In 1903 William Henry Holmes defined the South Appalachian Province as that region in the southeastern United States in which prehistoric ceramic surfaces were finished with carved paddle designs. Since that time archaeologists have assumed that this similarity of South Appalachian pottery indicated a degree of cultural similarity between the people who made these pots. Approximately 1000 years ago temple mound ceremonialism began to develop in the Province, and these temple mounds were associated with complicated stamped pottery. On the basis of extensive archaeological information and historical records, the appearance of this ceremonialism has been closely associated with a significant cultural change related to the introduction of an agricultural economy. This new cultural system has been termed South Appalachian Mississippian.

This paper is concerned with an analysis of the development of South Appalachian Mississippian. On the foundation of a philosophy of cultural operation presented by the author, the archaeological record has been examined and information promising to provide a holistic view of the general developmental pattern of South Appalachian Mississippian has been analyzed. The association of two traits, complicated stamped ceramics and temple mounds, was taken as representative of the developing cultural system, and the author has examined the distribution of these traits in time and space. The results of this examination have shown a definite relationship between these associated traits and the physical and cultural environment. On the basis of this distributional study the author has
developed a series of hypotheses concerning the development of South Appalachian Mississippian, which may be tested through future archaeological investigation.
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PREFACE

Background

During the past five years the author has been involved in archaeological research sponsored by the Research Laboratories of Anthropology of the University of North Carolina. This research included excavation at the Garden Creek site in western North Carolina and the Town Creek site in central North Carolina. Both of these sites are representative of prehistoric cultural systems of the Southeastern United States that were oriented toward an agricultural economy and temple mound ceremonialism. This research stimulated an interest on the part of the author in the relationship between these North Carolina archaeological manifestations and similar manifestations to the south and west in the area known as the South Appalachian Province. Preliminary research disclosed that definite spatial and temporal patterns were apparent in the archaeological record and that an examination of these patterns might lead to a better interpretation of the present information concerning prehistory. Further, and perhaps more important, a broad examination of the Province promised to lead to meaningful hypotheses that would be significant in future research design.

In choosing this topic the author has considered his own plans for future archaeological investigation. One of the primary constituents of successful archaeological investigation is the quality of hypotheses that an archaeologist tests during his research. This dissertation has enabled me to give detailed consideration to South Appalachian
Mississippian prehistory and to develop hypotheses for future investigation that are based on a broad examination of the presently available data.
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SECTION I
INTRODUCTION

Between the time of Christ and the colonization of North America by Europeans, the prehistoric cultures of the eastern United States passed through periods of dynamic cultural change. This general period of time was ushered in by the flourish of Hopewellian ceremonialism. This cultural expression emphasizing elaborate burial mound ceremonialism was centered in the Ohio and Mississippi River valleys, but the influence of the system was felt from the Rocky Mountains to the Atlantic Ocean. Recent research concerning Hopewellian cultural systems suggests that these systems operated on an economic structure that supplemented efficient hunting and gathering with a limited amount of horticulture. Living in relatively small gardening villages, the people of this cultural system supported the elaborate Hopewellian ceremonialism. Although the Hopewellian system was apparently limited by the small scale economic base from which it operated, the strength of its organizational and ideological elements prepared North American cultures for the development of the extensive agriculture characteristic of the Mississippian cultural system.

Most archaeologists feel that the nucleus for Mississippian development can be found in a hybridization of North and Middle American cultural traits. North America apparently provided an existing cultural base ripe for the adoption of extensive corn agriculture, and the Middle American cultural system was ready for the role of cultural transmitter.
Although the Mississippian system has been most commonly characterized by the existence of large truncated pyramidal mounds used for the support of temple structures, perhaps the most important element in the Mississippian development was the economic base. As a result of some type of stimulus, probably an improved variety of corn from Middle America, the Mississippian Period ushered extensive agricultural practices into eastern North America; and upon this economic foundation cultural systems rapidly expanded. The climax of the development of this type of cultural system appears to have been somewhere in the valley of the Mississippi River, and most archaeologists agree that this area was the "birth place" of Mississippianism. Regardless of its "birth place," the Mississippian cultural system grew, and its influence was felt over a large portion of the East. Effects of the expanding sphere of Mississippian influence were felt in the forests of southern Wisconsin, in the valley of the Ohio River, and the farthest extremities of the southeastern United States in the area now called the South Appalachian Province (Map 1). (Map 2 shows geographical features of the Province.) In this Provincial region indigenous cultural elements fused with the new elements of Mississippianism, and a new cultural system was born. In the South Appalachian Province the resulting culture was rivaled only by the climax in the Mississippi valley region itself; and, as such, the South Appalachian Province provides one of the most pertinent areas of the study of peripheral Mississippian development in the eastern United States.

Although several syntheses have previously included the South Appalachian Province, these syntheses have either treated the Province as part of a larger area of discussion or have treated only a limited
portion of the Province itself. In the definitive article on the South Appalachian Province, "Aboriginal Pottery of the Eastern United States" (1903), Wendell Holmes considered the Province as a unit in the discussion of the pottery of half of the North American continent. Following Holmes' initial discussion, several syntheses have treated the South Appalachian Province (Ford and Willey 1941, Griffin 1952, Caldwell 1958, Sears 1964, Griffin 1967, and Ford 1969). With the exception of Griffin's 1952 work these syntheses have treated the Province in a manner similar to Holmes—as a portion of a larger geographical and/or cultural area. James B. Griffin's edited volume *Archeology of the Eastern United States* (1952) is a somewhat different case. Although this volume is, in a sense, a synthesis of the archaeology of the entire East, the sections include regional discussions by specific regional archaeologists. In this publication the South Appalachian Province was treated by six separate articles, and the geographic divisions of the articles were based on the interests of local archaeologists. This division is quite understandable when we consider that rigorous archaeological investigation in the East had begun only during the Depression years, and most of the division of archaeological activity was based on political boundaries rather than cultural areas.

One of the results of this problem of geographical concentration, is that archaeological problems have not been developed with reference to large culturally meaningful areas; rather they have often been limited to the political region within which various Southeastern archaeologists have been working. To be sure, archaeologists have taken other areas into consideration, but the concentrated development of problems and the testing of those problems through archaeological
research has usually been undertaken at the local level. While locally developed problems are pertinent and important, it seems that problem formulation should be extended beyond the local situation. With a wide number of hypotheses archaeological investigation will be more comprehensive and lead to a better understanding of culture. The present paper is an effort to consider the goals of archaeological theory in the construction of a synthesis that contributes a number of broad hypotheses which may be tested through local investigations.

Presentation of this synthesis of South Appalachian Mississippianism involves three major sections. First, a cultural model—a philosophy of culture—is developed to be used in the synthesis of the cultural process of the Province during the period of interest. This model emphasizes the operation of culture as a variety of integrated subsystems articulating with the environment to provide for human needs. The model gives equal emphasis to the change and continuity of cultural systems. Second, the archaeological record of the South Appalachian Province, covering the period from the beginning of interest in the area to the most recent archaeological reports is reviewed. In this review an attempt is made to go beyond saying "who did what and when." The amount and nature of pertinent archaeological material in the Province are evaluated, and various interpretations based on this material are given consideration. Through this type of analysis we gain insight into the weak points of Provincial archaeology, and we can begin to point out areas that need attention in future investigation. The third and final portion of this paper consists of a synthesis of the information presented in the earlier sections. With an understanding of the type of problems we are trying to solve and the information
already available in the archaeological record, this last section is a
discussion of South Appalachian prehistory with an emphasis on apparent
patterns in the prehistoric record of the Province. These patterns are
presented primarily as hypotheses, which will require more investigation
and more testing before they may unequivocally be accepted as interpre-
tations of the prehistory of the Province.

As in any discussion of archaeological manifestations, to be as
explicit as possible concerning the unit of discussion is desirable.
In limiting the topic of discussion in this paper, two criteria—one
covering space; the other, time—are employed. Both criteria have been
selected on the basis of the significance to the cultural processes in
the region. The spatial unit is that described by Holmes as the South
Appalachian Province (1903: 130) (Map 1).

A culture province of somewhat marked characteristics comprises
the states of Georgia, South Carolina, and contiguous portions

The ceramic phenomena of this province include one great
group of products to which has been given the name South
Appalachian stamped ware, and also several less distinctly
marked varieties, belonging, in the main, to groups typically
developed in neighboring areas.

Although this definition of Holmes' was made on the basis of pottery
style alone, more recent investigations have indicated that a group of
cultural systems subjected to similar environmental constraints and
having similar cultural adaptations comprised the area covered by paddle
stamped pottery in the Southeast. This more holistic cultural aspect
of the Province has been emphasized by more recent writers. Caldwell
and Sears (Caldwell 1958, Sears 1964) have used the term South
Appalachian Tradition to include the primary cultural tradition asso-
ciated with complicated stamped ceramics. The term South Appalachian,
because it is thus associated with a lengthy tradition, imparts a connotation of the indigenous cultural characteristics of the Province as well as a geographical definition. The indigenous strain or the tradition of the South Appalachian Province lasted with enduring tenacity through periods of drastic change; and although the operation of the systems changed through time, these systems retained elements of local character.

As the prefix South Appalachian is important to the area under consideration and to the local cultural tradition, the term Mississippian is important to the time and newly developed cultural elements of the Province. Mississippian relates to change in the Province; it represents the appearance of new elements in the cultural systems, powerful elements which basically changed the operation of culture in the Province. Thus, the temporal unit of this discussion is that period during which Mississippian characteristics were developed in the South Appalachian Province. The period of discussion corresponds to that period familiarly referred to by most North American archaeologists as the Mississippian Period. This period is related to the cultural manifestation of the eastern United States which fits into the Mississippian Pattern of the Midwestern Taxonomic System (McKern 1939). Griffin's (1967) combination of the term South Appalachian Mississippian has an obvious attraction. South Appalachian Mississippian contains a spatial and temporal implication as well as the implication of the combination of two cultural systems, and as such it is quite apt to the present level of understanding of the prehistory of the South Appalachian Province.

Because of the importance of the term Mississippian and the
frequent misunderstanding of this term by archaeologists, the definition as utilized in this paper deserves consideration. Mississippian has a long and tortuous history in Eastern North American archaeology. In the Midwestern Taxonomic System it was a term of cultural content with no meaning in time and space. A generic term, the Mississippian Pattern consisted of a number of aspects in the terminology of the system which included the appearance of temple mounds and large scale agriculture.

The term Mississippian was used with reference to the South Appalachian Province only a short time after the development of the Midwestern System. A. R. Kelly, working in central Georgia, was quick to recognize the similarity of Provincial cultural expressions to the Mississippian cultural pattern (Kelly 1938: 66, 67).

There is no doubt but that the early stamped pottery categories perceived to have stratified and typological distinctiveness, widespread ecological distribution, and consistent seriations in various associated traits, represent in toto assemblages clearly basic—reminiscent of a "Woodland" pattern.

Similarly, Macon Plateau, particularly in its later stage of development, manifests the broad definitive features of the Mississippian basic culture. A Mississippian influx of cultural traits has been remarked in Lamar-like sites in Georgia, with the correlated conclusion that refocalization was widespread and characteristic.

Following the early usage of the term Mississippian as outlined by the Midwestern Taxonomic System, archaeologists began to use the terminology with a temporal and often spatial implication; but the cultural content elements in the initial outline were still present. The temporal term Mississippian Period was first used in the Archeology of Eastern United States (Griffin ed. 1952) as the designation of a specific span of time in eastern prehistory. The definition of the Period is given by Griffin (1952: 361) as follows:
This new cultural expansion [Mississippian] may be said to begin with the appearance of the pyramidal earthen mound in the southeast. This was utilized as a substructure for the important buildings of the community, such as the dwelling of the outstanding political chief, or as the center of operations of the outstanding religious leader. This pyramidal mound and associated plaza complex reflects both a new form of social organization and more extensive utilization of agricultural crops than anything which had gone on before, so that they have become the primary symbol of the Mississippi period and we can say that this general culture development begins with its introduction.

Thus, Mississippian in the terminology of American archaeologists began to have a double meaning—time and culture. According to Griffin the Mississippian Period began with the appearance of certain specialized cultural elements in the eastern United States and ended with the appearance of the European cultural system in North America (1952: 362).

More recently, Griffin (1967) has used the term Mississippian in a summary of North American archaeology. In this article Griffin (1967: 189) defined the term Mississippian in the following manner:

The term "Mississippian" is used here to refer to the wide variety of adaptations made by societies which developed a dependence upon agriculture for their basic, storable food supply (Fig. 5).

Here, Griffin used the term in a more generic sense than it had ever appeared in the past in that he related it entirely to the economic system. In a figure in his summary (1967: Fig. 5) Griffin delineates four types of Mississippian, each spatially and, to a degree, culturally different: Middle Mississippian, Caddoan Mississippian, Palquemine Mississippian, and South Appalachian Mississippian. In addition to these units which contain the term Mississippian, Griffin also associated the manifestations of Fort Ancient, Oneota, Elisher, Huber, and Monongahela with Mississippianism. The terminology South Appalachian, then, represents, according to Griffin, those cultural systems of the
South Appalachian Province which are associated with extensive agriculture.

The terminology of South Appalachian Mississippian used in this paper corresponds relatively closely to the usage employed by Griffin, but we would suggest that South Appalachian Mississippian should have more emphasis placed on the cultural side of the definition than was stated by Griffin. Although agriculture seems to be an integral part of Mississippianism, in most situations we find that a more holistic definition might be useful. Mississippianism as it is used in this paper consists of a variety of elements, some of which are more basic than others. Although extensive agriculture is one of the most basic, other cultural elements should probably be included in the definition of Mississippian. Large villages and extensive populations, temple mounds, palisaded villages, certain elements of ceremonialism, and a number of other attributes are also characteristic of the complex cultural system which is known as Mississippian. Of course, archaeological manifestations need not have all of the elements of the Mississippian system in order to be classified as Mississippian; rather they need only contain a minimum number of characteristics. For instance, if a group of people with Mississippian ideas traveled into an area with abundant natural resources, the group might retain elements of the Mississippian organizational pattern, temple mound construction, the Southern Cult, or any number of other Mississippian characteristics without employing extensive agriculture. Yet, this archaeological manifestation may have enough Mississippian characteristics to be included in the Mississippian cultural system.

As far as the archaeology of the South Appalachian Province is
concerned, little direct evidence from various archaeological manifestations concerning the extent of the employment of agriculture by the prehistoric cultural systems exists. Yet, many of the mounds of the Province are, indeed, temple mounds; and some of these mounds have been associated with large populations and extensive agriculture such as the manifestation at Macon Plateau. From this type of information from other Mississippian manifestations, we may hypothesize that the truncated pyramidal mounds of the Province may be temple mounds and that they may relate to the broad Mississippian cultural system, including extensive agriculture. Further, we may suggest that other sites of similar cultural constituents but without temple mounds may also be related to the Mississippian pattern of culture.

In this synthesis a special emphasis is placed on developing hypotheses concerning the cultural chronology and processes of South Appalachian Mississippianism. Because most of the information from the Province concerns the location and investigation of mound sites, this paper will be so concentrated. However, this emphasis shall be in the tone of providing hypotheses concerning the entirety of South Appalachian Mississippian culture, for the understanding of prehistory requires the understanding of entire cultural systems.
SECTION II
AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL MODEL

Archaeological field activity and the treatment of archaeological data are dependent upon a number of factors; however, knowledge of previous archaeological investigation and philosophy concerning the nature of the topic of study--culture and the physical biology of man--are particularly significant in the determination of the direction of archaeological research. On the basis of this background the archaeologist formulates hypotheses, tests their validity, and contributes the results to an increased understanding of culture.

Recently, Binford (1965) has explicitly pointed out that the cultural theory proposed by Leslie White (White 1949, 1954, 1959) is readily adaptable to archaeology. White's general thesis (White 1949: 363) is that culture is "... an elaborate mechanism, an organization of extra-somatic ways and means employed by a particular animal species, man, in the struggle for existence and survival." Culture is man's extra-somatic means of adaptation. White has also suggested that culture may be viewed as a system, i.e., as an intercommunicating group of cultural attributes, which combine to make the cultural whole. Combining these characteristics of culture, we can say that culture is a system oriented toward providing the needs of man by operating on the environment. Here the term "needs" goes beyond the biological needs of man and includes culturally-generated needs, such as those for system maintenance.
In addition to his recognition of culture as an adaptive system, White notes that cultural systems may be broken into three subsystems: ideological, sociological, and technological (White 1949: 364).

Because culture is viewed as an adaptive system, it follows that the elements of technology are of primary importance in providing subsistence and, therefore, limit the alternatives of culture. The technological capability of a given cultural system is the most independent factor of culture; and the configuration of the ideological and sociological systems are ultimately dependent upon technology. Social organization is required for the operation of the technology, and the social organization together with technology are related to the gross characteristics of ideology. If culture is viewed as a series of strata with technology at the base, ideology at the top, and social organization in the center, then the degree of dependence of variables increases with ascendance in the strata (Fig. 1).
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Fig. 1. Strata of culture.
Within cultural systems White sees technology and the comparable units of social organization and ideology as subsystems of the total cultural system, that is, as a more limited group of intercommunicating cultural attributes belonging to one of the three specific categories. The nature of the content of these subsystems is described by White in some detail (White 1941: 364).

The technological system is composed of the material, mechanical, physical, and chemical instruments, together with the techniques of their use, by means of which man, as an animal species, is articulated with his natural habitat. Here we find the tools of production, the means of subsistence, the materials of shelter, the instruments of offense and defense. The sociological system is made up of interpersonal relations expressed in patterns of behavior, collective as well as individual. In this category we find social, kinship, economic, ethical, political, military, ecclesiastical, occupational and professional, recreational, etc., systems. The ideological system is composed of ideas, beliefs, knowledge, expressed in articulate speech or other symbolic form. Mythologies and theologies, legend literature, philosophy, science, folk wisdom and common sense knowledge, make up this category.

