast connections along the coastal waters. People would have to look elsewhere for those linkages.

The morning of the last day in Birmingham had three interesting presentations. Fay-Cooper Cole spoke about the methods and objectives of doing archaeology. He explained the "Chicago Method" of digging mound and village sites in this paper. As a result of David Browman's recent research, we now know that this method was around four decades earlier at the Peabody Museum and had indirectly made its way to Chicago. Neil M. Judd delivered a most interesting paper on laboratory and museum work in his contribution. He presented the Smithsonian system of dealing with artifacts, and stressed the importance of documentation in addition to preservation. Clark Wissler then followed with a discussion of research and publication. He argued that the main responsibilities of the diggers after returning from the field are to record both the excavations and the artifacts in formal reports. Such reports did not necessarily need to be published, however; as to do so could get quite expensive. Nevertheless, site reports should be filed away in institutions with ready accessibility to researchers. Wissler argued that diggers should not necessarily feel the responsibility of having to do comparative studies. If they did so that would be nice, but it is not necessary. As long as solidly written accurate manuscripts exist, others can come along later to do the synthesizing. In other words, these reports would always have value and would be museum objects in and of themselves.

All in all, the Birmingham conference was a great success. Clearly had Guthe, Wissler, Swanton, and others not made a supreme effort to involve the locals, it could have turned ugly. They were treading on eggshells, but they were humble enough to walk carefully as the goals were too important to fail.

The Indianapolis Archaeological Conference, held in December of 1935, was somewhat different from the previous two conferences. The main difference is that it was far more exclusive, as almost all the people in attendance were professionals. Moreover, it had much more of a theoretical flavor to it. The principal topic was W. C. McKern's paper, "Certain Culture Classification Problems in Middle Western Archaeology." The participants had studied this document prior to attending the conference. As it is attached as an appendix to the book under review, I similarly recommend that it be read prior to reading the final report of the Indianapolis conference.

The exclusive nature of this particular conference is readily apparent, giving it a far different feel from the St. Louis or Birmingham conferences. One senses that the leaders felt it was this particular group that was going to make the decisions from now on. As an example, when it was recommended that archaeologists from Nebraska and Arkansas be included in establishing and defining traits, Carl Guthe felt this might not be a good idea. "In the first place, the group here knows what we are talking about. If we bring in others, their ideas will not be the same. They have never worked out this problem and do not understand this classification scheme. Let's understand among ourselves what we are trying to do and then ask the others for their opinions (p. 410)." Control was needed to stem the chaos of the archaeological record, and the approach as to how control was to be formulated clearly could not be left to the masses. The bulk of the participants were the "Young Turks" of the day. Although Swanton was at the meeting, his presence seems incidental, especially when compared to the dominant role he played in Birmingham. Absent at Indianapolis were Clark Wissler, Warren K. Moorehead, and Fay-Cooper Cole. Only Guthe attended all three conferences and this one, more than any other; was clearly "his baby." And it was he who composed the final report on the conference.

The first day of sessions at Indianapolis consisted largely of professionals who described the archaeology of their states. Most of them made valiant efforts to use McKern's system as a framework for their descriptions. They had not yet adopted the long tedious trait lists that so characterize this approach, but the papers are certainly a foreshadowing of what was to come. Although these sections are difficult to follow, they are informative as summaries as to what was known (and not known) as of 1935. It is clear that many of the presenters were not comfortable in their use of the McKern terminology. How terms like "phase" or "aspect" were to be applied was not clear-cut, and there was seldom unanimity as to what constituted an "aspect" or a "focus."

Swanton's presentation, which came at the end of Friday's sessions, is strangely out of place at this conference, although from the standpoint of
2002, it is the most interesting of the papers. As at Birmingham, Swanton showed the great utility of employing the Direct Historical Approach in organizing archaeological data. For the Midwest he considered the Siouan groups. First he discussed them in general terms, and then he focused on the complex movements of one specific tribe, the Ofo. It is a brilliant study, one that reveals Swanton’s impressive command of historic, ethno-
logic, and linguistic data. But, except for Griffin and one or two others, I do not receive the impression it was received well by the participants. This certainly was not the conference to focus on the value of historic groups as a key to organizing data.