White's model of the subsystems of culture is valid; and the elements of each category comprise a cultural subsystem. Yet culture is referred to as a system drawing elements from all three categories of culture to operate on the environment. The subsystems of culture may be considered to be goal oriented (Flannery 1968). However, the subsystems defined by White are orthogonal to the total cultural system. These subsystems cannot operate on the environment because all of the elements of one of these subsystems does not constitute an operational subunit of culture: they cannot be goal oriented. The elements of technology alone do not and cannot perform a subunit of the activity of culture. The subsystems of White are not independent units of the cultural system. However, if we view the subsystems of culture as intersecting the stratified categories of culture rather than being
parallel to them, we have a set of subsystems congruent with the orientation of the cultural system itself (Fig. 2). Then, these subsystems have a relative degree of independence.

Fig. 2. The total cultural system, showing the operation of subsystems.

The subsystems of culture referred to in this paper are subsystems which draw a few elements from each of the three categories of culture in order to perform specific operations. As an example we might say that within the cultural system of the Creek Indians of the Southeastern United States there was a subsystem operating to provide the food staple corn. Involved in this subsystem were all of the elements of technology required to grow corn. Additional elements of this subsystem would have been such elements of social organization as matrilocality, which implemented the technology of corn agriculture and such elements of ideology as the Busk ceremony, which interacted with the
supernatural in order that the efforts of agriculture be fruitful. These elements, then, working together in a systematic manner, made up an active subsystem of Creek culture. Besides this subsystem a variety of other subsystems would together have supplied all of the needs of the people and thus have enabled them to adapt to the environment.

Now, the subsystems defined in this manner are completely independent. The subsystems of a cultural system may well be related, and elements of one subsystem may be involved in the activity of another: that is, we cannot think of subsystems with mutually exclusive elements. Nevertheless, this concept of cultural subsystems has the advantage of coinciding with the actual operation of culture. Within the category of technology we expect elements to have relationships one with another, but we expect the elements of a goal-oriented subsystem of culture to have even closer relationships because they are all involved in the same activity. For example, take two technical elements from our modern technological inventory: armored tanks and fire hydrants. The tank is controlled by and interacts with the military organization; whereas the fire hydrant is similarly related to a community or municipal organization. Each of these items is an element of technology, but each is related to the organization that controls it more closely than either is related to the other. These technological elements are components of separate systems directed toward different goals, and each is intimately related to the operation of its respective subsystem.

After having recognized that culture is a series of subsystems operating on the environment, we can explicitly state this model of culture by representing relationships between basis elements of culture. By definition we will let the lower case letters i, o, and t represent
irreducible elements of ideology, organization, and technology within a given subsystem of culture. Examples of these elements may be a platform mound, a clan, or a stone hoe--elements of culture. Letting the letter \( \alpha \) represent any type of relationship which might exist between these elements, we can say that it will be possible to show various types of relationships between these elements of culture. A shorthand statement of this relationship would be

\[
i \propto o \propto t \propto e
\]

(1)

The nature of the relationship may remain unknown, but it is still of value to recognize relationships between the various elements of culture. These elements and their relationships make up a portion of the cultural subsystem operating on the environment. Assuming that any relationship of systematic elements of culture is in some way related to at least one element of the environment, represented by \( e \), we can write a further relationship.

\[
i \propto o \propto t \propto e
\]

(2)

So far, we have been talking about irreducible elements of a subsystem of culture and the related specific element of the environment. In order to express this relationship for any subsystem of culture, we must sum all of the relationships that exist for that subsystem. If we let the letters \( N, M, P, \) and \( H \) represent the total number of elements within any unit of a given subsystem and the lower case letters represent any specific element, we can sum (\( \sum_{n=1}^{N} i_n \) is the sum from \( n=1 \) to \( n=N \) of all irreducible elements of ideology in a particular subsystem) over all of these elements in order to show the relationship for that specific subsystem.
The subsystems of culture are dynamic. They vary with both time and space. Further, the environment to which they are related is also related to variations in space and time. Therefore, we can relate the operation of any given subsystem, which we shall denote as \( q \), to time and space variables \((S, T)\).

\[
\sum_{n=1}^{N} \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sum_{p=1}^{P} \sum_{h=1}^{H} m = l m = l q_m e_{ph} = S, T
\]

Of course, the most general expression for the activity of culture will be the summation of all of the subsystems of a cultural system. If we denote the letter \( Q \) to represent the total number of subsystems (each denoted by a different value of lower case \( q \)), then we can sum for an expression of the total cultural system with the environment and space and time.

\[
\sum_{q=1}^{Q} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sum_{p=1}^{P} \sum_{h=1}^{H} q_n o_{qm} t_{qp} e_{qh} = S, T
\]

The result is a general expression showing a set of relationships of a cultural system involved in the activity of adaptation to the environment.

Certainly, in addition to the relationships existing in each of the subsystems of a cultural system, there are relationships between elements of each of the separate units of culture. For instance, we may recognize a relationship between elements of the ideological unit of culture, such as the hypothetical possibility that temples tend to have alters; so there are a variety of relationships which are not directed in the same manner as the defined subsystems of the culture.
However, these elements will be expressed in the subsystem's pattern as elements of the total set of elements involved in any given subsystem. Further, there is no reason that subsystems may not have certain elements in common, such as the same type of organizational elements being useful in fishing as in planting the fields. As previously indicated, the subsystems of a cultural system are not necessarily mutually exclusive.

When studying cultural anthropology, we are continuously hypothesizing relationships in culture and testing to see if these relationships are valid. From the general relationship of culture given in relationship (5) we draw as many hypothetical relationships as we desire on the basis of our observation and test them for validity. During the early years of archaeology in the South Appalachian Province, many simple examples of this type of logical deductive analysis were employed. While working at Macon Plateau, A. R. Kelly immediately recognized, through observation, variation in the ceramics that were found. On the basis of this observed variation and the knowledge that ceramic variation had been related to chronology in the American Southwest, Kelly hypothesized that the variation of the ceramics of the Macon area was related to time. Kelly had hypothesized that one element of technology was related to time. The next step was to test the validity of this relationship; and it will be pointed out in the next chapter how this hypothetical relationship was tested through the examination of stratigraphy and style and, in later years, through the use of absolute dating. The end result was to show some relationship between an element of technology and time. The next logical step was to hypothesize a relationship between the elements of ceramic
technology and space. Showing this relationship required locating artifacts in space, and one of the purposes of the northern Georgia survey of Robert Wauchope was to do just that. Almost simultaneously with the attempts to relate ceramics of the Southeast to time and space there was a tendency to relate the ceramic element of technology to specific forms of cultural systems, and such a relation carried into the suggestion that similar elements of technology are related to one cultural system and to no other. Yet, the possible pitfalls to which this type of reasoning may lead are clearly evident in the understanding of relationship (5). An understanding of cultural systems involves the understanding of all of the network of relationships within the subsystems of culture. All of the relationships and all of the subsystems are not available to archaeologists; but we must seek to define as many as possible; and until all of the subsystems are defined, we cannot completely explain what happened in prehistory.

Examining an area such as the South Appalachian Province requires that we look first for the elements of cultural evidence that we can control. Albert Spaulding (1960) has pointed out that the "dimensions" of archaeology are space, time, and form; and to understand the process of prehistory we must control all three of these dimensions. Essentially, the prerequisite for understanding cultural process involves observation of the change of the form of culture through time and space. Once culture can be observed over a significant period of time, perhaps we can begin to identify the action of variables in the process of change. Archaeological investigation and interpretation in a specific unit of space define form: it is the definition of the various subsystems or portions of subsystems of culture that are evident on an
archaeological site. The successful definition of form and location in space gives us a portion of the overall relationship. Form is dependent upon the interpretation of the excavated material. After the formal interpretation is presented, we must seek to locate form in time. We are well aware that due to such factors as diffusion (as outlined in the age-area concept) and the Law of Superposition, the location of specific form in space may give some information concerning the relative position in time: that is, space and time are not independent functions as far as cultural form is concerned. With control of all three of these variables at a specific point in space and related to a specific environment, we can begin to compare this group of relationships to other relationships removed in space and/or time in an effort to examine the variation of types of cultural systems with space, time, and the environment.

As far as the South Appalachian Province is concerned, then, the goal of archaeology is to define the form of as many subsystems of cultural systems as can be defined for as many points in space and time as can be controlled. With this information we would be able to examine the variation of cultural systems with time, space, and the environment. Although the state of archaeology in the Province has not reached the point of complete explanation of culture in terms of the previously stated model, in the present paper we take initial and directed steps toward such an analysis. We have a significant amount of information concerning the distribution in time and space of certain elements, such as ceramics and temple mounds. Utilization of this information provides a hypothetical preview of the pattern of cultural development in the late prehistory of the Province.
On the basis of archaeological and historical evidence we can assume that temple mounds are, in some manner, related to the introduction of large scale agriculture and to the complex development of cultural systems accompanying agriculture. In some cases we suspect that temple mound construction is related to systems in which the primary effort of the culture is directed toward the production of corn. In others, perhaps those cultures in the formative stages of agricultural development, the temple mound may represent no more than contact with cultural systems practicing extensive agriculture. The analysis of temple mounds and ceramics alone cannot produce detailed and quantitative information concerning cultural process; however, the explanation of the pattern of temple mounds in space and time and the associated ceramic assemblages can lead to hypotheses concerning the broad picture of cultural change in the South Appalachian Province. These hypotheses may in turn be tested through future archaeological investigation in the process of providing more information concerning the picture of South Appalachian Mississippian development.
SECTION III
THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL RECORD

A. THE EARLY ARCHAEOLOGICAL RECORD

Archaeology within the South Appalachian Province is still in the stage of youth. Our knowledge of the location and contents of prehistoric sites is, at best, a fragmentary and unorganized body of information. Yet, from this body of information we must draw our hypotheses for the construction of problems for further archaeological investigation. As a result we must endeavor to draw the maximum amount of reliable information from all of the available records relating to the prehistory of the South Appalachian Province. Archaeological sites are on the face of a changing topography; today they are not as they were a century ago. The destructive forces of erosion and of men have drawn their toll from the sites left as a legacy of the prehistory of the Continent. For a portion of a description of this legacy we turn to early travelers and investigators for their comments on observations concerning the prehistoric sites of the Province.

One of the most observant and verbose of the commentators of South Appalachian Province "monuments" was also one of the earliest. In 1776 William Bartram, a naturalist from Philadelphia, embarked on a trip from Charleston, South Carolina into the interior of the colonies of South Carolina, Georgia, and North Carolina. Bartram's description of his trip into the heart of "Indian country" (1791) includes accounts of
Indian sites that were occupied at the time of his visit as well as sites that had evidently been abandoned some time before his observations. During his travels he visited and described the Evelyn Mound at the mouth of the Altamaha River, the Macon Plateau group, and the Lamar Mound. Traveling to the east, he visited and described the now destroyed mounds of Silver Bluff and Rembert on the Savannah River. Moving from the central region of the Savannah River, Bartram traveled into the heart of the country of the Cherokee. First he visited the town of Keowee in South Carolina; then, moving to North Carolina, he visited and described the Cherokee towns of Sticoe, Echoe, Nucasse (Nikwasi), and Whatoga. In many cases he described mound structures associated with these Cherokee towns.

Of an interpretative nature Bartram was evidently biased with respect to the mounds for he continually tried to ascribe them to a "remote period" (Bartram as quoted in Waring 1968: 288) despite the fact that he had pointed out that the "use of mounds in conjunction with Creek ceremonial had been abandoned only recently." With respect to the antiquity of the mounds on historic Cherokee sites, Bartram noted (Bartram 1791: 296 as quoted in Coe 1961: 53) that the

Cherokees themselves are as ignorant as we are, by what people or for what purpose these artificial hills were raised; . . . that they found them in much the same condition as they now appear, when their forefathers arrived from the West.

Coe (1961: 52, 53) has recently pointed out that Bartram's comments concerning the mounds of the Cherokee have often been taken as "prima facie" evidence for the facts that the mounds of the Cherokee were built by someone who had preceded them and that the Cherokee did not build mounds. Coe (1961: 54) continues by stating that " . . . both of
those assumptions are untenable in light of present knowledge and that Bartram's statements should be considered in the same spirit as his descriptions of the 'Elysian fields' and the 'Companies of young, innocent Cherokee virgins.' Thus, while we can accept the descriptions of Bartram, his interpretations must be evaluated in the light of modern archaeological and historical evidence.

Bartram's comments on the mounds encountered on his travels through the Southeastern Province were followed by many references to the large mound sites in the area. The large site of Etowah was first mentioned in 1819 by the Rev. Elias Cornelius, and later it received further attention in John Haywood's *Natural and Aboriginal History of Tennessee* (1823). This began a tradition of publishing in scholarly journals, articles concerning the mounds of the Southeast. Most of these articles related directly to the mounds as objects of interest and curiosity. The story of the mounds as far as most people were concerned was still quite a mystery; and interpretation was open to the wildest of speculations, most of which centered around the idea that the mounds were built by an extinct "race of people." Waring (1968: 289) quoted in his notes on the history of archaeology in Georgia that Cornelius felt, "It seems probable that they were erected by another race, who once inhabited the country. That such a race existed is now generally admitted."

Amid this atmosphere of mystery concerning the mounds of the Southeast, and for that matter the entire eastern United States, some publications still valuable to practicing archaeologists appeared. One of these publications was Ephraim Squier and Edwin Davis' *Ancient Monuments of the Mississippi Valley* (1848). Squier and Davis' location
and description of certain mound sites is a valuable collection of information on artifacts and sites. These two investigators produced excellent plates of a number of mound sites. Of importance to the present study is an article contributed by Dr. William Blanding from Camden, South Carolina concerning archaeological sites in the central portion of the state. Blanding (1848) described numerous mounds on the banks of the Wateree River near his home in Camden; and Squier and Davis reprinted a map drawn by Blanding (1848: Plate XXXVII), which located mound and village sites along the river. Blanding supplied a short description concerning each site listed on the map. He wrote of the McDowell (Mulberry) Mound, later excavated by the Bureau of American Ethnology and the University of Georgia (1848: 107),

On the opposite side of the river, about two hundred yards below the mouth of Pine-tree creek, is a group of mounds, surrounded by a low embankment (J). One of them has been nearly washed away by the river, and the others have been much reduced by cultivation. The largest is yet twelve or fifteen feet high, with a very wide base. From these mounds are disclosed arrow-heads, axes, urns, and other vestiges of art, accompanied by human bones and the bones of wild animals, and marine shells, all much decayed. As the water washes away the side of the mound on its bank, charcoal, urns, bones, etc., in successive strata, are exposed; as though it had constituted a cemetery, receiving deposits from time to time, from its commencement to its completion. The strata vary in thickness from six to eighteen inches, and are mixed with much mica, sometimes in large plates. It was long under cultivation in corn, then indigo, and in 1806, when I first saw it, in cotton, which is still cultivated on it. On the large mound stood the overseer's house; around it, on the smaller piles, were the negro quarters.

The year following the publication of Squier and Davis' lengthy work, George White published a volume of statistics on the state of Georgia (1849). Included in this compilation was a description of some of the mound sites of Georgia, one of which was the Rembert Mound group on the Savannah River (1849: 229-230). Later, in 1854 he published
another book (White 1854) containing information from Georgia deemed of a historical nature, but included descriptions of prehistoric mound sites.

During the 1850's Henry Schoolcraft presented his multivolume works on the American Indians (1851-1857, 1860). The first series bore the title Historical and Statistical Information Respecting the History, Condition and Prospects of the Indian Tribes of the United States; the second, the title of Archives of Aboriginal Knowledge. As had been the case with Blanding's report in Squier and Davis' work, Schoolcraft's "Archives" contained a few accounts of archaeological manifestations in central South Carolina: "Archaeological Indian Remains in S. C." (Schoolcraft 1860: 88-91); "An Essay on the Antiquities of the Congaree Indians of S. C." (Howe 1860: 155-168); and "The Tribal Relations of the Carolina Indians to the Leading Ethnographic Families of the Country" (Schoolcraft 1860: 179-182). The first article contained descriptions and pictures of a few artifacts from the Camden area, and the last article was a rather generalized account of some of the historic tribes of the region and their relationship to such groups as the Iroquois and the tribes of Virginia. The second article, written by Rev. George Howe, contained a description of artifacts from the vicinity of the present city of Columbia. Howe described and illustrated (1860: 160-162, Plate 16, Fig. A) a series of artifacts (including burial urns and skeletal material uncovered by a flood of the Congaree River in 1852. Referencing the Darlington Flag, May 7, 1851, he commented (1860: 162) that a burial urn owned by the museum of the South Carolina College, "... was from an Indian mound near Darlington, in which great numbers were found."
Interest in the monumental structures of the South Appalachian Province continued to grow during the last half of the Nineteenth Century, and descriptive accounts of the mounds within the Province appeared in books and journals with increasing frequency. Charles C. Jones, a necessarily retired colonel of the Confederacy and past mayor of Savannah, published a lengthy description of the Antiquities of the Southern Indians, Particularly of the Georgia Tribes (1873). In this report Jones described the nature and location of a number of mounds in the state of Georgia as well as a variety of relics that had been gleaned from the countryside. This, however, was only the largest of Jones' reports concerning the antiquities of the prehistoric inhabitants of Georgia; he also published a number of shorter articles for various journals (1869, 1878a, 1878b), treating topics similar to those covered in his larger volume.

In addition to Jones' contributions to the literature concerning the antiquities of Georgia, other writers published descriptions of the mound sites of the state. Charles Whittlesey wrote three accounts of the large group of mounds on the Etowah River near Cartersville, Georgia (1871, 1872, 1883). M. F. Stephenson wrote similar articles concerning the mound sites of northern Georgia (1870, 1872, 1873). William McKinley (1873) described the shell mound on Sapelo Island in Georgia and the large mound site of Kolomoki in Early County on the other side of the state. Benjamin Kent mentioned the impressive stone mounds near Eatonton and a few other sites in his comments on "Mounds in Putnam County, Georgia" (1883).

Jones as well as other writers of the period made clear implications that the mounds of the Southeast were the work of the American
Indians and not of a mysterious "race of mound builders." However, the myth of the mound builders remained. Then, into the milieu of questioning and speculation concerning the mounds came the United States government. In 1881 Congress independently added five thousand dollars to the appropriations bill for the newly established Bureau of American Ethnology. This money was to be "... expended in continuing archaeological investigation relating to mound-builders and prehistoric mounds" (Silverberg 1968: 172). Within the next year, Cyrus Thomas became the head of the Mound Division of the Bureau of American Ethnology directed by Major John Powell. From this point the systematic investigation of the mounds of the East began, and a force of the Division was sent to the Southeastern United States. Georgia, having a number of well known mounds, received the brunt of the Southeastern attack.

Waring (1968: 292-293) in "A History of Georgia Archaeology" gives an excellent description of the tactics of the Mound Division in Georgia. The vanguard of the operation was John P. Rogan, who began Georgia investigations in 1884. Rogan, no doubt becoming an ubiquitous figure in northern Georgia, worked in White, Rabun, Habersham, McIntosh, Forsyth, Elbert, and Bartow Counties. In Elbert County he excavated in the Rembert Mound group on the banks of the Savannah. Moving to the west, he settled his operations in Bartow County in northwestern Georgia. Here, he excavated in the Ben Akerman Mound, the Conyers Mound, the Rowland Mounds, the Edwards Mound, and the C. T. Shelman Mound; and he eventually attacked the large Etowah group. His excavations in Mound B and Mound C at Etowah created a degree of excitement in Washington. In Mound C Rogan discovered several stone box graves which produced the
impressive copper Eagle Plates now recognized as elements of the Southern Cult. The recovered artifacts stimulated continued research at Etowah; however, later results were not as spectacular as the early excavations in Mound C (Holmes 1884; Thomas 1884, 1894: 292-325, 1907).

While Rogan was excavating in northern Georgia, Edward Palmer was busy digging a hole in the large mound at Kolomoki; and Henry L. Reynolds was investigating the Hollywood Mound on the Savannah River a few miles below Augusta. Palmer's report on the excavation at Kolomoki never reached the press. On the other hand, Reynolds' excavation at the Hollywood site was presented in some detail in the Twelfth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology (Thomas 1894: 317-326). Waring (1968: 293) has referred to the excavation of the Hollywood Mound by Reynolds as "the most competent single excavation performed in Georgia during this period of Bureau activity." Later, after the mound investigation project was terminated, Reynolds was sent to South Carolina to investigate mounds along the drainage of the Wateree River. Although he was able to investigate the McDowell Mounds in Kershaw District, South Carolina (Thomas 1894: 326-327), other investigations were curtailed by his death.

Like Blanding's and Howe's notes on the antiquities of the drainage of the Congaree and Wateree Rivers in South Carolina, Thomas' report on the excavations of the Hollywood and McDowell Mounds forms a valuable part of the fragmentary archaeological record of the central portion of the Atlantic Coastal Plain region. With the exception of a small excavation at Hollywood by De Baillou (1965), Thomas' report is the sole description of the excavation of the Hollywood Mounds; and his report on the McDowell Mound is the only published description of the
exploration of a mound in Kershaw District.

During the continuous program of the Mound Division, the annual reports of the Bureau contained articles concerning the exploration of mounds. These articles included reports on investigations in Tennessee, Georgia, Alabama, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Florida—all of the states which constitute the South Appalachian Province. The two major reports of the Division were the "Catalogue of Prehistoric Works East of the Rockies" (Thomas 1891) and the monumental "Report of the Mound Explorations of the Bureau of Ethnology" (Thomas 1894). This latter report directly refuted the myth of an extinct "race" of mound builders. Although the myth hung in the air for a few more years, it was essentially dead when the results of the investigations of the Mound Division were made public.

During the latter years of the Nineteenth Century, a great many things related to the archaeology in the South Appalachian Province began to happen. In Richmond, Virginia, a wealthy businessman, Mann S. Valentine, became interested in the collection of antiquities and in the excavation and preservation of information concerning prehistoric sites. Particularly interested in western North Carolina, he designated A. J. Osborne of Canton to represent him in buying artifacts for the museum and in excavating certain sites in the mountain area. Osborne collected a mass of material for Valentine and in doing so dug holes into several of the mound sites in western North Carolina. Original copies of the notes of Osborne, Valentine, and Valentine's sons, who participated in the collection of the material, are still on file in the Valentine Museum, Richmond, Virginia. The Research Laboratories of Anthropology of the University of North Carolina has
obtained copies of most of the primary information describing the activities of the Museum in western North Carolina and has acquired a small portion of the original collection.

While Mann S. Valentine was collecting information from western North Carolina, Clarence B. Moore was beginning to attack the South Appalachian Province from all flanks. Undoubtedly, Moore should receive the title of the most enthusiastic and successful collector of Indian antiquities in the last century. Moore traveled the water courses of the Southeast in his stern-wheeler dubbed "Gopher" and searched for sites that would produce relics. Primarily, he dug in mounds, and illustrations in his reports give evidence of the success of his endeavor. Moore's early work was done on the east coast of Florida, after which he moved north to investigate sites along the coast of Georgia and South Carolina. Although Moore was not rigorous in the preservation of information concerning the associations of his artifacts, Waring has correctly pointed out (Waring 1968: 294) that

His memorable series (Moore, 1897, 1898) in the Journal of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia, . . . gives us the most complete history of artifacts of known provenience which we have for this area.

Because information from the Georgia coast is so fragmentary, we must use the incomplete record of Moore (1897, 1898a, 1898b). Although illustrations of the relics collected by Moore are excellent, the most valuable aspect of his reports is the location of sites that he visited. Moore's work is the closest thing we have to a "survey" of the Georgia and South Carolina coastal region and the drainage of the lower Savannah River.

Moving from his Atlantic coastal attack, Moore traveled the Gulf Coast, searching for antiquities; and of interest to the present study
he investigated sites along the Apalachicola, Flint, and Chattahoochee Rivers (Moore 1903, 1907a). Like the reports concerning the Atlantic Coast, Moore's publications concerning the drainage of these rivers together with the comments of Peter A. Brannon (1909) supply us with information complementing the fragmentary record of this region. However, this area has received more recent attention than the Atlantic Coastal region.

After his busy operations on the Gulf Coast, Moore headed the "Gopher" up the Mississippi River and began to "turn over" the mounds along that river. Eventually, he again approached the South Appalachian Province--this time from the "back side"--in his investigation of mound sites along the Tennessee River (Moore 1915).

These investigations of Clarence B. Moore and the operations of the Mound Division under Cyrus Thomas produced a mass of artifacts from the entire region of the eastern United States. Both sets of material were reworked by W. H. Holmes for his lengthy analysis of "Aboriginal Pottery of the Eastern United States" (1903). In this excellently illustrated volume, Holmes made one of the earliest divisions of prehistoric culture areas in the eastern United States. He divided the entire eastern half of the country into Provinces and discussed the pottery from each Province. As has already been mentioned in the Introduction, the South Appalachian Province, which is the region of interest in this paper, was defined by Holmes at this time on the basis of the unique characteristics of stamping on the pottery.

In the first thirty years of the present century, North American archaeology grew from the level of relic hunting to a part of the methodology of anthropology. In addition, the level of field
techniques in collecting the data was improving. Like many before them, the Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation, New York City became interested in collecting antiquities from the South Appalachian Province. To satisfy this interest they excavated sites in northern Georgia and western North Carolina. The excavation of the Nacoochee Mound in White County, Georgia was the largest of their undertakings. Waring (1968: 294) has stated that with the exception of the excavation of the Hollywood Mound by Henry Reynolds,

... the first piece of professional archaeology in Georgia worthy of the name was done by F. W. Hodge, G. G. Heye, and G. H. Pepper (1918) at the Nacoochee Mound near the northern border of the state in 1916 (Hodge 1916). ... The virtues of this work lay in the completeness with which the material was reported rather than in any particular brilliance of conception of the archaeological problem; the matter of structure was simply ignored.

During the same period as the work in Georgia, field efforts of the Heye Foundation in the South Appalachian Province were also directed toward mound sites in western North Carolina (Heye 1919). In the Pigeon River valley near Canton, Heye excavated a mound on the farm of James Plott and one on the property of T. D. Singleton of Bethel. The James Plott mound was in the proximity of two other mounds, one of which had been examined by Osborne for the Valentine Museum in 1880. These two latter mounds have more recently been excavated by the Research Laboratories of Anthropology of the University of North Carolina and are designated Hw^01 and Hw^02. The mound excavated by the Heye Museum was designated Hw^03 by the Laboratories. These mounds and the contiguous "village" area constitute the Garden Creek site.

After this short excursion into the South Appalachian Province, the Heye Foundation retreated from the Province; and only two other references to the area were published by the Foundation. One of these
was a report by Margaret Ashley (1927) concerning the Shinholser Mound on the Oconee River in Georgia. The other was a comment by George F. Pepper (1924) concerning an urn, which was found near Camden, South Carolina. In commenting on this urn, Pepper refers to the investigation of W. de F. Haynes, Esq. of New York (Pepper 1924: 75),

A part of the old Wateree region has been flooded in recent years by a reservoir [Wateree Pond], but while it was still exposed, Mr. Haynes was enabled to explore one of the mounds and to gather some aboriginal objects from the adjacent village-sites.

Among the more noteworthy artifacts thus procured is an earthenware jar of unusual size (fig. 10). . . .

In exploring a mound at Longtown, in the same county, a small package consisting of a bark wrapping within which was a small human figure modeled in clay, was recovered. This interesting object is among the collection generously presented by Mr. Haynes.

As has been repeatedly mentioned, the archaeological record of the Wateree valley is quite fragmentary, and this bit of "salvage archaeology" is all the information we have concerning sites now inundated by Wateree Pond. The reference to the mound at Longtown is the only known published reference to this mound.

In addition to the references of George Pepper to archaeological sites in South Carolina, other individuals commented concerning sites in this state. The Charleston Museum under the direction of Laura Bragg was interested in memorabilia concerning prehistoric sites. In 1918 she reported (Bragg 1918) on the unorganized excavations by two collectors in Greenville of two mounds, one on the banks of the North Saluda River in Greene County and another on Reedy River in the same county. The former of these mounds has been visited by representatives of the Research Laboratories of Anthropology and has been designated Soc0230. Other reports on antiquities from the area include unpublished records of Laura Bragg's two days of excavations at the Greenhill site
just outside of Columbia in 1925; a report by Anne King Gregorie (1925) concerning artifacts from coastal South Carolina; and a note by J. Walter Fewkes (1928), who examined and reported collections from the vicinity of Greenville. These reports are singularly rather insignificant, but they do provide an idea concerning the general types of prehistoric materials and the locations of those materials in South Carolina.

Meanwhile, in northern Georgia Warren K. Moorehead was busy examining the site that had produced the impressive artifacts for Rogan when he was working for the Mound Division. Moorehead was in the Cartersville area for two field seasons and retrieved an unbelievable number of impressive artifacts for his "efforts." Many of the artifacts have since been ascribed to the Southern Cult (Waring and Holder 1945); and to Antonio Waring, who was the country's foremost authority concerning the Cult, we turn for a description of Moorehead's work at Etowah (Waring 1968: 294).

During 1927 and 1928 Warren K. Moorehead and his assistants virtually destroyed Mound C. It was in this remarkable and irreplaceable structure that Rogan had found the famous Etowah Copper Plates. Moorehead attacked it with all the discredited archaeological techniques of the last century, using undercutting, caving, horse scrapers, augurs, and probes. His efforts resulted in the accumulation of a striking collection of ceremonial objects relating to the Southern Cult, but he destroyed forever the context in which they were deposited.

. . . The caliber of Moorehead's report was no better than the caliber of his archaeological technique, and it is of value only for its pictures and for Willoughby's (1932) interesting and astute comments on the more elaborate ceremonial material. (Moorehead, 1925a and b, 1929a, 1932).

The work by Moorehead was published in the several references mentioned in the previous quote by Waring, the most important of which was the "Etowah Papers" edited by Moorehead (1932) and containing information
from various people on investigations in northern Georgia including Willoughby's (1932) comment on the Cult material from Etowah. The remainder of the report presents a good look at many of the materials from Etowah; but as Waring indicates, little information exists concerning association of this material.

Following Moorehead's work at Etowah, little work was done in the South Appalachian area, a fact probably due to the onslaught of the Depression. However, a few wealthy people managed to side-step the Depression. William H. Chaflin, Jr. of Massachusetts took an interest in a shell mound on the Savannah River a few miles above Augusta, Georgia and financed an excavation performed by Mr. and Mrs. C. B. Cosgrove. The resulting report on the Stalling's Island Mound (Chaflin 1931) was one of the best archaeological reports of its time. It contained plats and profiles of the excavations and illustrations of representative types of materials from the site. Additionally, Chaflin recognized through the stratigraphy of the site that there were two assemblages present: one of the earlier Stalling's Island people and the other of the later people who made stamped pottery. Thus, the early days of South Appalachian Province archaeology ended with what Waring (1968: 294) has termed, "... the first really competent archaeology ..." in the state of Georgia.

Summary

Mounds--beginning with the earliest explorers of the Southeastern Colonies there has been a lasting interest in these earthen structures of the Indians. Early interest was stimulated by curiosity and the suggestion that the mounds were the product of a "race" of men who were
far more "advanced" than the American Indian. Later, when the myth of the "race of mound-builders" had been negated, interest in the mounds continued. Even though the mounds were built by a people who were less spectacular than the mythical "mound-builders," the mounds were still the impressive monuments of a past people; and they were effective in drawing human interest. Probably most important was the fact that early investigations into the mounds of the East had shown that they were a rather reliable source of various exotic relics. Demand for these relics became a significant force in creating interest. In looking over the early period of archaeology in Georgia, Waring (1968: 294) has stated,

Up to 1923, the sum total of Georgia archaeology was mound archaeology of a rather poor quality. It was devoid of any interest in temporal relationships and was motivated chiefly by a search for spectacular specimens. In this respect it was in no way remarkable, since the same thing was true of all archaeology of the eastern United States.

Time has dealt a severe blow to the mounds of the Southeast. In addition to the natural forces of erosion, which would tear at the structures in any environment, the mounds of all of eastern North America have had to pass the ordeal of modern society--the uninterested and the interested. First, the opening of land for agriculture has caused an increased vulnerability of the mounds to erosion and the plow. And, if the mounds formed an obstacle to the path of "progress," they were simply removed. Such has been the damage dealt by the uninterested. Yet, the "interested" were almost as destructive as the uninterested. As pointed out, such relic hunters as Clarence B. Moore and Warren K. Moorehead were quite effective in destroying various mounds in order to acquire a collection of aboriginal antiquities. Generally, we find that only the most obscure mound structures have escaped the ravaging of
natural erosion and the hand of the white man.

With this perspective of the damage wrought on the mounds of the South Appalachian Province, we can evaluate the utility of the early archaeological record. In such an evaluation we accept the damage dealt to these structures and seek to maximize the salvageable information. Obviously, one of the major advantages of early reports on mound sites is that these observers were often able to view and describe certain mounds that have since been destroyed or nearly destroyed. That these mounds were often destroyed by the persons making the observations is unfortunate but irrelevant. Further value comes from the fact that these early observers often made comments concerning the nature of the artifacts from various sites. Yet, perhaps the most significant value of this historical record concerning these prehistoric sites is that for almost two centuries writers have noted and recorded the locations of hundreds of "Indian mounds." These have included mounds of all types--temple mounds, burial mounds, shell mounds, etc. Recording these locations has produced an impressive body of information concerning mound sites. Thus, with respect to various mound sites of the East, we have in the historical record the results of an archaeological survey, which has been underway for more than two centuries; and the value of this survey should not be underestimated. The archaeological record of the early observers of prehistoric sites can be a valuable aid in the structure of modern archaeological research, and this early archaeological record should be critically and rigorously reviewed in order to derive as much valid information as possible.
B. CENTRAL GEORGIA

1. Depression Period

The original area of archaeological work of the Civil Works Administration was in central Georgia in the vicinity of Macon. This initial emphasis was probably due to a number of factors; however, two of these factors were certainly the impressive mounds at Ocmon Fields across the river from Macon and the presence of certain interested individuals in the Macon area, who immediately saw the benefits available to both archaeology and relief programs. Archaeological work at the Macon Plateau site began in December 1933 (Kelly 1938: 22) as a Civil Works Administration Project under the auspices of the Smithsonian Institution. Work continued under various relief projects, and in 1935 Ocmon Fields was made a National Monument.

The archaeological program at Macon provided the core unit of information upon which all of the initial interpretation (Kelly 1938) of the prehistory of central Georgia was based. In addition to Macon Plateau, important sites in this program included Brown's Mount, Lamar, Swift Creek, Napier, Mossy Oak, Stubbs' Mound, One Mile Track, Shell Rock Cave, Horseshoe Bend, and Cowart's Landing (Kelly 1938: 3) (Map 3). Certainly, sites removed from the valley of the Ocmon Fields were used in interpretation, but the intensity of work seems to have been inversely proportional to the distance from Macon.

Few of the factors involved in selecting the sites near Macon were related to any academically rigorous process for selecting archaeological sites for investigation. The archaeological manifestations at Macon obviously represent important elements of the prehistoric occupation of central Georgia. However, the manifestations at Macon most
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SITES IN THE OCMULGEE BASIN (Kelly 1938: Fig. 1).
certainly do not constitute the only such locations in the area; nor should we suppose that they constitute the most representative examples of the archaeological units of the central region of Georgia. Thus, as the interpretations of central Georgia are reviewed, we should keep in mind that, although other sites are given consideration in Kelly's as well as in future interpretations, the basic information for all interpretations was gathered from a limited number of sites, most of which are located within ten miles of Macon.