Saturday was largely devoted to discussion periods. Each period began with a series of brief statements that stimulated significant commentary. Frank H. H. Roberts, Jr set the stage for what was to follow. Although he was actively involved in the excavation of the Shiloh site, it should be remembered that Roberts was first and foremost a southwestern archaeologist. Consequently, he (along with Guthrie, who had worked extensively in the Southwest) brought perspective to the conference. Roberts stated how grateful he was for the dialogue overall, because he was just starting to analyze the Shiloh material and was not exactly clear how to proceed. But having said that, he confessed that he was still somewhat confused by the way in which terms were being applied. He was particularly critical as to the manner in which the Woodland basic culture was defined. He drew readily from Southwest Pueblo studies in his discussion, referring to the results of the Pecos Conference. He warned that a direct use of the Southwest approach to archaeology was not advisable because of differences in the control of time—the Southwest had it, whereas the Southeast and Midwest did not.

Fay–Cooper Cole was unable to attend the meeting because of health problems, but he made sure that he sent a letter giving his blessing to McKern’s system. Fearing perhaps some resistance to its use, he agreed that it is not the ideal system; its value, however, rested in its practicality. Its principal advantage to Cole was that it permitted recognition of similarities and was a great improvement over what existed five years earlier.

Frank M. Setzler, the next contributor, had a major problem with the use of the term “Woodland,” if it in any way was identified with Algonkians. He was adamant that Hopewell had no connections with these Algonkian tribes. The significance of Hopewell as a cultural entity was lost, he argued, when it was subsumed under the Woodland term. He also reasoned that it is a far more effective strategy to develop systems by working up from individual sites rather than by starting with “basic cultures” and working down to components. The latter generalizing procedure may be sound for teaching purposes, but it does not reflect reality. In the discussion that followed, Setzler made it quite clear that he felt that Hopewell came out of the south. His intensive experience with the Marksville site in Louisiana gave him a much greater perspective than most of the other participants with regard to the cultural relationships of the phenomenon known as Hopewell.

James B. Griffin urged a combination of approaches in his brief statement. In line with Setzler, he argued that Midwestern archaeologists should work on constructing foci first, eventually building up to aspects and phases. And while this is underway, major attention should also be devoted to understanding the archaeological expression of historic groups in the Midwest, a subject that had been almost entirely ignored. The discussion that followed is fascinating reading. For students of theory and method, it is delightful to watch the scholars of the time wrestle with each other in trying to make the system operable. McKern, quite naturally, argued that determining the cultural complexes had to have priority over tying the complexes to historic groups—at least for the Midwest. Largely due to Swanton’s career, the Southeast was far ahead of the Midwest with regard to identifying archaeology with tribal units. Swanton served as an arbiter here by saying that one should go with the strengths of the area. In the Southeast the data were far more amenable to tying archaeology with historic tribes, so it made more sense that that approach would work better in the Southeast than in the Midwest.

The final discussions in the conference foreshadowed the difficulties that people would have in applying the terminology of the McKern system. Most of the participants agreed that there was such a thing as a Woodland-Mississippi division, but they really did not know how to deal with the Hopewellian problem. There seems to have been a general feeling that Hopewell looked more “southern” than “northern,” yet its major florescence in the Ohio Valley, deep within the Woodland area, was disconcerting. As stated above, Setzler was convinced of its southern origins and made many forceful arguments at the conference in favor of such. Others at the conference, even McKern (see p. 405), were receptive to Setzler’s argument, but were hesitant to say very much about Hopewell’s origins or connections, because there were too many gaps in the archaeological data in the intervening area. Griffin called for an archaeological survey down the Mississippi River to address this specific problem.
(pp. 405 and 411), and under the same discussion, McKern stressed that the other major problem is the meaning of "Middle Mississippi." Swanton added, quite significantly, "How are you going to get anywhere with Middle Mississippi until you investigate the Arkansas-west Tennessee district?" These two issues, understanding Hopewell in the Lower Mississippi Valley as well as the nature of Middle Mississippi, were the stimulus for the birth of Phillips, Ford, and Griffin's monumental study of the Lower Mississippi Alluvial Valley. In my mind's eye, I can see Griffin listening very carefully to the proceedings of this meeting, no doubt making mental notes as to who exactly would be the best people to work with him in addressing these important issues. This was a very important meeting indeed. It set the agenda for American archaeology.

Ian W. Brown is a Professor of Anthropology at the University of Alabama and Curator for Gulf Coast Archaeology at the Alabama Museum of Natural History.


Reviewed by R. Berle Clay

Kit Wesley of Murray State University has finally rescued an important Mississippian site, the Wickliffe Mounds, from an obscurity into which it was cast by the fables of fallible archaeological foes in the 1930s and restored it to its position as a highly significant late prehistoric site. Once known as "Ancient Buried City" and the only archaeological site listed (and illustrated) for the state in the 1939 WPA guide to Kentucky, the site was excavated by various individuals under the prodding of Fain King who hoped to charge admission and gain wealth (as proprietor) and fame (as an archaeologist) from the venture. It just so happens that he tried to do this in a state whose primitive professional archaeology was dominated by William S. Webb who could be nothing short of a curmudgeon, especially when faced with such an uncertain entity as King proved to be, time and time again. The two never got along and I expect that it was this friction which principally soured King against the profession for a multitude of reasons, all of which Wesley covers in an excellent historical background. Interestingly, King got along much better with Fay Cooper Cole (or perhaps Cole got along better with King), for King paved the way for Chicago's lease of the Kincaid site so Cole's students could excavate it in a justly celebrated field school in Midwestern archaeology.

Although Wesley does not discuss the issue, Victoria Fortner's forward reveals that he, as a professional archaeologist, has gone to great lengths to repair relations with interested Native Americans who have been understandably offended by the thoughtless public display of their excavated cemetery, long the centerpiece of the roadside show, through the removal of human remains from display, continued consultation with interested parties, and planned reburial of human remains and associated artifacts. He has done this through a well thought out research design addressing important questions raised by the site, respecting the rights of interested Native Americans, and at the same time stressing full publication of the results. I might add that in this professional endeavor he has hardly been appreciated by his colleagues in Kentucky, even regarded with intense suspicion in certain quarters. I applaud him.

While the whole effort has left Wesley reasonably fed up with Fain King, for the record it should be noted that Webb set off to dig at McLeod's Bluff, a nearby site, about the same time as King got into Wickliffe mounds. He went to the site specifically to excavate Native American remains, and ceased his excavations because he was afraid he would excavate a stray Anglo American in the process. He left the site after buying a favorite pot or two for his private collection at the University of Kentucky from the local collector who, in all probability had looted them from a Native American grave. Yes, we have come along way!

Wickliffe Mounds is one of a series of compact Mississippian villages with mounds along the Mississippi River bluffs in Kentucky. Almost carbon copies occur downstream in the Turk (15C6), and McLeod's Bluff (15Bi1) sites, less so the larger Adams site (15Bi4) or Twin Mounds (15Ba2). They are not the earliest Mississippian sites but start circa 1100 A.D. and last until some time after 1300. While the total settlement pattern is not that well known, these sites seem remarkably self-contained. Although no doubt surrounded by small farmsteads, there is no suggestion that any one of them dominated the other. Wesley, concentrating on excavation units specifically designed to address questions about the five mounds at the site (in one way or another mauled by King and his workers), does an excellent job of parsing the development of this small mound center in time. The first 50-75 years (Early Wickliffe 1000-1175 A.D.) saw a small a compact settlement lacking mounds. Not that much is known of
the non-mound contexts because they have been badly battered by ground modifications since 1930. In Middle Wickliffe (1175-1250 A.D.) a series of mounds were started - the Mound C complex - which ultimately became the locus for the notorious cemetery. Mounds A and B were also started, which clearly had a series of summit structures, one of them perhaps an elite residence. In Late Wickliffe (1250-1350 A.D.) A and B got their final caps (and structures) and attention shifted to the lower Mounds D, E, and H. At the end of the period the site seems to be abandoned although there are ceramic traces of occupation or visits to the site for the next 50 years. This sequence is the product of some 15 years of excellent, focused fieldwork directed by Wesler reported herein in two forms, the text, and a CD that adds plans of excavated units, sections, photographs of the excavation and artifacts, and specialist reports by 15 contributors.