The early results of the work in the Macon area were outlined by Kelly (1938) in *A Preliminary Report on Archaeological Exploration at Macon, Georgia*. Essentially, the results consisted of the segregation of various archaeological units on the basis of ceramics and other elements of archaeological evidence. Kelly's preliminary report was the first modern attempt to understand prehistoric phenomena in the Southeast, and his problems as the initial investigator were considerable. Kelly was confronted with the task of organizing a large collection of unfamiliar material, material that was being recovered *en masse* by large groups of unskilled relief workers. With the advantage of four years of investigation in the Macon area, Kelly was successful in segregating the basic and most obvious prehistoric units—Swift Creek, Macon Plateau, and Lamar. With respect to these units he was able to see the rudiments of a temporal and spatial pattern. In consideration of the limited amount of analysis at the time of the preliminary report, Kelly was quite cautious with his identifications and his interpretations of the relationships between these three manifestations.

Segregation of Lamar temporally from the other two units was no
particular problem. Lamar material capped the top of most of the sites in the area, including a thin distribution at the Macon Plateau site itself. Temporal segregation of Swift Creek from Macon Plateau was a more difficult problem. Both types could be internally subdivided, but the relationship between the types could not be ascertained. Typological and stratigraphic results from the excavation of the Swift Creek site led to a tentative and undocumented division of Swift Creek ceramics into Early, Middle, and Late units. While the Early and Middle components of division were well represented at the site, the Late component was only sparingly represented. As a result of work at the Plateau and investigations underway at the Brown's Mount site, the Macon Plateau occupation was broken into two periods--Early and Late Macon Plateau. The intercomponent integration produced problems. Kelly could not determine a temporal difference between the Early Swift Creek and the Early Macon Plateau manifestations, for both of these expressions were found in the lower levels of stratified units at the Macon Plateau site. It is not obvious that Kelly ever had any substantial information on the temporal relationship between the Middle and Late Swift Creek units and the Macon Plateau units. In summarizing the evidence Kelly (1938: 43) stated,

... the best opinion to be had from the present data would point to temporal and cultural discontinuity as between Swift Creek and Macon Plateau. The evidence implies that there is a Late Plateau, represented by the mound-building activities, which came after Swift Creek manifestations, probably blanket ing the immediate territory and forcing the Swift Creek people out at that point of cultural advance marked by a Middle stage of stylistic evolution in pottery stamping.

Most of the interpretative statements in Kelly's early report concerned the temporal placement of the segregated units, but he was also aware of the possible significance of the spatial distribution of sites
representing the various units. On the local level he noted that Swift Creek and Lamar characteristics were not well represented on the Macon Plateau and Brown's Mount sites. Rather, sites with the characteristics of these units tended to appear in the lower levels of the valley on the river terraces. With respect to the broader distribution of sites, Kelly pointed out that the Macon Plateau occupation seemed to be limited to the immediate vicinity of Macon. On the other hand, he recognized wide areal distributions for both Lamar and Swift Creek.

For Swift Creek he observed (Kelly 1938: 45),

The same stylistic trends with loss of balance and skill in execution [that characterize Late Swift Creek] were observed in collections of Swift Creek pottery made on sites as far removed geographically from Macon as the Georgia coast and the lower Chattahoochee Valley, i.e., Evelyn plantation near Brunswick, Ga., and Kolomoki in Early County. Intermediate sites between Macon and these peripheral expressions of Late Swift Creek were represented in collections from Kelling's Camp on Big Indian Creek, 40 miles south of Macon on the Ocmulgee, and several sites located near Talbotton, Ga., 50 miles west of Macon toward Columbus.

Kelly recognized (1938: 51) a wide distribution of the Lamar ceramic traits at the sites of Irene, Neisler, Shinholser, Nacoochee, Etowah, Stalling's Island, and Bull Creek. This recognition implied that the distribution of these elements in space may have some relationship to the nature of the cultural processes at work in the Georgia area.

Apparently in the manifestations of Lamar and Macon Plateau, a degree of similarity existed between elements of the prehistoric occupation in the area and the Pattern that had been called Middle Mississippian in the Mississippi basin. Concerning this similarity, Kelly stated (1938: 62),

Mississippi influences have been suggested at Macon at two junctures. The earliest prehistoric movement from the Mississippi is represented in the period of mound building on the Macon Plateau. . . .
Lamar introduces the second mound-building period into Macon chronology. Mound architecture shows generalized resemblance to features observed in the Macon Plateau period. Lamar exhibits for the first time a new technique of pottery decoration, incising, soon to supplant and completely dominate. . . . Incised patterns increase in number and come to assimilate more closely decorative motifs known to have a wide distribution in the lower Mississippi Valley.

Agriculture, which was a significant part of the Mississippian Pattern, was also recognized at Macon (Kelly 1938: 10, 61).

Although the associations of Lamar showed obvious similarities to the Mississippian Pattern, elements of Lamar ceramics were similar to Swift Creek ceramics (Kelly 1938: 62), particularly in the application of complicated stamps to the surface of vessels. Thus, while the Macon Plateau material showed a rather direct relationship to the Mississippian Pattern, the Lamar material displayed characteristics of the indigenous tradition. Recognition of Mississippian acculturation in the South Appalachian Province had begun.

In addition to the identification of the ceramics of Lamar, Macon Plateau, and Swift Creek and to suggestions concerning their distribution in time and space, a variety of minority wares were also identified and discussed in the Macon area during Depression period archaeology. In order that these wares not be tied down spatially, they were, in some cases, assigned alphabetical classifications. These included Delta ware (later to be called Napier), Theta ware (later termed Stalling's Island), and Vining Simple Stamped (Mossy Oak). For the most part these ceramic types were found in the lowest levels of the Macon Plateau site, and Kelly considered them to be quite early. Of these types, Napier has been given considerable prominence in the explication of the sequence of the Georgia piedmont during the period of Mississippian acculturation. The Napier site was the only "pure" site
of this manifestation in the Macon area, and no extensive investigation was performed at this site. On all other sites Napier ceramics appeared as a minor element, and the temporal relationship of this ceramic type to the other units (specifically Swift Creek and Macon Plateau) was not firmly established.

Following Kelly's preliminary report other primary publications concerning archaeology of the Macon area were presented. Willey (1939) in the report of his excavation at the Cowart's Landing site substantiated, with rather conclusive evidence, the temporal superposition of Lamar over Swift Creek. In the same year Jennings (1939) published a cursory report concerning excavations at the Lamar site.

Kelly had placed a considerable degree of emphasis on the analysis of ceramics in his initial discussion of the archaeology of the area. The major factor in the segregation of Lamar, Macon Plateau, and Swift Creek was different ceramic attributes. The ceramics of these sites provided a large sample of data showing a high degree of variability. That the variables of ceramics might well be related to variation in prehistoric culture was clearly recognized. In view of the importance of ceramics in the interpretation of the prehistory of the area, several descriptions of the types mentioned by Kelly as well as a few new types were presented in the *Southeastern Archaeological Conference Newsletters* for the years 1939 and 1940. In 1939 these types included Mossy Oak Simple Stamped, Swift Creek Complicated Stamped, Lamar Bold Incised, Lamar Complicated Stamped, and Ocmulgee Fields Incised (Jennings and Fairbanks 1939). A year later the types Bibb Plain, Halstead Plain, Napier Complicated Stamped, Macon Thick, and Hawkins Fabric Marked appeared (Jennings and Fairbanks 1940). Unfortunately,
in the type description of Swift Creek the distinction between the important divisions of Early, Middle, and Late were not made. To date, no explicit evidence for the division has been published. While the division undoubtedly exists, its nebulousness has led to misinterpretations (an example of which will be given in the discussion of the archaeological record for northern Georgia).

2. Post-Depression Period

Following the flourish of archaeological activity in the Macon area during the Depression, Charles H. Fairbanks remained to tie up the loose ends. The credit for most of the assimilation of archaeological data in the Macon area must go to Fairbanks, who continued publication concerning the central Georgia region with "The Lamar Palisade" (1940b), "The Macon Earth Lodge" (1946b), "A Preliminary Segregation of Etowah, Savannah, and Lamar" (1950), and "Archaeology of the Funeral Mound" (1956). Although trait lists for the Macon Plateau, Lamar, and Ocmulgee Fields units of the area were constructed quite early as indicated by a reference in an early bibliography (Martin, Quimby, and Collier 1947), the Lamar trait list was not published until 1950 (Fairbanks 1950: 144-145); and the Macon Plateau and Ocmulgee Fields lists were not published until the publication of the report on the Funeral Mound (Fairbanks 1956: 83-86). A trait list for Swift Creek was never presented, apparently due to lack of information concerning the Swift Creek site. Presentation of these lists added to the body of descriptive information concerning the segregated units defined by Kelly in 1938. Although trait lists have become rather passé in American archaeology, those formulated by Fairbanks did contribute to the understanding of the holistic unit that composed these
archaeological manifestations.

Fairbanks added flesh to the archaeological units defined by Kelly, and he moved to define the position of the Macon manifestations with respect to the prehistory of the contiguous portions of the Southeast. In the Faye-Cooper Cole memorial volume, Archeology of Eastern United States (Griffin, ed. 1952), he described the archaeological manifestations of the piedmont region of Georgia, arranged the manifestations into a reasonable temporal and spatial framework for the area, and related the prehistoric sequence of central and northern Georgia to the prehistory of the contiguous archaeological areas.

In the process of describing and relating the archaeological units of the area, Fairbanks made some statements which must be reevaluated in the light of more recent work and in consideration of the use we would like to make of archaeological data. First, he described (1952: 289) the temporal and spatial relationships of Early, Middle, and Late Swift Creek in much the same manner as Kelly. Fairbanks considered the peripheral expressions of Swift Creek to be Middle and Late Swift Creek, and he felt that these types were in some way related to Deptford and Weeden Island ceramics. Concerning the region of the type site Fairbanks (1952: 289) stated, "In central Georgia it [Swift Creek] is found stratigraphically below Lamar at the Lamar and Cowart's Landing sites. It is also below Macon Plateau." Further, he commented that (1952: 287), "Agriculture may have been present but certainly was not important and the presence of shallow stone mortars and bun-shaped millers might as well indicate the use of wild seeds and nuts." The relationship of Swift Creek to peripheral sites appears reasonable with respect to the present level of knowledge.
The author does not take issue with the basic content of the preceding statements, but rather, seeks to clarify. In the first case, the reference of Fairbanks to central Georgia is to the sequence in the Ocmulgee valley in the vicinity of Macon rather than to the entirety of the central region of Georgia. Further, when he refers to Swift Creek as below Macon Plateau, he does not specify which Swift Creek—Early, Middle, or Late. The only published information concerning these manifestations (Kelly 1938) would suggest that his reference is to Early and Middle Swift Creek. While Late Swift Creek was present in the Macon Plateau area, it would be denial of information for possible construction of hypotheses to relegate all of Swift Creek to a position predating Macon Plateau. The stated conclusions concerning agriculture present a similar situation. The fact that evidence for agriculture did not show up in the limited investigation of the Swift Creek site does not indicate that agriculture was or was not an important association of Swift Creek ceramics. To validate such a statement would require a series of investigations of Swift Creek sites.

Mound building associated with Swift Creek ceramics is another problem concerning central Georgia. Fairbanks (1952: 287) points out that it is not clear whether the Swift Creek mounds are related to the Mississippian type pyramidal mounds or to the accretional mounds of shell characteristic of an earlier period of Southeastern prehistory. The mound at the Swift Creek site has been consistently referred to as an accretional mound (Kelly 1938: 26; Martin, Quimby, and Collier 1946: 376; Fairbanks 1952: 287). Definitively, this mound has been referred to as one which was "erected haphazardly by bottom-land dirt separated by layers of sand" (Martin, Quimby, and Collier 1952: 376), and as a
mound formed by the accretion of "sand and humus" (Fairbanks 1952: 287).

Little is known about the Swift Creek mound and, for that matter, Swift Creek mounds in general. Two questions remain: was the mound at Swift Creek related to Mississippian temple mounds and, if so, how is the cultural expression of Swift Creek ceramics related to the Middle Mississippian Pattern? These questions are yet unanswered; and with the paucity of information concerning Swift Creek, we would be defeating the scientific method to resign the associations of Swift Creek ceramics to a definition separating them in kind from the components of the Mississippian Pattern.

The significance of Napier ceramics presented by Fairbanks also deserves comment. On existing evidence he made interpretations with respect to Napier and Mossy Oak ceramics that may well be true, but a more rigorous analysis of the situation may forestall some problems in understanding these types. First, Fairbanks made it quite clear that (1952: 290), "Napier Complicated Stamped (Kelly's Delta ware) is known from only one pure site in central Georgia but is apparently more abundant in northern Georgia from surface collections." The first phrase of this statement is quite true while the cautious second phrase is based on unanalyzed information from northern Georgia. As will be pointed out in the next section, northern Georgia has not produced much more data concerning Napier than has been found in the central portion of the state. After this statement Fairbanks (1952: 290) comments,

During the Swift Creek period people making Mossy Oak Simple Stamped pottery continued to live in central Georgia. Others making checked stamped, and another type of complicated stamped (Napier) lived here of nearby. In midden pits at Macon sherds of Swift Creek Complicated Stamped, Mossy Oak Simple Stamped, check stamped and Napier Complicated Stamped were present in varying percentages.
This evidence actually indicates no more than the fact that at one point in time all three of these types had appeared in the Macon area. It does not indicate that the makers were contemporaneous. With respect to the region of central Georgia, the significance of Mossy Oak Simple Stamped and Napier Complicated Stamped is unknown.

Lamar was recognized by Fairbanks, as it had been by Kelly, as a widespread ceramic phenomenon; and regarding the unit that he understood to be Lamar, he made the following comments:

Swift Creek probably developed into Lamar although the precise steps cannot yet be demonstrated. (Fairbanks 1952: 289)

... as a whole Lamar must have had a long time span. (Fairbanks 1952: 293)

There is some suggestion that Etowah is earlier than Lamar but this results largely from a contrast to a series of earlier sites from the Etowah group in contrast to a series of later sites within the Lamar group. The complexes are roughly contemporary and I should imagine also closely enough related to form one aspect. (Fairbanks 1952: 293)

These comments, as Fairbanks would agree, were and continue to be hypotheses. In some cases they are hypotheses which have a high probability of being demonstrated to be correct; but they are, nevertheless, hypotheses.

The latest information concerning the archaeology of the Macon area (with the exception of two radiocarbon dates [Wilson 1964]) was the previously mentioned report on the "Archaeology of the Funeral Mound" at Ocmulgee National Monument (Fairbanks 1955). In this report Fairbanks reevaluated the prehistoric sequence at Macon Plateau on the basis of archaeological information from the excavation of the burial mound. Specifically, the investigation of this mound provided more descriptive information concerning the Macon Plateau unit; and it reinforced previous conclusions concerning the temporal relationships of
the site. All of the new information came directly from the Macon Plateau site. This information is identical in kind and general location to the information which Kelly used in the 1938 preliminary report.

3. Summary

Central Georgia archaeology produced the genesis of understanding prehistory of the South Appalachian Province. Depression investigations provided evidence upon which the major segregations of archaeological materials recognized as Swift Creek, Macon Plateau, and Lamar were founded. The basis for these segregations was in the separation of various ceramic types that were assumed to be related to cultural variables. Concerning this relationship Kelly, in his initial report, recognized that the Macon Plateau and Lamar assemblages and their associations were similar in some respects to the Middle Mississippian Pattern as it had been identified in the Mississippi valley. Further, the practice of complicated stamping on ceramics evident in the Swift Creek and Lamar assemblages was isolated as a characteristic of the South Appalachian Province as described by Holmes (1903). The relationship of Lamar to the indigenous tradition and to the Mississippian Pattern led to the recognition of acculturation in the Province.

The emphasis on ceramics in the interpretation of the prehistory of the area led to the publication of several descriptions of ceramic types; but, unfortunately, quantitative ceramic studies and nonceramic cultural associations were slow in appearance or did not appear at all. This is due to several reasons, not the least of which is the problem that archaeology is a pauper discipline. There was, and will probably remain permanently, a severe information lag concerning the Depression investigations in the Macon area. With the exception of the
preliminary report by Kelly, the only archaeological units treated in
the literature from the Macon Plateau site have been the Earth Lodge
and the Funeral Mound. The Lamar site and the Swift Creek site have
received only limited investigation and even less analysis. Primary
publication concerning these two sites is limited to a short article
written by Fairbanks (1940b), describing the palisade at the Lamar site.
Fortunately, Fairbanks has published a trait list for the Lamar mani-
festation in central Georgia. This is the only data available concern-
ing the associations of Lamar ceramics in this locality. Yet, even
this list must be accepted by archaeologists with reservations because
the excavation data is not available.

The analysis and publication of central Georgia archaeology has
been severely limited. Thus, it is not surprising that cultural pro-
cesses related to the manifestations of Swift Creek, Macon Plateau, and
Lamar are virtually unknown. The Swift Creek site in central Georgia
is known only from fragmentary ceramic analysis and the fact that in
the Ocmulgee River bottom is an "accretion" mound. The cultural
aspects of this manifestation are, for the most part, assumed. Macon
Plateau ceramics and associations are known to a greater extent. Due
to the extensive investigation of the Macon Plateau site and the analy-
ses by Kelly and Fairbanks, Macon Plateau ceramics and associations are
recognized as an intrusive Middle Mississippian expression. Because
the interpretation of the complex of traits termed Lamar suggests both
generalized relationships to the Middle Mississippian Pattern and to
Swift Creek ceramics, it has been hypothesized that Lamar was in part
the result of acculturation between the indigenous Swift Creek and the
Macon Plateau manifestations. The limited ceramic studies in the area
have not verified these hypotheses, and that ceramic studies alone ever will is unlikely. In order to adequately interpret the prehistory of the three units, it will be necessary to rigorously examine the ceramics as well as other aspects of the archaeological data and the structure of this data. Fairbanks has suggested that the "Lamar Period" must have lasted a long time and also that Lamar must have evolved out of Swift Creek. These are hypotheses, and their proof will require rigorous investigations.