While subscribing to the idea that the Wickliffe Mounds represents a chiefdom, Wesler is refreshingly cagey about what all this means in social terms. Rather, he would leave it to the "creativity of future researchers." I sense he sees the possibilities as largely speculative at this point. As he points out, the entire Wickliffe site, mounds and all, would not be noticed under the footprint of Monk's Mound at Cahokia. So it is for most of the neighboring sites in Kentucky. Having said this, one must resist (and I think Wesler does to a degree) the idea that one socio-political interpretation necessarily fits all Mississippian sites with mounds throughout the south and Midwest. Certainly he reminds us that a reasonable population for the town at its peak (200-300, which I think is high) is far below what some authors have pegged as the size of ethnographic chiefdoms. I would like to see the whole interpretation of power as somewhat up in the air for Wickliffe Mounds and possibly something that may have been in the process of evolving through time.

Further thoughts on this, from a Wickliffe point of view, are somewhat limited by the nature of Wesler's excavations. As I gather, most of the village (apart from the mounds and in theory surrounding a limited plaza) was destroyed by highway and access road construction with the result that we don't know that much about the total settlement pattern. Again, although Wesler has done an admirable job of sequencing the Wickliffe occupation through his careful stratigraphic excavation of mound remains, and elsewhere, we don't know that much about the nature of structures on them, or sequences of structure in them. These problems hardly detract from Wesler's accomplishments, which demonstrate how careful stratigraphic excavations—among other things of mounds—can provide the significant evidence to define and date the historical sequence.

On dating, Wesler's work has produced a nice string of 17 C-14 dates, most from good contexts and associations. Interestingly, 22 OCR (Oxidizable Carbon Ratio) seem to fit the C-14 sequence quite well, which might augur well for this recent, low cost absolute dating technique. Dates and pottery produce a ceramics sequence that seems to be replicated elsewhere in Western Kentucky at a number of sites, suggesting that he and other workers now have the temporal framework down pat.

In the early 1960's Lee Hanson and I set off on an excursion to Western Kentucky to "get a feel" for the archaeology to help us as we wrote up river basin work. Our first stop was Ancient Buried City (aka Wickliffe Mounds) where the then-proprietor, George Johnson, took us in hand, to sites where we made sherd collections, and to see existing collections (and we saw the Walker and Muscoy valley collections in the process). We also met others interested in the archaeology, most importantly I remember Richard Bradham who had worked as a tour leader at the site and was then a graduate student at Missouri and who was to die tragically shortly thereafter. I was introduced to a host of problems such as the late survival of clay tempered pottery in the area, which have stayed with me for some time although we had been warned by our superiors not to expect too much from the Wickliffe experience. At another graduate school I got curious dead stares when I even mentioned I was interested in the late prehistoric archaeology of the Wickliffe vicinity. Well, Wesler has redeemed the site and with his fine work has set the stage for understanding the dynamics of late prehistoric Mississippian at the Confluence. In addition he has produced a nicely presented volume with historical photos from the King era and plans, sections, and photos from his own work. I can only protest that the Lluboun Site (Figure 6.1) is more generally known as the Lluborn Site (and it took me some time to spot that editorial transgression!).