Such minority wares as Mossy Oak and Napier were thought to have been significant in the pre-Macon Plateau manifestations of the Macon area, and they may have been. But, this material has never been analyzed in the Macon area, and the principle sites of these types have never received adequate archaeological investigation and reporting. Therefore, the value that comments concerning these types holds for the formulation of new hypotheses must be accepted with reservations.

In retrospect the preliminary report by Kelly concerning central Georgia archaeology was a good and cautious beginning. That this has been the only report ever published by the primary investigator of Depression archaeology in central Georgia is, indeed, unfortunate. Although more recent writers (specifically Fairbanks) have contributed additional information concerning the prehistory of the area, Kelly's basic preliminary outline has remained the general structure for the understanding of central Georgia prehistory. Barring more descriptive data concerning the content of the cultural units segregated by Kelly, we know little more today about the process of culture in prehistory in the Macon area than Kelly reported in 1938.
C. NORTHERN GEORGIA

Discussion of the geographical area referred to as northern Georgia will generally cover the area surveyed by Robert Wauchope (1966) as part of a relief period Works Progress Administration project. The emphasis is on the term "generally cover." As with central Georgia, flexibility with respect to the physical boundaries of reference to northern Georgia will be maintained. On the present level of investigation there is no reason to work within the confines of a tightly defined region. Some of the region covered by Wauchope's survey will be included in the discussion of the mountain portion of the South Appalachian Province.

As in other parts of the Southeast, archaeology was not carried out in northern Georgia on a large scale until the Depression. The investigation of the area near Macon was undoubtedly the major archaeological activity in Georgia during this period, and the Depression period survey of northern Georgia appears to have been an investigation spurred by the need for information to complement that being obtained in central Georgia. A neat unit of archaeological activity, the northern Georgia survey has contributed significantly to the body of archaeological data concerning the prehistory of the South Appalachian Province.

Since the Depression, the word in northern Georgia archaeology has been "salvage." Salvage projects, large and small, have dominated the archaeological scene. Large salvage programs were carried out in the Allatoona Reservoir on the Etowah River (Caldwell 1950; Sears 1950, 1958) and the Buford Reservoir on the Chattahoochee River (Caldwell 1955); and investigations are presently underway on the Conasauga River...
in the northwestern portion of Georgia at the Talking Rock Dam site. (A. R. Kelly is in charge.) In addition to this work a limited amount of salvage work was also carried out by the Smithsonian Institution in the Clark Hill Reservoir (Caldwell 1953; Miller 1949, 1950). Besides these river basin salvage projects, smaller salvage investigations have been undertaken, such as the work by Dickens in Stone Mountain Memorial Park (Dickens 1964, 1965) and that in the vicinity of Atlanta by A. R. Kelly.*

Archaeology in northern Georgia has been extensive and has produced a wealth of material as well as a degree of explanation concerning the prehistory of the area. However, for the most part investigations have not been problem oriented, and the work has lacked continuity. Furthermore, ceramic analysis has consistently received most of the attention of investigators. The present study will examine the contributions of the northern Georgia investigations and will select that information of value in formulating new research strategy.

1. The Northern Georgia Survey

On the basis of the WPA-sponsored project Wauchope presented several articles (Wauchope 1948, 1950, 1953) and a final report (Wauchope 1966) concerning the archaeological survey of northern Georgia. In the final report he provided an outline of the results of the survey (Wauchope 1966: vii-ix):

We located and assessed hundreds of Indian sites in a practically unknown archaeological area. We established a ceramic sequence for northern Georgia that had been wholly lacking and that, with some refinements is still valid. In so doing, we clarified several confused matters of central and southern

*Note: Kelly is presently performing salvage operations on a large Woodland site in the vicinity of Atlanta, Georgia.
Georgia archaeology, such as the distinctness and relative position of Napier and Etowah Stamped pottery. We demonstrated stratigraphically for the first time the actual chronological position of Dunlap Fabric Marked, Mossy Oak Simple Stamped, Deptford Simple Stamped and Deptford Check Stamped pottery, and we discovered an entirely unknown period or cultural expression in north Georgia prehistory characterized ceramically by the Woodstock pottery. We identified some of the larger ceremonial sites more closely with the Mature Mississippi "Etowah" ceramics than had been previously suspected. Our findings bridged many an archaeological gap between eastern Tennessee on the west, North Carolina above, and Piedmont Georgia in the south. We demonstrated unsuspected cultural continuities from Woodland to Protohistoric times, and dispelled the notion that stamped pottery disappeared, even temporarily with the advent of Mississippi culture. Our large ceramic samples from hundreds of sites spread over a large area—almost half the state of Georgia—provided materials for working out the minute ceramic changes diagnostic of subperiods. We "discovered" (professionally, not actually) many major sites, among them Horseshoe Bend, Wilbanks, Long Swamp, Tugaloo, Woodstock, and Two Run, all of which have now been excavated. Probably most important of all, we were able, for many years after the survey to recommend for more intensive excavation the most significant sites that were to be covered by large reservoirs in the great river valleys of the north; we recorded scores of ancient Indian villages that are now under several hundred feet of water and may never again be seen by man.

Within the framework of the present approach all of Wauchope's list of accomplishments cannot be accepted without some qualification. In the following discussion some of the aspects of the total northern Georgia survey, which are particularly germane to the present approach, will be discussed. After this discussion appropriate comments will be made concerning certain components of the above compilation of accomplishments.

In 1948 Wauchope published a preliminary report on the archaeological survey. In this paper he discussed the most important sites in the area and molded the data into a description of "The Ceramic Sequence in the Etowah Drainage, Northwest Georgia." Working within the existing understanding of the archaeological periods and absolute time scale of the 1940's (Ford and Willey 1941), Wauchope placed the ceramic sequence
of northern Georgia in perspective with the prevailing understanding of the "cultural" sequence of the eastern United States. In excavation Wauchope had controlled several stratigraphic sections, the most important of which included sequences at the Two Run Creek, Long Swamp, Wilbanks Farm, and Horseshoe Bend sites (Map 4). The first of these sites, a mound and village, provided stratigraphic information concerning periods termed by Wauchope as Woodland and Mississippian. The latter three sites were quite important in that they provided detailed stratigraphic relationships between Etowah (defined by Wauchope for northern Georgia), Savannah (a type Wauchope felt to be similar to Savannah Complicated Stamped [Caldwell and McCann 1941]), and Lamar ceramics—all belonging to Wauchope's Temple Mound I and Temple Mound II periods. Interestingly, Wauchope does not discuss the sequence of northern Georgia in his later report. It is assumed that he felt enough had been said about the sequence on the basis of existing information.

Because the limits of confidence in accepted archaeological sequences are important to the conceptualization of new problems in archaeology, it is desirable to closely examine the basis for Wauchope's sequence and the foundation which this first sequence formed for later interpretations of northern Georgia prehistory. At the Two Run Creek site, located on the Etowah River a few miles from the Etowah site, Wauchope in his earlier paper reports two units of archaeological investigation: a village and a mound. He comments (Wauchope 1948: 201), "The village site adjacent to the mound, but antedating it, yielded exclusively early materials." In the test pits in this village Wauchope obtained the total body of stratigraphic information on the
relationship between Dunlap Fabric Impressed, Mossy Oak Simple Stamped, Deptford Check Stamped, and Woodstock. Woodstock was present in small amounts on the surface of this site. These stratigraphic test pits included two, three by ten feet excavation units in what is inferred to be a shallow midden on the site. Unfortunately, Wauchope did not report the details concerning this stratigraphic pit (Wauchope 1966: 446-450), and this author infers that the evidence from this work is not sufficiently conclusive for complete acceptance.

Wauchope also analyzed the stratigraphy of the mound at the Two Run Creek site. In the 1948 paper he noted that the major ceramic type in the mound was Late Swift Creek ceramics; yet he commented that this ceramic type was not adequately described and that he might have to change the identification. Furthermore, he pointed out that because Early and Late Swift Creek were in the lowest levels of the mound and Woodstock was in the upper levels of the village, these types must post-date Woodstock (Wauchope 1948: 203). As a result of his analysis Wauchope places Woodstock as an early type in northern Georgia.

Woodstock Stamped appeared before Swift Creek Stamped at the Two Run site, and its decorative design resembled Swift Creek design to some extent, but it seems to have increased very slowly, while early Swift Creek must have risen fast, degenerated into its late form, and then declined before Woodstock Stamped reached its peak.

These were Wauchope's conclusions concerning Woodstock and Late Swift Creek in 1948.

By the time of the final report Wauchope had changed his interpretation concerning certain aspects of the Two Run Creek site. He discarded the term Late Swift Creek for the predominant ceramic type of the mound in favor of the type Savannah. (Yet, it should be remembered that he distinguished between Late Swift Creek and Savannah in the
early report.) In the final report (1966: 223-231) Late Swift Creek ceramics are not mentioned, but Savannah is referred to as the predominant type in the mound. The percentages of Savannah in the mound ranged from 51.5% in the lowest stratum to 98% in the highest (Wauchope 1966: 225). On the basis of this information, it may be assumed that the mound was built no earlier than the period in which ceramics of the type called Savannah by Wauchope were produced in this area of Georgia. Because no Lamar ceramics were found on the site, it can be said with a considerable degree of confidence that the mound builders were making Savannah ceramics.

The respective temporal segregation of Etowah, Savannah, and Lamar ceramic assemblages was one of the most significant contributions of the survey. Wauchope discussed this sequence in the early report (Wauchope 1948: 205) and cursorily described the three sites (Long Swamp, Wilbanks, and Horseshoe Bend) which produced the evidence. The appendix of the final report (Wauchope 1966: 446-471) contained a description of the excavations, and the body of the report contained a brief summary of the data. The sequence was further substantiated by Sears' work at the Wilbanks site (Sears 1950, 1958) and by Larson's investigations at Etowah (L. H. Larson personal communication).

With an analysis similar to the one used to show that the mound stages of Two Run Creek were associated with Savannah ceramics, it may be shown that the lower levels of the mounds at Horseshoe Bend, Long Swamp, and Wilbanks were associated with Etowah ceramics. (Wauchope interpreted the lower structures on the first two of these sites to be earth lodges, and Sears later showed that the lower structure at the Wilbanks site was an earth lodge.) Likewise, Savannah and Lamar
ceramics may be shown to have appeared in this respective order in the upper levels of these three sites. The association of the mound structures is shown to coincide with the temporal interpretation.

Thus, in northern Georgia Wauchope presented two chronological sequences. The first was based on his excavations in the "village" area at Two Run Creek and related the Woodland ceramic types of Dunlap, Mossy Oak, Deptford, and Woodstock. The second sequence came from the sites of Two Run Creek, Long Swamp, Horseshoe Bend, and Wilbanks and related Etowah, Savannah, and Lamar ceramics. Because there is no overlapping stratigraphic evidence, the transitional period (Woodland to South Appalachian Mississippian) in northern Georgia poses problems of the type faced in central Georgia. In central Georgia a break was defined between Swift Creek and Macon Plateau, and Napier had been considered to have been important in the transition period. Napier in northern Georgia showed up in similarly low percentages as had been observed in the central part of the state. Wauchope found no pure Napier sites, and the percentages of this type on seven of the fourteen sites that he had analyzed by 1948 showed occurrences of .1% to 13.0% (Wauchope 1948: 204). By the time of the final report (Wauchope 1966) a tabulation of the Napier material shows that only 902 sherds of this type were found in the entire northern Georgia survey (Table 1). Of this sample of sherds, 497 were found at the Towaliga site on the Ocmulgee River twenty-two miles north of Macon.

In the explanation of the prehistory of northern Georgia a great deal of emphasis has been placed on the importance of Napier ceramics in the stylistic evolution of ceramics. Wauchope argued for a stylistic transition from some styles of Napier directly into Etowah styles,
TABLE 1
QUANTITATIVE TABULATION OF CERAMIC SERIES
FOUND IN THE SURVEY OF NORTHERN GEORGIA
(Data from Wauchope 1966)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramic Series</th>
<th>Number of Sherds Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>23,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalling's Island</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunlap</td>
<td>2,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossy Oak</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deptford</td>
<td>14,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Swift Creek</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Swift Creek</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napier</td>
<td>902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodstock</td>
<td>5,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etowah</td>
<td>26,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah</td>
<td>5,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamar</td>
<td>17,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocmulgee Fields</td>
<td>7,813</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
especially the nested diamond motif (Wauchope 1948: 204-207). Later, Sears favored (1958: Fig. 9) the derivation of Etowah's nested diamonds from Woodstock, but he felt that the Woodstock patterns had evolved from Napier styles. From this stylistic study both Wauchope and Sears have implied that the style variables involved show a continuous linear development through time and that these variables are related to other cultural variables. As such, the styles are implicitly considered indicative of the Woodland-to-Mississippian transition. The possible validity of these arguments is not questioned. However, evolutionary explanations based on style analysis are less desirable than explanations based on stratigraphic analysis. When explanations based on style analysis are used in the construction of archaeological problems or the clarification of other archaeological manifestations, the confidence level of the original interpretation should be kept in perspective.

The transitional period in northern and central Georgia is nebulous; and other poorly understood ceramic components—including Mossy Oak, Deptford, and Swift Creek—should be considered as possibly involved in this transition. Such a statement may appear cavalier. Yet, very little is known concerning these ceramic types in northern Georgia. It has been mentioned that the stratigraphic relationships from Two Run Creek cannot be taken as conclusive. Recent investigations in western North Carolina (Dickens personal communication) suggest that types similar to Mossy Oak Simple Stamped and Deptford Check Stamped may be contemporaneous and that these types were possibly being made as late as A.D. 600-1000 in the South Appalachian Province.

Reviewing Wauchope's list of accomplishments with the present
philosophical approach in mind, we find that they may be accepted with a few reservations. An itemization of certain of those accomplishments previously mentioned follows.

1. . . . We clarified several confused matters of central and southern Georgia archaeology, such as the distinctness and relative position of Napier and Etowah Stamped pottery. Indeed, the most important factor in this portion of the analysis was the segregation of Etowah from other ceramic types and the location of the relative temporal position of Etowah. Wauchope was not so successful with Napier. While the distinctness of Napier may have been demonstrated in the northern Georgia survey, there is still room for reservations concerning the relative position, general distribution, and associations of this ceramic type.

2. We demonstrated stratigraphically for the first time the actual chronological position of Dunlap Fabric Marked, Mossy Oak Simple Stamped, Deptford Simple Stamped, and Deptford Check Stamped pottery . . . .

For northern Georgia the interpretation of the stratigraphy in this case appears to be valid. Yet, further substantiation would be desirable. Primarily, Wauchope's stratigraphic information concerning these ceramic types comes from two shallow test pits on one site, Two Run Creek.

3. . . . We discovered an entirely unknown period or cultural expression in north Georgia prehistory characterized ceramically by the Woodstock pottery.

This statement implies a direct relationship between this ceramic type and a distinct cultural and temporal unit. Such a relationship has never been shown to exist. One Woodstock site was discovered in the northern Georgia survey, and excavation did not show that this site was significantly different culturally from sites with other ceramic types in northern Georgia, nor did it define a period which can be called the
Woodstock segment of prehistory for northern Georgia.

4. We identified some of the larger ceremonial sites more closely with Mature Mississippi "Etowah" ceramics than had previously been suspected.

The success of this identification appears valid in some cases, questionable in others. Suggesting and demonstrating associations are different levels of significance. In some cases Wauchope was able to demonstrate associations, as at Two Run Creek; but this was with Savannah ceramics rather than Etowah. In others, he merely gained some suggestion as to the association. Unfortunately, the Etowah site itself is a victim of this problem. Until recently most northern Georgia archaeologists, including Wauchope, have assumed the mounds at Etowah to have been built by people making Etowah ceramics. As will be discussed later, a recent suggestion is that the major mound building activity at Etowah may have been carried out by people making the ceramics described by Wauchope as Savannah rather than Etowah.

5. We demonstrated unsuspected cultural continuities from Woodland to Protohistoric times, and dispelled the notion that stamped pottery disappeared, even temporarily with the advent of Mississippi culture.

They did, but this is based on stylistic studies and the assumption that Napier is a significant type.

6. Our large ceramic samples from hundreds of sites spread over a large area ... provided materials for working out the evolution and persistence of pottery traditions, and for isolating minute ceramic changes diagnostic as subperiods.

The persistence of the pottery tradition in northern Georgia was demonstrated, and Wauchope made suggestions concerning the evolution of ceramic types in northern Georgia. Without more information concerning the relationships between types, this remains no more than a study of style, which needs to be further substantiated. While there may be
sufficient information to "isolate minute ceramic changes diagnostic as subperiods," this evidence has never been presented in the literature.

7. We located and assessed hundreds of Indian sites in a practically unknown archaeological area. . . . We "discovered" (professionally, not actually) many major sites: . . . .

Undoubtedly, the location of sites in northern Georgia is the most significant contribution of the northern Georgia survey. It is the contribution which will provide significant support for further research in the South Appalachian Province.

2. Salvage Work

The majority of archaeological investigation in northern Georgia since the survey work of the Depression has been in the form of salvage operations, particularly river basin salvage preliminary to the construction of dams for large water reservoirs. The information from much of this salvage work has not received final treatment in the literature, and for our interpretation we must resort to personal correspondence and preliminary reports.

a. The Allatoona Investigation

The first of the large salvage projects in Georgia, the survey of the Allatoona basin, was carried out in the years following World War II in the basin of the Etowah River near Cartersville, Georgia. The area had been rather thoroughly surveyed by Wauchope during the northern Georgia survey. The first site selected for excavation, the Wilbanks site, was one that had been recommended by Wauchope as one of the most important sites in the basin. Work at the Wilbanks site was carried out by William Sears as a representative of the University of Georgia. In addition, other sites were investigated by Joseph Caldwell and Carl
Caldwell published a preliminary report (1950) on the Smithsonian portion of the survey. Presently, a final report is in the process of preparation for publication. In the initial report Caldwell separated the prehistory of the Allatoona area into nicely defined "temporal" and "cultural" units. Caldwell (1950: 6) was cautious to point out that this segregation was a "simplified chart of the prehistory of the Allatoona reservoir as known today." Unfortunately, we do not know the evidence upon which Caldwell made his conclusions; thus, the explanation must be evaluated on the basis of previously substantiated data.