R. Berle Clay
is a senior archaeologist with Cultural Resource Analysis, Inc., Lexington, Kentucky.

Reviewed by Phillip R. Hodge

Ancient Earthen Enclosures of the Eastern Woodlands represents the first body of archaeological literature wholly devoted to the study of pre-columbian earthen enclosures. It is unique for that reason alone. Moreover, Robert Mainfort and Lynne Sullivan are to be commended for assembling such a diverse array of theoretical perspectives and methodological approaches to address these enigmatic cultural features. Avocational and professional archaeologists alike will benefit from such broad perspectives that include everything from good old-fashioned dirt archaeology to more humanistic and reflective post-processual archaeological approaches. Similarly, readers will find this volume geographically and temporally comprehensive. The editors offer ten case studies that range from the Late Archaic and Middle Woodland periods of northern and central Louisiana to the Middle and Late Woodland periods of the Ohio Valley and Great Lakes region. This volume is, however, strongly weighted toward enclosures in the Ohio Valley. I don't point this out as a critique; on the contrary, I think the composition of this volume reflects a disciplinary historical emphasis on Ohio Valley enclosures. Furthermore, though the editors have thus maintained a somewhat traditional geographic focus, their inclusion of Jon Gibson's chapter (Chapter 2) on Poverty Point recognizes the recent conceptual expansion of earthwork construction into the Archaic. Gibson's contribution is the only chapter that addresses Archaic enclosures and one of only two that deal with the Southeast in general. This is surprising in light of a flurry of archaeological research publicized in the early to mid 1990s that documents, mostly in Louisiana and Florida, numerous Archaic earthworks including mounds and enclosures. Readers might refer to Southeastern Archaeology Volume 13:2 (1994) as a supplemental reference on Archaic earthworks in the Southeast.

This volume is part of the Ripley P. Bullen Series in archaeology published by the University Press of Florida. After a foreword by series editor Jerald Milanich, Mainfort and Sullivan introduce readers to the overall goal of their volume, which is, namely, to deconstruct traditional interpretations of prehistoric enclosures as simplistic and static cultural features. The editors organized this volume around three primary themes that are designed to emphasize the social, symbolic, and diachronic nature of enclosures. The first theme, enclosure use (which they differentiate from function), is aimed at moving archaeological explanations beyond the traditional interpretive dichotomy, in which enclosures are seen as either ceremonial or defensive structures. Enclosure symbolism is their second theme. Contributors start with the assumption that material culture is a symbolic medium for the communication of culturally relevant information. In this context, enclosures are interpreted as material culture writ large. Their third theme is enclosure architecture. Their main objective here is to emphasize the structural evolution of these features by documenting modifications and additions throughout the life history of individual enclosures. Following their introductory chapter, readers will find the case studies organized and presented chronologically and geographically beginning with the Late Archaic period in Louisiana and concluding with Late Woodland enclosures in the Great Lakes region.

In the first case study, Jon Gibson (Chapter 2) explores the notion of distinguishing sacred and secular space in the archaeological record of the Poverty Point site. Gibson reexamines the work of pre-1950 theorists to develop a conceptual basis for religious and ritual behavior in small-scale societies and then turns to the ethnographic and historic record of southeastern indigenous societies for evidence of such behavior. He concludes that these behaviors are not distinguishable in ethnographic or ethnohistoric contexts and therefore, archaeologists should not expect to identify such distinctions archaeologically. The archaeological record of Poverty Point seems to support this assertion. For example, Gibson speculates that ritual activity alone would not account for dense accumulations of midden found at Poverty Point. Rather, such midden development is characteristic of daily domestic activities, which in his view, suggests that a full-time resident population occupied Poverty Point. If so, then the Poverty Point site was simultaneously sacred and secular.

Although I agree with Gibson's main conclusion, I find his methodological approach troubling - particularly in his extension of the ethnographic and historic record back to the Late Archaic. Even though continuities certainly exist between historic and prehistoric societies, 4,000 years is a vast amount of time. Nonetheless, this should not detract from the more theoretical aspect of his argument, which is, the line between sacred and secular in ethnographic and historic small-scale societies is blurry, if visible at all. As such, archaeologists should not expect such distinctions to appear in the archaeological record of similarly organized societies.

In Chapter 3, Dennis Jones and Carl Kutterluff summarize previous archaeological research at the Marksle enclosure in central Louisiana and report on more recent excavations at this site by the Louisiana Archaeological Society.
Their chapter represents perhaps the most pragmatic contribution to this volume and stands out as a great example of field archaeology driven by an explicit research design. The LAS excavations provide new information about the construction of the Marksburg enclosure itself, but did little to clarify its chronology since no datable materials were recovered during excavations.