Implications made in the preliminary report on the survey of the Allatoona concerning ethnic identification appear to suggest that Woodstock people were ethnically different from Etowah, Savannah, and Lamar people. Caldwell states,

A site identified as Long Swamp was partly excavated by Wauchope in 1940 and again by Larson and Mahan in 1949, also of the University of Georgia, but the remains were of an earlier date, and represented the occupation of Creeks rather than the Cherokee. (1950: 7)

... These Muskhoceans were not in intimate contact with the English or Spanish settlements. (1950: 11)

It is assumed that these remains of an "earlier date" and "these Muskhoceans" refer to Lamar material. While Lamar material in this case may well relate to the Creeks, the evidence to support this has not been produced; and this flat statement seems much too strong on the basis of extant information. In another case, the implication is made that the people who made Woodstock pottery were not Muskhoceans (Caldwell 1950: 13).

It is not known who were the inhabitants of the Etowah Valley before the arrival of the Muskhoceans, but they left many traces in the reservoir basin. The period preceding Etowah
is called Woodstock, after a site excavated by the University of Georgia (Wauchope 1948).

What is the evidence that these people were not Muskhoceans? Certainly, none has ever been presented in the literature. Neither artifacts associated with Woodstock ceramics, physical remains of the people who made these ceramics, nor archaeological structure of these remains has ever been discussed in depth. Evidence does not seem to indicate that anything can be said about the identity of the culture (other than ceramics) of the people who made Woodstock pottery.

In this preliminary report Caldwell (1950: 13) identified the "famous Tumlin mounds" as belonging to the "Etowah period." The mounds at Etowah have long been thought to be associated with the Etowah occupation. This is the same problem faced by Wauchope. The conclusion was based on the excavation of Moorehead, the correspondence between the name of Etowah ceramics and the name of the mound site, and the profusion of this type of ceramics on the surface at the Etowah site. Recent investigations by the Georgia Historical Commission (Larson personal communication) have indicated that the major mound building activity at the Etowah site is associated with Wilbanks ceramics (Savannah in Wauchope's terms). Further, as a result of excavations in Mound C, which is the mound excavated by Moorehead and the one from which most of the "Cult" material was obtained, this elaborate expression is believed to have been associated with Wilbanks ceramics rather than Etowah. The lower levels (below Moorehead's work) contained Wilbanks ceramics, and Wilbanks has been found stratigraphically above Etowah on the site (Wauchope 1948: 205; Larson personal communication).

Maize has been shown to have been quite important in the subsistence pattern of Middle Mississippian manifestations; and in the
examination of acculturation involving elements of the Mississippian Pattern, maize will certainly be one of the important aspects of the study. In the report of the Allatoona Reservoir Caldwell has made an interpretation concerning the subsistence of the people associated with Kellog ceramics. He states (1950: 17), "An exhaustive examination of the pits was made to see if there was some indication of the use of maize. We can say definitely that maize was not cultivated." Maize may not have been cultivated by the people making Kellog ceramics, but Caldwell did not prove this definitely. A more acceptable manner of making this interpretation would have been to say that the evidence does not indicate that maize was cultivated. The level of understanding of maize in the Southeast is quite poor; and this level will not be improved by inflexible statements, which do not relay the true nature of the factual information.

During the excavation of sites in the Allatoona reservoir other sites were excavated in addition to the Wilbanks site. An important site on Stamp Creek, a tributary of the Etowah River, produced material from most of the ceramic types identified for the northern Georgia area. The Stamp Creek site had a stratigraphic section six feet thick. Excavation and subsequent analysis showed that (Caldwell 1950: 17), "The findings agreed in most essentials with those of Wauchope." Unfortunately, detailed information concerning this section will not be available until the final report of the Allatoona survey is published.

One of the other important sites excavated during the survey was the Procter's Bend site, which contained the Woodstock Fort (Caldwell 1950: 13). This site was surrounded by a circular shallow ditch and two palisade lines, which Caldwell has interpreted as supports for a
platform. At certain points along the palisade were defensive towers. This appears to have been a significant site, and the publication of data concerning the site will be quite helpful.

In the same year in which Caldwell published the preliminary report on the Smithsonian work in the Allatoona, Sears published the preliminary report on the excavation at the Wilbanks site. Sears interpreted the mound as a collapsed earth lodge and confirmed Wauchope's stratigraphic sequence from the site. He found the chief ceramic type of the site to be the type described by Wauchope as Etowah. In this early report Sears also discussed the ceramic type described by Wauchope as similar to Savannah Complicated Stamped from the coast of Georgia. Sears states (1950:140-141),

The major pottery type of this occupation is Savannah Complicated Stamp (Caldwell and McCann, 1941, pp. 44-45). The sherds differ from the original type description in the Irene Report in that the motifs now recognized as Etowah Complicated Stamp are not present, and that some sherds exhibit more complex stamps (Fig. 47, 8, 9, and 10). The remainder of the ceramic complex in this midden deposit is not at all like that found at the Irene site, however. There is no Savannah Check Stamp, no Savannah Burnished Plain, and no Savannah Fine Cord Marked as described by Caldwell and McCann (1941). In place of these we have a new plain ware, in jar and bowl shapes, with an indifferently smoothed surface which is frequently sandy to the touch, and an orange filmed ware which is apparently confined to bowl shapes.

It now seems probable that the Savannah Complicated Stamp sherds at the Irene site were not of local manufacture, since they are in the minority at that site, were mixed with Etowah sherds, and do not fit too well, typologically, with the remainder of the complex. That we are dealing with substantially the same period of Savannah development at both sites is indicated by the Etowah Complicated sherds at Irene. All of those illustrated by Caldwell and McCann (1941, Fig. 18) are the late variants which immediately preceded the Savannah deposits at CK-5. The Irene contact with North Georgia then was at approximately this late Etowah-Savannah juncture.

Sears does well to point out that the ceramic assemblage associated with the sherds called Savannah Complicated Stamped in northern Georgia
is not like the assemblage associated with this type on the coast. This author has examined Savannah Complicated Stamped material from the Irene site, which is on file at Ocmulgee National Monument; and no complicated stamped sherds fitting the Etowah type description (Sears 1958: 189) were identified. It would have been better if Sears had pointed out that the stamps on the material illustrated by Caldwell and McCann (1941: Fig. 18) are "late variants of Etowah which immediately preceded the Savannah deposits at CK-5." Nevertheless, Sears' concluding statement that "Irene contact with North Georgia then was at approximately this late Etowah-Savannah juncture" is reasonable and deserves further investigation.

The remainder of the preliminary report by Sears was a cursory statement of the same topics he covered in the final report. This final report on the investigations of the Wilbanks site contained a description of the excavations, including the Wilbanks earth lodge. The remainder of the discussion pertained to ceramic materials from the site in their stratigraphic relationship at Wilbanks, their relationship to the evolution of ceramic styles in northern Georgia, and their relationship to the ceramics of surrounding archaeological manifestations, which Sears thought contemporary with the various units at Wilbanks.

Because Etowah material comprised the major ceramic component at the site, this component received most of Sears' attention. His stratigraphic phases A and B fit into the Etowah sequence, Etowah I-IV (Sears 1958: 170), which had been developed by him and Caldwell on the basis of their combined work in the Etowah basin. Unfortunately, evidence for this division has never been presented in the literature. The
division is based primarily on stamps, and Sears has placed most of his emphasis on the stamps in the understanding of the "development" of Etowah out of Woodstock. Sears, like Wauchope, has analyzed thoroughly the stylistic importance of the stamps on Etowah ceramics and on the basis of this style study has inferred evolution of ceramics and the implied change of culture.

The "Southern Cult" (Waring and Holder 1945) has often been cited as an important aspect of the South Appalachian Mississippian expression. From evidence at the Wilbanks site Sears (1958: 134) concluded, . . . It is reasonably certain that the cult had its peak during the second half of the total span of Etowah culture occupation of the site . . . and almost completely certain that the cult pertains to the Etowah culture rather than to the later Wilbanks (formerly Savannah) or Lamar Periods.

The Etowah "period" has been associated with the Southern Cult on rather tenuous grounds. First Sears correlated Etowah with Dallas in the Tennessee valley with which the "Cult" is associated. Second, he had limited evidence from two burials at the Wilbanks site (only one of which was excavated by Sears) that copper ear spools and an effigy bottle were associated with Etowah ceramics. And third, he supposed the material excavated by Moorehead at the Etowah site to have been associated with Etowah ceramics. We conclude that this is the type of information in which we must place low confidence.

The Savannah Complicated Stamp problem was again attacked in the final report. This time Sears' approach was with more vigor and a higher degree of confidence than in the earlier report. In discussion he has attempted to show that the usage of the term Savannah by Wauchope (1948: 206), Caldwell (1950: 11), and Fairbanks (1950: 143-144) is erroneous. Sears has stated (1958: 172),
... Only one pottery type of the coastal Savannah series was present, the complicated stamped type. Since there was believed to be only an overlap of one pottery type, the cultures were considered to be distinct, and it was believed that a name other than Savannah should be chosen.

After examination, Sears saw a difference in the complicated stamped wares from the two sites. Then, on the basis of the difference in stamps, paste, and members of the series, he presented the name Wilbanks to the northern Georgia material and termed it a separate and distinct series from the Savannah series on the coast.

Sears interpreted the Wilbanks occupation of northern Georgia as an intrusion. He concluded (1958:182) that very little is known about this occupation and that "One of our greatest needs in north Georgia at present is the excavation of pure sites of this period, to straighten out temporal relationships and give us a full picture of the culture content." This is, in fact, what is needed concerning the associations of Wilbanks, but Wilbanks is not the only manifestation in northern Georgia that needs this treatment.

Lamar ceramics constituted only a minority of the material at the Wilbanks site. Sears provided a general description of this material and pointed out (Sears 1958:183), "... We may eventually work out temporal and ethnic variants of Lamar pottery complexes with some exactness. We need not give up and simply reiterate 'Muskhogean culture of the 16th century.'"

The work and the interpretation of the work in the Allatoona reservoir were caught in a bind between time and understanding. The work was the rushed work of a salvage program, and the interpretation was the effort of archaeologists to produce as much explanation for the academic world as was reasonable from the evidence on hand.
Archaeological theory has taken some turns since the interpretation of the Allatoona by Caldwell: today we look for and expect different results from archaeological investigation. Presently, archaeologists do not request explanations as much as they request facts. And, they need to be aware of the confidence of those facts if interpretive material is to be of value in the formulation of hypotheses for investigation in their own areas of interest. Explanations are good for the general public and for the archaeologist whose interests are significantly removed in time and space. The archaeologist can formulate his own explanation. This is not to say that archaeologists should not interpret their material, but that interpretation should not cloud the validity of the information upon which that interpretation is based.

b. Other Salvage Projects

The salvage work in the Allatoona Reservoir was one of the largest and most extensive of such archaeological operations in the northern Georgia area, and from it we have a considerable amount of data concerning the prehistory of northern Georgia. This information has been and will be supplemented in the archaeological record by information from other, more recent investigations.

Salvage operations in the Buford Reservoir near Gainesville, Georgia were carried out between 1950 and 1951 by the Smithsonian River Basin Survey Commission. The final report concerning this salvage operation has not been published. Caldwell has given a preview in a short article on "Cherokee Pottery from Northern Georgia" (Caldwell 1955a). This paper was devoted to the description of a late pottery complex, which Caldwell typed as Boyd Complicated Stamped and Boyd Check Stamped. These types were similar to the Galt material from the
Allatoona survey. In addition, Caldwell referred to the Summerour Mound, which was located in the reservoir and which was later excavated. The excavation and interpretation of this mound indicated that the mound was occupied by people who made Woodstock ceramics (Caldwell personal communication). So far, this is the first mound site that has been associated with this type of ceramics. A combination of the results of these excavations with those from the Woodstock (Wauchope 1966) and the Proctor's Bend sites (Caldwell 1950: 13) should begin to give some substance to the cultural associations of Woodstock.

The investigation of the Clark Hill Reservoir on the Savannah River was brief; and, unfortunately, it did not yield a substantial amount of material. Two reports were published concerning ceramic sites from the Reservoir: Miller's (1950) report on the ceramics from 38-Mo-6 near Clark Hill and Caldwell's (1953) report on the Rembert mound group. With respect to the interests of the present study, the Rembert report is the more important of these two discussions. The Rembert group was one of the mound sites visited by Bartram in his travels through Georgia, and the mound was later examined by several others. The location of this site by Caldwell and the types found during the investigation indicate its importance in the understanding of the prehistory of the middle Savannah River drainage. The illustrations of the material in the report on the Rembert group (Caldwell 1953: Plate 56) suggest the existence on the site of representatives of many sherd types, including Lamar, Pee Dee, Savannah, and Etowah. Caldwell mentioned that Woodstock material was present on the site. Unfortunately, with which of these manifestations the mound is associated is unknown. A close investigation of the information may yield a
suggestion as to which type(s) it is associated, but it would only be a suggestion.

Another northern Georgia salvage project of importance to this discussion was carried out by Roy Dickens, Jr. in Stone Mountain State Park (Dickens 1965). Important in the report from this site is that Dickens found a small stratigraphic unit containing both Woodstock ceramics and a type that he called small-element simple stamped and suggested to be Napier. With the paucity of information concerning Woodstock and Napier ceramics this site provides valuable, if not quantitatively large, amounts of information. However, from the stratigraphic distribution Woodstock and Napier material were not segregated.

Recently, the University of Georgia has carried out extensive archaeological investigations in the Conasauga River basin in the vicinity of Table Rock Creek. At the mouth of this creek the Corps of Engineers is constructing another dam, and the University of Georgia has been called upon to perform salvage investigations. The salvage work has been carried out under the direction of A. R. Kelly and has included excavations at the sites of Little Egypt and Bellfield (Ashley 1932), which are of interest to this study. The physical location of these sites indicates that the final report on these investigations should provide important evidence concerning the nature of the occupation of this area and the overlap between cultural types of the Tennessee valley, western North Carolina, and northern Georgia.
3. Summary

In reviewing the archaeological record of northern Georgia, the emphatic theme of that record appears to have been explanation—explanation of the prehistory of the area rather than a presentation of the archaeological evidence. Wauchope began the reporting of modern investigation in the area with his preliminary report (1948) on the WPA survey of northern Georgia. This report included a preliminary presentation and explanation of the data which had been analyzed by that time. His second report (1950), concerning the evolution of ceramic styles in northern Georgia on the basis of the unreported survey data, was wholly explanatory. The entire informational basis for the explanations was presented only in the final report. In 1950 Caldwell published a sequential set of conclusions concerning the prehistory of the Allatoona Reservoir and gave the archaeological world little more than a new set of type names. Sears' report on the excavation of the Wilbanks site (1958) presents primary evidence and explanation, but Sears' explanation (e.g., Etowah settlement patterns) extends beyond the Wilbanks site itself. However, without the complete report of the Allatoona Reservoir investigation we must reserve judgement on these explanations.

When Wauchope began the northern Georgia survey, he was operating in the "archaeological light" which had been produced as a result of the investigations at Macon and on the Georgia coast in the vicinity of Savannah. As a result Wauchope appears to have seen patterns in northern Georgia from the point of view of the archaeology of central and eastern Georgia. For instance, Kelly suggested that Late Swift Creek ceramics was a variety of Swift Creek, which was displaced from the
Macon area with the appearance of Macon Plateau ceramics and that it showed up in peripheral sites on the late time level. Initially, Wauchope found Swift Creek ceramics in northern Georgia just as the pattern from central Georgia predicted. In the final report much of what had been previously termed Late Swift Creek was classified as Savannah Complicated Stamp. Further, Kelly had suggested that Napier material would be a significant component of the ceramics from northern Georgia. Although approximately half of the 907 Napier sherds found in the northern Georgia survey came from within twenty miles of Macon, Wauchope continued to consider Napier a significant ceramic type in northern Georgia. This type was seriously considered in his discussion of the evolution of northern Georgia ceramic types. In another case certain complicated stamped ceramics, which bore some resemblance to a ceramic type on the Georgia coast, were found. Borrowing the name from the coastal region, Wauchope called this type of ceramics Savannah Complicated Stamp. Sears conditionally accepted this designation in his early report on the Wilbanks site, which produced this type of material. Later, in the final report on the Wilbanks site, Sears made his case for the new type name of Wilbanks for the northern Georgia ceramic series.

It is reasonable to expect that the northern Georgia survey analysis should relate to the existing data from the remainder of the state; yet, such an approach produces a recognizable bias on the part of the investigator. Classification of the ceramics from the northern Georgia survey clearly indicates the presence of this bias. Wauchope was influenced considerably by the work which had been performed in central and southeastern Georgia. Arguments against typological splitting
notwithstanding, the separation of ceramic types is an important aspect of research in the Province. Interpretation that hinders the correct analytic separation and identification of ceramic types in time and space is an impediment.

Analysis of the temporal significance of ceramic types in northern Georgia has been based upon three major methods: stratigraphic studies, style analysis, and cross-dating ceramics with relative dates from other portions of the contiguous geographical area.

Stratigraphy has not been a frequent luxury on northern Georgia sites. Wauchope found significant stratigraphy on only four sites. In two test pits on the Two Run Creek site he discovered a thin stratigraphic section containing the types Dunlap Fabric Impressed, Mossy Oak Simple Stamped, Deptford Check Stamped, and Woodstock. These types were interpreted to have been distributed in this respective order from top to bottom of the section. However, the details concerning the section were never presented. From a statement by Caldwell (1950: 17) it is supposed that at least a portion of this section has been substantiated by the six feet of stratigraphic section at Stamp Creek in the Allatoona Reservoir, but the results of this investigation have not been released. We must conclude that the temporal position of these ceramic types in northern Georgia as related by stratigraphic analysis is tenuous.

On the other hand, four other sites in the northern Georgia survey produced stratigraphy showing significant results. Excavation at the Long Swamp, Wilbanks, and Horseshoe Bend sites uncovered stratigraphic relationships between Etowah, Savannah, and Lamar ceramics, which appear from all recent investigation to be quite valid. Wauchope
proposed that these ceramic types were related in this respective sequence with Etowah earliest and Lamar latest. During the Allatoona salvage Sears substantiated this sequence with the excavation of other sections at the Wilbanks site. More recently, Kelly (1962: 5) and Larson (personal communication) have reported a similar sequence from the Etowah site. Thus, in the present study a high level of confidence will be placed in this temporal relationship for the northern Georgia area.

The alignment of relative temporal sequences by the use of cross-dating has been frequently employed in northern Georgia. Basically, this has involved assigning temporal relationships to a ceramic type because a similar ceramic type had been found in a certain relative and temporal position in a contiguous area. Wauchope considered Deptford and Mossy Oak types to be early because similar sherds had been found in an early context in central and eastern Georgia. Presently, there is evidence from western North Carolina that ceramic types similar to Mossy Oak and Deptford are not uniformly early over the entire South Appalachian Province. The North Carolina evidence indicates that types similar to these may have been made as late as A.D. 600-1000 (Dickens 1970: 16-21). Similarly, Napier ceramics was put into the temporal position in northern Georgia that had been suggested for it on the basis of investigations in central Georgia and the similarity of this type to certain varieties of Swift Creek. Additionally, Wauchope temporally aligned Etowah with Mature Mississippian on the basis of assumed similarities of cultural expression. In a more recent case Sears also used cross-dating to temporally align the ceramic manifestations from the Wilbanks site. He related Etowah to the Mature
Mississippian Period (not the Macon Plateau, Early Mississippian Period) on the basis of ceramics, the Southern Cult, and the temple mounds which were supposed to have been associated with Etowah ceramics. Due to his evolutionary sequence of style, this alignment placed Woodstock and Napier into Sears' Early Mississippian and Middle Woodland periods, respectively. Likewise, after having changed the terminology of the Savannah type in northern Georgia to Wilbanks Complicated Stamp, Sears suggested that this ceramic type should be related to the temporal period on the Georgia coast that produced Savannah ceramics.

The value of cross-dating is obvious to the understanding of pre-history. However, as investigations proceed and our knowledge of the past improves, we recognize that cross-dating is often an impediment to the understanding of the relationship of temporal and spatial variables. Temporal alignment may vary significantly in separate spatial contexts. No better argument can be presented for the necessity of absolute dates from the South Appalachian Province.

One of the important aspects of archaeological work in northern Georgia has been the location and identification of sites and components of sites through excavation. In the present approach one of the important elements in the formulation of hypotheses is analysis of distribution of known archaeological entities. Many sites have been located in northern Georgia, and from the survey standpoint it is probably better known than any portion of the South Appalachian Province.
D. THE MIDDLE CHATTAHOOCHEE RIVER VALLEY

The middle Chattahoochee River valley is an area on the periphery of the major expression of complicated stamped ceramics. As has been pointed out (Caldwell 1958: 47; Sears 1964: Fig. 5), the middle drainage of the Chattahoochee is the point of contact between the complicated stamped tradition of the South Appalachian Province and the plain and incised wares of the Gulf Coast Tradition. During the Mississippian Period, which we have recognized as the South Appalachian Mississippian in the Province, the middle valley possesses an expression of acculturated elements somewhat different from those of the more central portion of the Province. Yet, in this area there is a strong expression of complicated stamped pottery as well as temple mounds, and this fact makes it imperative that the region be considered in any study of the acculturation of indigenous cultures and the Mississippian Pattern.

The middle Chattahoochee valley did not receive the impact of Depression archaeology as it was felt in central Georgia. Only a few reconnaissance investigations and one small excavation have been reported in the literature from this period. These investigations included the salvage operations of Frank Lester at the Bull Creek site (Patterson 1950) in 1936, Willey's excavation of the site of Kasita in 1938 (Willey and Sears 1952), and Fairbanks' reconnaissance along the Chattahoochee in 1940 (Fairbanks 1955). These operations were limited in scope as well as in treatment in the literature; thus, the middle Chattahoochee region emerged from the Depression as virtually unknown archaeologically.

More recently, a great deal of information has come to light concerning the prehistory of the middle Chattahoochee. The installation
of two large dams (Walter F. George Reservoir and Lake Oliver) called for extensive salvage operations (Proctor 1953; Huscher 1959; McMichael and Kellar 1960; Kelly et al. 1962; Kellar, Kelly, and McMichael 1962). Aside from the formal salvage operations, the threat of damage to the Rood's Landing site on the shore of the Walter F. George Reservoir stimulated the Columbus Museum to initiate investigations at this well known site (Caldwell 1955b). In addition to the stimulation of salvage operations in the region, investigations at the large site of Kolomoki were sponsored by the Georgia Department of Parks. Extensive excavation was carried out at this site (Sears 1951a, b, c, 1953, 1956) as part of the development program of the Department of Parks. As is the unfortunate case with most archaeological investigations, most of the archaeology of the middle Chattahoochee region has been performed with a lack of central coordination; and we suffer from lack of publication of some of the important aspects of the investigation. Nevertheless, the information that has been presented is sufficient to express the importance of this region to the understanding of South Appalachian Mississippian acculturation and to provide information for partial solution and construction of hypotheses related to this problem.

1. Kolomoki

The large site at Kolomoki with its numerous large mounds has long been recognized as a major site in the Southeast. Kelly (1938: 45) mentioned it as an important Late Swift Creek site. Furthermore, the number of mounds and the truncated pyramidal structure of the large mound suggested the relation of this site to the horizon in the eastern United States which had produced temple mounds.

Sears began the excavations at the Kolomoki site and found that he
was limited by two factors. First, he could find no stratigraphy on
the site other than that of the mounds themselves, and the site appeared
to have had multi-component occupation. Second, when Sears began his
investigations, he was "breaking archaeological ground" in the region;
and he had only the information from such removed places as central and
northern Georgia and the Florida Gulf Coast (Willey 1949) with which to
compare and complement his investigations. Due to the spatially
limited area of his investigations he had only the information from
Kolomoki upon which to base conclusions. The totality of Sears' pub-
lished information came from his excavations in six of the seven mounds
at the site and excavations in the "village" associated with the mounds.

Kolomoki investigations produced an assemblage which Sears felt
consisted of utilitarian as well as ceremonial materials, principally
"village and mound." Within these materials he recognized units that
he felt could be segregated into two separate divisions (Sears 1956a:
30): a unit of plain and incised ware similar to the Gulf Coast
Tradition and a unit in which the complicated stamping of the South
Appalachian Tradition was dominant. Due to the lack of stratigraphy
Sears resorted to a seriation in order to construct the relative tem-
poral positions of the ceramics at Kolomoki. His seriation resulted
in the construction of a sequence beginning with a type of Gulf Coast
Weeden Island ceramics, which he divided into two parts (Weeden Island
I and I-b), and ending with the period of Kolomoki Complicated Stamped
ceramics.

The ceramic seriation constructed by Sears has a strange appear-
ance to most Southeastern archaeologists because it places a Swift
Creek related type (Kolomoki Complicated Stamped) temporally after the
Weeden Island types. In the southern region of the South Appalachian Province Swift Creek and its associated Santa Rosa complex have been thought to have preceded Weeden Island or, at least, to have been no later than Weeden Island I (Willey 1949: Fig. 76; Kelly 1950: 28, 32; Caldwell 1958: 57). However, the basic information for this opposing opinion has come from manifestations that were probably Early or Middle Swift Creek rather than Late Swift Creek. Sears was essentially fitting a type which has been termed Late Swift Creek onto the end of his sequence at Kolomoki. He suggested that a type of complicated stamped ceramics, Little Kolomoki Complicated Stamped, was present with the Weeden Island I ceramics of the site, and that the style of complicated stamping was present at all levels of time in the Kolomoki sequence. The situation was one of a blending of a minor complicated stamp type with Weeden Island and then a re-emergence of that style in Kolomoki Complicated Stamped.

With respect to the derived sequence for the Kolomoki site, Sears was careful to point out the assumptions in his analysis. First, he assumed (Sears 1956a: 30) a continuous cultural development at the site; and, second, he assumed (1956a: 31) that the various units used in the seriation were sufficiently valid to yield significant results. Sears' evaluation was that "... these units are what we have to work with, and seriation achieved with them has some definite value."

Of course, when the assumptions are clear and after the seriation has been performed, the next problem of the methodologist is to decide which end of the seriation is "up." The results of Sears' decision led to a controversy, which he (1956a: 30) himself had predicted.
Although not a necessity before beginning seriation work, it is desirable, and almost unavoidable, to have some idea of the order in which these periods occurred. This is not completely necessary, of course, since the charts can be turned upside down if desirable. In fact, I strongly suspect that some Southeastern archaeologists will feel happier looking at the one here produced in the inverted fashion. However a number of points might be mentioned which indicate that the Kolomoki period is the latest.

In the present approach to the archaeology of the South Appalachian Province, the level of confidence in results such as those of Sears in this case are important. Because Kolomoki has the appearance of a site which is quite important in the development of Mississippian traits in the Southeast, we must know the limits to which results such as these may be taken.

Sears has pointed out his reasons (1956a: 30) for placing Kolomoki at the end of the sequence.

First, it was realized quite early that Mound E belonged in the Kolomoki period since Kolomoki Complicated Stamp vessels were a part of the assemblage. Other vessels in Mound E, particularly the Mercier Red on Buff pots with their free painting and Mississippian shapes, indicated affiliations with or influences derived from, Mississippian rather than Woodland temporal levels. A second point is the association of the village areas bearing Kolomoki Complicated Stamp as the major pottery type with the temple mound and plaza set-up. Since this feature too is Mississippian, the Mound E evidence is strengthened.

Then, having aligned this sequence with other sequences in the Southeast, Sears (1956a: 78) pointed out that the Weeden Island portion of the sequence carries through Period D of the lower Mississippi valley sequence (Phillips, Ford, and Griffin 1951) and that Kolomoki must thus fall into Period C; he assumed for a somewhat nebulous reason that Kolomoki must be no later than the appearance of the Southern Cult and Etowah ceramics. He also pointed out that the pattern of the site with the temple mound at Kolomoki is similar to sites of Periods C and
We find that at the present time the last two of Sears' arguments for alignment need reconsideration. First, although Kolomoki may be pre-Southern Cult and pre-Etowah ceramics, Sears' argument is not strong. He states (1956a: 78),

*Although there is a stylistic overlap in this definitely pre-Savannah stamp, the Kolomoki period can extend no later than does the Etowah period in which the Southern Cult (as manifested at Etowah) falls. This is based on stratigraphy at Wilbanks and elsewhere in the Etowah Valley, including recent work at the Etowah site. Savannah Complicated Stamp and the related Wilbanks Stamp are post-Etowah culture everywhere in the valley (Sears 1950c and b, Caldwell MS).*

It has been shown in the previous section that the presumed relationship between Etowah and the Southern Cult has yet to be demonstrated.

In the latter case Sears suggests that the plan of the mounds at Kolomoki is similar to the "Large Rectangular Village Sites with temple mounds" which Phillips, Ford, and Griffin (1951: 309-343) have placed in the C-B time period (Late Coles Creek and Plaqueme). Sears (1956a: 10) refers to the large mound at Kolomoki as "One of the rectangular truncated pyramids classified at [sic] Temple Mounds in the Southeast." He continues to refer to the mound as a "Temple Mound" and to base conclusions on the fact that it is a temple mound. The large mound at Kolomoki was termed such because it was a truncated rectangular pyramid; yet mounds on the Kolomoki site which have been demonstrated to be burial mounds have presented structural features including truncated pyramids (e.g., Mound D, Sears 1956a: Fig. 4). The obvious question is whether or not the large mound at Kolomoki may be a burial mound. The lack of a ramp, the similarity of the shape of the mound to other mounds, and the lack of partial excavations to reveal any of the elements of a structure on the summit all suggest that revaluation of the
assignment of the title "temple mound" to this large mound may be necessary. Revaluation is especially important because this mound is often referred to as one of the earliest temple mounds of the Province (Caldwell 1958: 47; Sears 1964: 271).

Kolomoki appears to have been an important site from the standpoint of its large size, its location between the two traditions of the Southeast, and the nature of its mounds. Yet, the excavation there has provided only the beginning of the analysis of the prehistory represented at Kolomoki. Sears' publications concerning the site primarily have presented descriptions of the burial mounds and of the pottery types found in the various units of his investigation. His seriation was an attempt to draw something of meaning out of a limited amount of information. Sears has stated (Sears 1956a: 50),

We view the relationships and temporal arrangements, which have been outlined as hypotheses, not as final results. The probable degree of approximation to what may be eventually demonstrable fact varies as noted in several instances. The writer feels that this sort of attempt is necessary since we will never have answers without constant attempts at comprehension of the observed phenomena and constant attempts at problem formulation on the basis of them.

The present writer could not agree more wholeheartedly with this statement of Sears. As archaeologists we must continually remind ourselves that our hypotheses are not results, and that the hypotheses of other workers in the field often appear to us as results because of our lack of familiarity with the material. We accept Sears' description of the ceramics from Kolomoki, and we accept his description and interpretation of the burial features on the site. But, we must be careful to evaluate his conclusions, to consider them as conclusions based on inference that involves various methodological procedures, and to remember that the assumptions behind these methods should condition
acceptance of the results. While we may generally accept Sears' conclusions, we cannot use them as demonstrable fact in the formulation of hypotheses for further work, for, as Sears has commented, they are hypotheses themselves.

2. Salvage Archaeology

The investigation by Sears was the first of a series of rather extensive investigations in the middle Chattahoochee valley. The installation of the Oliver and Walter F. George dams on the river called for salvage archaeology, which has contributed to the body of knowledge of the prehistory of the Chattahoochee valley.

The report on the archaeological survey of the Oliver Basin (McMichael and Kellar 1960) is one of the best reports of salvage archaeology presented in the literature in the South Appalachian Province. The report provides essential data from the survey, including the location of sites and the results of their excavation. The publication includes the presentation of the data and the illustration of stratigraphic and plan relationships of the material. The data collected and reported is as complete as may be expected from a salvage operation, and the information is treated in a holistic manner. Following the report of the data, the writers present the facts for a historical correlation of the salvage information, a study of the environment and economy, and, finally, a discussion of the cultural chronology and the continuity of the cultural systems of the basin.

Especially useful in this presentation is the section on environment and ecology. McMichael and Kellar have necessarily placed a significant amount of importance on the artifacts of their collection, especially on the ceramic artifacts. Yet, they also have recognized
the necessity of placing these artifacts and the clusters of artifacts, which are recognized as sites, in the perspective of their structure within the environment. They have presented charts showing the relationship between sites and various topographic, hydrographic, and soil variables. Furthermore, they have presented information concerning the economy of the sites as far as this information is available; and they are cautious to point out the limitations of the data. For example, they clearly note the positive and negative aspects of their conclusions (McMichael and Kellar 1960: 196).

In the Swift Creek period, slight evidence (1Le17) indicates a continuance of the strong gathering tradition of the Early Woodland period. On the other hand, it is suspected that the Etowah and Avarett [sic] groups represent the beginning of another trend, which sees more dependence upon horticulture. As far as known, Swift Creek in the local area has not produced any evidence of horticulture; it is lacking on both early and late sites further south (Haloca; and Quarter Master Site, Chase, personal communication). Apparently the riverside location of these sites, especially at shoal lines in the lower basin indicates considerable fishing by all these groups.

In every case the information, or lack of information, upon which the writers have based their interpretation is clearly presented in the report. For instance, a glance at Table 23 in the report shows that the interpretation of fishing activity associated with sites producing Swift Creek ceramics is based solely on the proximity of sites to a particular type of riverine environment rather than on recovery of fish remains from these sites.

In the concluding chapter of the report, the cultural chronology is presented in considerable detail (McMichael and Kellar 1960: Fig. 22). Of interest to the present study is the latter portion of this chronology involving the time period during and immediately preceding the period of the South Appalachian Mississippian expression. The
appearance of this sequence is the first holistic sequence presented for the middle Chattahoochee. (Sears [1958] had presented a sequence in his final report on the site at Kolomoki, but this sequence did not include many of the archaeological units that have since been recognized to exist in the region.) Because the general sequence presented in the Oliver Basin report is the one which seems to be generally accepted by most of the workers in the Chattahoochee region, we shall continue discussion by examining the evidence from the entire middle Chattahoochee valley in support of this chronology and the cultural associations.

The writers (McMichael and Kellar 1960) recognized Swift Creek in the Oliver Basin and broke this unit into the classic tripartite division—Early, Middle, and Late. However, they classified the Late Swift Creek in the basin as the Oliver variant. (Unfortunately they did not give a description of this type. There certainly seems to be some aversion in the literature to descriptions of Late Swift Creek ceramics.) In all three divisions of the type only scant evidence appears to exist for sites with significant Swift Creek associations in the basin. Only one site contained components of Early and Middle Swift Creek ceramics; elsewhere there were only a few scattered sherds (McMichael and Kellar 1960: 209). Concerning the Late variety the authors have pointed out that the Kolomoki strain of Late Swift Creek was absent from the region as was any indication of a relationship of the material to Weeden Island types. As with the Early and Middle varieties, only one site was located, which had a significant quantity of this Late Swift Creek type.