Robert Thunen examines the enclosure at Pinson mounds in western Tennessee (Chapter 4). The Pinson enclosure, he points out, is unique because it forms a complete, somewhat irregular circle and is associated with a number of large flat-topped mounds. Based on his excavations there, he argues that Pinson is a "built environment" deliberately situated on a peninsula-type landform and designed to capitalize upon natural topographic features that would have emphasized its indigenous or emic perception. To Thunen, this suggests the builders possessed an "acute sense of place" that guided the planning and development of the Pinson enclosure and mounds.

The next two chapters focus on hilltop enclosures in the Ohio Valley. These chapters, especially Robert Riordan's, stand out as more interesting contributions to this volume. Both use creative theoretical approaches to model the cultural rules and natural environmental conditions that underwrote the emic perception (Riordan) and physical construction (Robert Connolly) of hilltop enclosures.

Riordan's chapter (Chapter 5) can be divided into three parts. First, he "samples" the wide variety of interpretations put forth to explain hilltop enclosures from the late 10th century to the present. In the second part of his chapter he focuses on the inter-relationship between enclosure use, bounded-ness, and landscape setting and how these variables may have affected emic interpretations of enclosures. For example, in Riordan's discussion of "Enclosures: Control and Resistance", he sets forth a conceptual vocabulary in which controlled access to enclosures, or lack thereof, as well as their seasonal and cultural visibility can be understood. In the last part of his chapter, he applies this approach to the Pollock earthworks and defines the range of cultural, symbolic, and natural modes of access and visibility at the site.

The upland setting of hilltop enclosures has led many antiquarians and archaeologists alike to assume their location was dictated by topographic considerations alone. In fact, in the previous chapter Riordan noted that "...hilltop enclosures lack the sense of planning so obvious in the geometric enclosures of the river valleys (p. 68)." Connolly's (Chapter 6) research at the Fort Ancient site forcefully confronts such interpretations and dispels the myth that upland enclosures played second fiddle to those in the lowlands of Middle Woodland Ohio. Following Esselpreis' analysis of primary gateway complexes, Connolly examines the various elements that make up secondary gateway complexes. He argues the patterned distribution of gateway elements at Fort Ancient reflects construction rules, or what he termed "canons of construction" that guided the placement, landscape preparation, and construction of hilltop enclosures. Connolly presents convincing evidence that Middle Woodland peoples significantly altered culturally selected upland landscapes to accommodate the location of hilltop enclosures.

In chapters 7 and 8, Bradley Lepper and A. Martin Byers present somewhat contrasting views of the Newark earthworks in central Ohio. Lepper (Chapter 7) synthesizes nearly 200 years of antiquarian and archaeological investigations at Newark. His interpretation is based in large part on the recent discovery of the previously unknown pre-Civil War Wyrick and Salisbury maps that, in Lepper's words, "...revolutionize our knowledge..." about the Newark earthworks. Lepper discusses the major components of the Newark complex with an eye toward use or function. He concludes that mortuary and domestic activities occurred in limited frequency, but argues that the complexity and scale of the earthworks themselves, as well as their direct, physical connection with other earthwork complexes through the "Great Hopewell Road" points to a more ritually oriented use. Lepper views the "Great Hopewell Road" as evidence for social, economic, and political integration, framed in the context of ritual, between geographically distinct Hopewelian groups. This is based on ethnohistoric accounts of Mayan saebeob, which were processional routes constructed to cultivate and maintain social, political, and economic relationships between distant Mayan centers.

Lepper's fractional reliance on this largely analogical model is Byers (Chapter 8) main point of contention. He accepts Lepper's saebeob comparison but contends that he only used those parts of the analogy that conveniently fit his "Great Hopewell Road" model. Byers argues that in order to validate such a comparison, one must adopt the entire analogy including all of its theoretical and historical baggage. In contrast, Byers offers an alternative perspective of the Newark earthworks based on a processual approach informed by interpretive hermeneutics.

More than any other contributor, Byers views enclosures as material culture that communicates and reproduces underlying structural information relevant to members of the social system responsible for the enclosure
complex itself. He argues underlying structural information is accessible by archaeologists, but requires a material clue, a "Rosetta Stone", to decode the temporal and spatial variation in the archaeological record. From here, archaeologists can enter into the social and cultural world of Middle Woodland Ohio and explore the enigmatic meaning behind the earthworks themselves. In his view, the Newark complex is the Rosetta Stone needed to decode Hopewellian enclosures. He argues the construction practices evident at Newark are the product of a belief system that considers the world an "intrinsic sacred cosmos" and prohibited the disturbance of the existing enclosure during modification or construction of new enclosure elements. He terms this belief system the "sacred-earth principle" and links it to rituals of world-renewal. In an earlier paper, Lepper challenged Byers' Rosetta Stone argument based on new information about the Newark earthworks that he derived from the Wyrick and Salisbury maps. In this chapter, Byers attempts to demonstrate that his Rosetta Stone hypothesis can not only account for Lepper's new data but also show how the Great Hopewell Road model is dependent on the validity of his hypothesis.

I found Lepper's argument to be more plausible, but perhaps only because Byers seemed overconfident in the potential of his analysis. Although Byers analysis is more thorough than Lepper's, it may leave readers unconvinced since he marshaled very little empirical data to support his assertions. Lepper's interpretation is far more conservative and therefore more tangible than that of Byers. The major problem I see with both analyses however is that they're primarily based on archival and analogical information and as a result have produced a bird's eye view of the Newark earthworks. Connolly (Chapter 6, p. 87) echoes the importance of basic empirical data when he notes that "... [without such data] meaning will be necessarily superficial in terms of the actual physical form of the built environment and consequently not [be] able to move beyond abstract theoretical models for the meaning of monumental constructions." It is unfortunate that so much of Newark has been destroyed because many of these issues could be clarified through well-planned excavations informed by the antiquarian maps in which Lepper's and Byers' analyses are based.

Moving on to the Late Woodland period, Stephanie Belovich (Chapter 9) challenges traditional assumptions that all hilltop enclosure sites in northeastern Ohio are Whittlesey period (A.D. 950-1560) fortified agricultural villages. To test this, she analyzed data from the Greenwood Village enclosure site taking into account artifacts, features, site structure, and radiocarbon dates. Her analysis points toward a Late Woodland occupation rather than a late prehistoric fortified village. This conclusion has several important implications for the study of comparable sites in this area. First, it cannot be assumed that all hilltop enclosures date to the Whittlesey period. Diagnostic ceramics and lithics from Greenwood Village are similar to those described for the Late Woodland period, which would date to sometime between A.D. 600-800. Radiocarbon dates from the site narrowed this range to the A.D. 750 ballpark. Second, it can also not be assumed that hilltop enclosures are exclusively defensive in nature. Whittlesey period enclosures typically exhibit palisades. Greenwood Village did not, which raises the possibility that palisades are absent at similar sites in the region.

Claire McHale Milner and John O'Shea (Chapter 10) consider the ways in which Late Woodland enclosures facilitate social and economic interaction during periods of increased risk. They examined the physical and social contexts of Late Woodland enclosures and found that most of them are located on or near the threshold of distinct ecological zones and boundaries between, presumably, regional social groups as demarcated by the distribution of distinct ceramic traditions. Based on these patterns, they concluded that enclosures provided an outlet for social and economic interaction that functioned to mitigate risk associated with environmental changes.

In the final chapter, Sarah Neusius, Lynn Sullivan, Phillip Neusius, and Claire McHale Milner (Chapter 11) question the antiquarian assumption that the Ripley enclosure, like Greenwood Village, is a fortified village site. They initially thought that Ripley might represent a specialized mortuary facility. They began to doubt this interpretation after analyzing the Ripley artifact assemblage, because it was inconsistent with that of contemporaneous mortuary sites in the area. In light of their interpretation, they conclude by noting that enclosures were multi-functional cultural features that may have served domestic, mortuary, ceremonial, or defensive functions — or something altogether different at one time or another throughout their life history.

With Ancient Earthen Enclosures of the Eastern Woodlands Mainfort and Sullivan have metaphorically backfilled a test pit left open through nearly two centuries of antiquarian speculation and limited archaeological research on prehistoric enclosures. On the most basic level, this volume is visually and substantively satisfying. Although its price is a bit steep, readers will find its format, style, and readability economical. It is a well-written and researched piece that is user friendly enough to entertain a
general audience, yet detailed enough to satisfy the intellectual appetites of avocational and professional archaeologists. The index and references cited sections compound its usefulness by providing a quick reference to particular aspects of this volume, as well as a bibliographic point of departure for future enclosure research. My overall impression is that the contributors more than satisfied the goals of the volume set forth by the editors in their introductory chapter. This volume goes well beyond simply proposing alternative interpretations. Rather, it literally redefines the ways in which archaeologists talk about and conceptualize prehistoric enclosures by placing direct emphasis upon their social, symbolic, and diachronic nature.

Phillip Hodge is a graduate student at the University of Southern Mississippi.


Reviewed by Christopher Davies

To say that The Petroglyphs and Pictographs of Missouri is an extremely ambitious book would be a fair statement. The book goes well beyond the typical descriptive nature of most works on the subject. Indeed, the stated goal of the book is "to illustrate how rock art production correlates with other facets of culture, particularly those of environment, specific placement of a rock art site, and ideology of cultural groups known to be related either linguistically or spatially to those who were documented as having inhabited the state at the time of contact as well as those known to have been in the area in recent times previous to contact".

Notwithstanding the lofty goal of the research, the book itself contains many useful illustrations and much factual data. Of particular interest to this reader are the numerous state maps displaying the distribution of known pictographs and petroglyphs throughout the state. These illustrations are presented for differing types of environmental setting and for separate categories of motifs. An illustration displaying the frequency of rock art by county is also quite informative. Excellent photographs and drawings of the rock art abound throughout the pages.

The book unfortunately loses the lay reader quickly in the fourth chapter. This chapter focuses on the methods of the research and contains lengthy, detailed diatribes on the "contextual approach". The following chapter has equally lengthy philosophical discussions on what exactly constitutes "style". Yet another chapter on interpretation contains a drawn-out description of the "cognitive approach" utilized by the authors. Not surprisingly, much of the book is dry and, at times, difficult to read. This book is obviously not aimed at an amateur archeologist audience, much less the lay reader. A refresher in modern archaeological theory is recommended before undertaking much of the book.

Ultimately, however, these very detailed discussions lead into some very interesting interpretations. Rock art in Missouri is tied to the creation myths and oral traditions of tribes that inhabited the state proto-historically and historically. Rock art is seen as ritual or ceremonial in nature due to its typical location away from habitation sites. Dating of rock art sites strongly suggests that most of the art was produced after agriculture and complex political systems became dominant in the region. Cahokia, located just to the east of St. Louis, is explicitly mentioned as a force for exchange of thoughts and ideas influencing rock art in the region.

In summary, The Petroglyphs and Pictographs of Missouri has its faults and its strengths. A great deal of the book is dedicated to pontificating on modern archaeological theories. Granted, some of these discussions were necessary, but not all were needed in order to adequately explain the research framework. The one question that will perplex the reader throughout the book is that of the categories. The rock art is divided into fifty-eight stylistic categories such as bird motif, banner-stone motif, and even "joined and associated squares motif". The researchers then appear to demonstrate their belief that these categories somehow mean something, regardless of the fact that they, in fact, imposed the categories upon the art.

The authors correctly noted that rock art in Missouri has been exception-ally understudied. The research presented in this book compiled a large amount of data and actually attempted to do something with it. This attempt, flawed or not, to interpret the meanings behind the petroglyphs and pictographs of Missouri must be respected. Doubtless, the authors actually intended the book to instigate productive dialogue and debate concerning the state's rock art amongst archeologists in the region. This book is recommended for professional archeologists and serious amateurs that operate in Missouri or its surrounding environs. The book is also
highly recommended for any dedicated student of pictographs and petroglyphs.

Chris Davies is an archaeologist with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Little Rock District.
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