One of the most interesting Early and Middle Swift Creek sites of
the valley is the Mandeville site located in Clay County in the basin of the Walter F. George Reservoir (Kellar, Kelly, and McMichael 1962). The site is particularly significant to the present study because it contained two mounds, the larger of which was a truncated rectangular pyramid. The smaller mound was a burial mound associated with Swift Creek ceramics. The larger mound appeared to have been the result of construction activities of a Mississippian Period group (Rood's Focus) because this type of material was spread over the surface of the site. Excavation disclosed that the upper level of this mound was associated with this late type of ceramics. However, the lower levels of the mound were demonstrated to have been associated with Deptford and Early and Middle Swift Creek ceramics. Excavation showed that throughout the four levels of construction activity on the mound, all of the structures had been truncated pyramids; and the lowest three levels of the mound were associated with Woodland ceramic types. The lowest of these structures, which was associated with Deptford ceramics, contained a truncated pyramidal feature that was evidently the initial phase of mound construction (Kellar, Kelly, and McMichael 1962: 339).

One of the earliest constructions is Feature 25. This structure provided definitive evidence of the fact that Mound A began, as well as ended, as a truncate rectangular mound. Feature 25 was a long, low, 2-foot high mound, very definitely flat-topped, composed of clean yellow sands and clays. The flat summit measured 18 feet wide by 40 feet long.

All levels of Woodland occupation of the mounds produced considerable occupational or midden debris on the southern side of the structures, while the northern portions were relatively clean of debris. No pattern of post molds discernable as structures appeared on any of these levels.

With respect to the significance of the truncated pyramidal mounds
at the Mandeville site the authors have commented (Kellar, Kelly, and McMichael 1962: 353),

It is important to note the presence of a well defined truncate pyramidal mound ... occurring at a chronological level in early to early-middle Woodland times. Just how unique or phenomenal this may be is a moot question at this juncture. There are strong suggestions that Moore noted similar examples on the Northwest Gulf Coast of Florida in his early work, and then too, the possibility exists that other Woodland mound structures exist but are masked by Mississippian caps, as exemplified at the Mandeville site. Further, while not as definite as the Standley Mound at Mandeville, the mound architectonics at the Swift Creek site near Macon, present some suggestions of contained primary structures. It is conceivable that the immense "temple mound" at Kolomoki might well be of multiple construction, with much of the earlier building ascribable to a middle Swift Creek occupation, masked by Weeden Island additions. Hence it seems likely at least that the presence of a pyramidal mound at the Mandeville site of early Woodland provenance is not unique, and that more intensive site exploration in south Georgia and northwest Florida might produce additional examples on this early time level. It seems clearly indicated that truncated rectangular mounds occur in this area long before the classic Mississippian temple mounds.

McMichael and Kellar (1950: Fig. 22) follow the Swift Creek varieties of materials with the Averett ceramic type (Chase 1959). Etowah (II and III) material, which is considered intrusive, is placed as contemporaneous with Averett. This is followed by the Rood's Focus (Caldwell 1955b) and a variant of Lamar, which is called Bull Creek Focus. During the historic period the chronology is ended with the appearance of the historic Ocmulgee types.

The Averett ceramic complex was presented in 1959 (Chase 1959) as a new ceramic type in the Chattahoochee region. Chase originally had thought that the type represented a terminal phase of the Middle Woodland occupation of the region. He has reported the material from three sites in the vicinity: the Averett site on the Ft. Benning Reservation in Georgia; the Kendrick site (Abercrombie Mound) in
Russell County, Alabama; and the Alexander site in Harris County, Georgia. Two types, Averett Plain and Averett Incised have been described. Interestingly, Chase has noted (1959: 4) that the Averett ceramic type "bears closest resemblance to Etowah II in terms of temper, texture, color, and rim form" and (Chase 1959: 8) that the material appeared on the Alexander site in a general association with Etowah Complicated Stamped.

The nature of the frequency and distribution of Etowah material in the middle Chattahoochee region (above the fall line) was indicated by the Oliver survey (McMichael and Kellar 1960: 211-212).

The Etowah-like appearances in the basin seem to be largely of thin impermanent nature, and of a slightly different type than the typical northern Georgia expressions. . . . Only three sites produced Etowah sherds in any quantity.

Yet, the association of this type with the Averett material described by Chase seems to be rather strong. Chase (1963) followed his initial report and the Oliver Basin report with "A Reappraisal of the Averett Complex." In this reappraisal Chase noted that the results of survey investigation since his original report suggest that some significant relationship may exist between Averett ceramics and Etowah Complicated Stamped ceramics. Three sites produced features in which Averett ceramics was in direct association with Etowah Complicated Stamped material. As a result, Chase felt that the Averett material may be culturally more closely associated with Mississippian than with Woodland expression.

The Rood's Focus, which followed and was partially contemporaneous with the Averett period in the Oliver sequence of the Chattahoochee valley, is another important phenomenon. This manifestation was first reported by Caldwell in 1955. He had spent two months of the summer of
1955 excavating in four of the eight mounds of the Rood Plantation on the Chattahoochee River. The site was on what was to be the shore of the Walter F. George Reservoir. At the Rood's site Caldwell recognized two distinct manifestations. One was a combination of material similar to Lamar and Ft. Walton ceramics, and the other was a plain and incised ware, which had loop and strap handles. These were divided into three periods: Earlier, Middle, and Later. The Lamar ceramics came primarily from the upper levels of the mounds. Caldwell excavated structures on the summits of three of the mounds at Rood's, and structures on two of the mounds were shown to have been associated with the Later Period ceramics.

The plain ware, which came from the lower levels of the mounds and which was chronologically placed in the Middle and Earlier Periods, is the material that appears in the literature as the Rood's Focus. The artifacts came from the middle and lower levels of two of the mounds and from all levels of the other mounds excavated by Caldwell. On the basis of the similarity of this assemblage (especially shell tempered ceramics which were found in the lower levels of one of the mounds at Rood's) to the Macon Plateau ceramics and to the ceramics from Hiwassee Island and other Mississippian Pattern sites, and on the basis of the dissimilarity of the wares from the artifacts which were generally associated with the South Appalachian Province, Caldwell (1955b: 41) concluded,

The earlier levels at Rood's Landing, then constitute such an exceedingly sharp break with the indigenous tradition that they must represent a different people who moved into this area from some place west of Georgia where plain surfaced, shell tempered pottery is more characteristic.

Unfortunately, Caldwell did not give a description of the material from
this site; rather he referred to some of the material as similar to Lake Jackson Plain and varieties of Pinellas Incised (types recognized from northern Florida [Willey 1949, Griffin 1950]).

Interestingly, by the time of the report on the Oliver Basin, the designation of the material from the Early and Middle Periods at the Rood's site had been given the classification "Early Lamar." Due to the lack of similarity of this material to the type description of Lamar, McMichael and Kellar (1960: 213) suggested that the name be changed to Rood's.

Therefore, we would drop the Lamar entirely and give the Middle Chattahoochee area expression a focus designation which will be understood to be more Mississippian than anything else. For the focus designation, Rood's is suggested. While the Singer Mound group to the south may well be the best and purest expression of this focus (Chase, personal communication), the only published information on the focus derives from the early phases of Rood's Landing (Caldwell, 1955 and 1958). Therefore, it seems preferable to call this the Rood's Focus.

In the Oliver Basin the Rood's material was very sparsely represented. Only one site contained any significant number of the sherds which the authors placed in the Rood's Focus. On the basis of this small scattering of Rood's ceramics they concluded (McMichael and Kellar 1960: 214) that the Focus might still be viewed as a "more or less isolated Mississippian expression, with a few large ceremonial centers (Singer-Moye, Rood's Landing) and otherwise of no great extension, though viewed from the Oliver Basin only, this may be misleading."

Unfortunately, we who view the activity in the Chattahoochee valley from afar must sit back and wonder what Rood's Focus actually represents. As mentioned, Caldwell's initial report on the small excavation at the site is the only description of the material by the primary investigator. McMichael and Kellar (1960: Plate IV) presented
photographs of a few sherds. Later, in one of the group of reports of investigations on several sites in the Walter F. George Reservoir, Kelly and De Baillou (1962) reported some of the Rood's material from the Grace's Bend site in Clay County, Georgia. The authors reported that the site had been badly disturbed and that there was "... nearly complete destruction of in situ context." The data report of the material from this site consisted primarily of a set of plates of photographs of some of the diagnostic material from the site. In Plate I (Kelly and De Baillou 1962: 27),

There is an interesting panel on rimsherds with characteristic loop handles with variations of nodal proturbances, with crudely incised rim sections, all familiar in the Chattahoochee variant of early Mississippian locally denominated Rood Focus.

They proceed to say that,

Survey of the type site and its archeological potentials may be said to be in an early exploratory stage; such a large, imposing, and significant site deserves several seasons of careful investigation, with much more time allowed than Caldwell had at his disposal. Survey along the Chattahoochee has shown the widespread occurrence of this culture as one of the components on many multiple-occupied sites within the river basin.

Unfortunately, a description of this type and a firm placement within the temporal and spatial framework of the Chattahoochee valley has never been presented. Therefore, in the preparation of hypotheses that involve Rood's material, we must be critical of the supposed position of this ceramic type. Rood's material appears to have been significant in the prehistory of the South Appalachian Province, and it may hold some keys to the better understanding of both the Mississippian Pattern "intrusion" into the Southeast and the acculturation which ensued.

Following the Rood's Focus in the sequence outlined by McMichael and Kellar (1960: Fig. 22) is the Bull Creek Focus, which they
considered a "Lamaroid" focus. In addition to pointing out the Lamar influence in this Focus, they indicated that there was also Ft. Walton influence. The definition of the Bull Creek Focus was presented in an explanatory manner in the last section of the Oliver Basin report (McMichael and Kellar 1960: 214-215).

At about 1350-1400, several forces begin to impinge upon Rood's Focus, which eventually alter it into a Lamaroid expression. Coming from the south, moving up the Chattahoochee River, Fort Walton begins to appear in many sites, especially incised types and Lake Jackson Plain. This force is so strong that a movement of peoples is probably indicated. Secondly, coming from the east and north is the resurgent stamping tradition, complicated and check-stamped, from type Lamar, Savannah, and Wilbanks sources; again a movement of people is indicated and the Rood's Focus is acculturated into the Lamar tradition, but with addition of Fort Walton-like traits. The culmination of this is probably to be seen at Bull Creek, on the southside of the City of Columbus. And hence, we would term this phase in the continuum as the Bull Creek Focus.

Ceramics related to the unit described by McMichael and Kellar's Bull Creek Focus have also been found with some frequency in other parts of the middle Chattahoochee (if we are to assume that all sites with Lamar-like pottery with Ft. Walton influence in the valley belongs to the Bull Creek Focus). Caldwell found this type of ceramics at the Rood's Landing site and assigned it to the Later Period on the site (Caldwell 1955b: 36); Sears found similar material at the Kolomoki site (1956a: 26-27). In addition, artifacts that would fit into the definition of the Bull Creek Focus were found during the survey of the Walter F. George Reservoir (Kelly et. al. 1962). One site in particular, 9C1a51, in the survey has produced a significant amount of this material; and the Broyles' report (Broyles 1962: 29-35) has presented several good illustrations of the ceramics. Unfortunately, a detailed description of the location and structure of sites is not available for the Walter F. George Reservoir as it is for the Oliver Basin.
3. Summary

Archaeology of the middle Chattahoochee River valley has disclosed that it is an important area in the prehistory of the South Appalachian Province. Ceramically, the region represents a blending of the South Appalachian Complicated Stamped tradition and elements of extra-areal traditions, particularly the Gulf Coast tradition. As in central Georgia three distinctive units of ceramics may be segregated: unmistakable evidence of Swift Creek ceramics is found throughout the valley; a variety of plain ware (Rood's Focus), which is comparable to the plain ware from Macon Plateau, is present; and a late complicated stamped ceramics (Bull Creek Focus), which is related to the Lamar expression is central Georgia, is found. However, unlike the situation in central Georgia, the Chattahoochee material shows evidence of pottery style characteristic of the Gulf Coastal Plain. The earliest of these Gulf Coastal types to be found in the Chattahoochee region is ceramics of the Weeden Island type. This type is particularly evident at the Kolomoki site. Later ceramics of the Gulf Coastal tradition, which appear to influence the ceramic assemblage of the middle Chattahoochee, are those of the Ft. Walton type. Additionally, minority types similar to Lake Jackson and Pinellas types of the Gulf Coast are influential during the later period.

Temporally, only a few rough approximations of the positions of the assemblages have been demonstrated. Through the use of a seriation technique, Sears (1956a) produced a temporal sequence at Kolomoki, relating Weeden Island I types and the Kolomoki Complicated Stamped variety of Late Swift Creek ceramics; but this sequence has not been fully accepted by areal archaeologists. Sears placed Kolomoki
temporally later than the Weeden Island types; however, many workers in
the Southeast feel that the various forms of Swift Creek should precede
Weeden Island ceramics in the Gulf Coastal region.

The temporal relationship between Swift Creek and the later types
of Averett and Rood's Focus have not been determined in detail. At the
Mandeville site material of the Rood's Focus has been shown (Kellar,
Kelly, and McMichael 1962) to fall temporally later than the manifesta-
tions of Early and Middle Swift Creek. Yet, the temporal spread
between these two types is not clear. At the Rood's Landing site
(Caldwell 1955b) Rood's Focus material has been bracketed beneath mate-
rial similar to Ft. Walton and Lamar ceramics. In the northern portion
of the drainage of the Chattahoochee (McMichael and Kellar 1960) Rood's
Focus material has been shown to have been generally contemporaneous
with Averett ceramics (Chase 1959). However, McMichael and Kellar's
chart notwithstanding (1960: Fig. 22), Rood's Focus material has not
been shown with any degree of certainty to postdate the Etowah ceramics
which have been found in the middle Chattahoochee region.

The spatial structure of archaeological material in the middle
Chattahoochee region is only partially represented in the literature.
In the Oliver Basin report McMichael and Kellar (1960) give adequate
information concerning the spatial distribution of sites that they
found in their survey. For the remainder of the drainage of the river
we are not so fortunate. The distribution of sites in the Walter F.
George Reservoir is known only from the few site reports that have
appeared (Kelly, et. al. 1962; Kellar, Kelly, and McMichael 1962), and
this is only from the Georgia side of the river. Survey of the western
side of the river, which was conducted by the University of Alabama has
not been reported. A similar situation exists with respect to the
distribution of archaeological material in the vicinity of the site of
Kolomoki in Early County. We have a large amount of information from
the Kolomoki site itself but know relatively little about the general
distribution of material in the area.

The holistic definition of cultural manifestations in the region
and the analysis of cultural process in the area are minimal. On the
basis of the burial mounds at the Kolomoki site Sears has suggested a
rather in depth interpretation of the prehistoric culture associated
with the mounds (Sears 1956a: 95-100). Yet, we do not conclusively
know the significance of the largest mound on the site; we do not know
the relationship of domestic activity to the ceremonial site; and we
have no direct evidence concerning the economic base of the people who
constructed the mounds at Kolomoki.

As the Kolomoki site presents problems concerning the relationship
between Late Swift Creek ceramics, Weeden Island ceramics, and temple
mounds, the site at Mandeville presents similar problems. The upper
portion of the mound at Mandeville is understandably associated with
material belonging to the Rood's Focus. The lower portion of the mound
is associated with Deptford, and Early and Middle Swift Creek ceramics;
and the levels with which the ceramics are associated constitute rec-
tangular truncated pyramids—the type of mound morphology generally
associated with Mississippian temple mounds. That these early levels
at the Mandeville site are temple mounds has not been demonstrated;
however, their existence indicates that the general type of mound sub-
structure associated with the introduction of Mississippian elements
into the South Appalachian Province was present in Province at least as
early as the period when Swift Creek ceramics were being made in the middle Chattahoochee valley. As McMichael, Kelly, and Kellar point out, this is certainly basis for reevaluating the Swift Creek mound at the type site.

Associations of Rood's Focus material are poorly known. Caldwell has shown that the Rood's material is related to temple mounds at the Rood's Landing site (Caldwell 1955b). It has been suggested that the mounds at the Singer-Moye site are related to the Rood's Focus (McMichael and Kellar 1960: 213). However, information such as the settlement pattern and the economic base of the manifestations of Rood's Focus, as well as a definitive analysis of the ceremonial manifestations of this Focus, has not been presented.

We may apply the same type of criticism as outlined above for the Averett manifestation and for the distribution of the Bull Creek Focus. However, more information is available for the Bull Creek Focus than for any other prehistoric unit in the valley. This type of ceramics comprise the major type found by McMichael and Kellar in the Oliver Basin. With respect to ceremonial centers, Averett ceramics has never been shown to be associated with the construction of a mound that has been demonstrated to be a temple mound, while Bull Creek Focus material has been reported to be associated with the construction of two of the mounds at the Rood's Landing site.
E. ATLANTIC COASTAL PLAIN

The transitional zone from the complicated stamped pottery region of the South Appalachian Province to the cord and fabric marked wares of the northern Atlantic seaboard crosses the piedmont and coastal plain area of North and South Carolina. To the south this coastal plain region has a natural boundary formed by the drainage of the Savannah River. We have seen from comments of early observers (Blanding 1848, Howe 1860, Schoolcraft 1860, Thomas 1894, Pepper 1924) that significant groups of prehistoric sites are found in this portion of the coastal plain. Many of these sites were mound sites, some of which were supposed to have been temple or domiciliary mounds. The evidence suggests that the coastal plain region will prove to be significant in the study of Mississippian acculturation in the South Appalachian Province.

Archaeologically, the Atlantic Coastal Plain region has been sadly neglected. A systematic survey of archaeological sites in the area has never been conducted; and extensive archaeological excavation has been carried out at only two sites, both of which are located on the periphery. The Irene site in Chatham County, Georgia (Map 4) was excavated during the Depression years from 1937 to 1940. On the northern extension of the region, excavation at the Town Creek site (Map 4) also began during the Depression (1937) and has continued to the present. Smaller scale operations have been carried out in recent years at the Hollywood site in Richmond County, Georgia (De Baillou 1965) and at the McDowell (Mulberry) site near Camden, South Carolina. (Here work was carried out by the University of Georgia.) Additionally, a few sporadic comments concerning the archaeology of the area have
appeared, such as the cursory ceramic type studies by Griffin (1943, 1945) and the reports of the Harvard University investigations on the Savannah River (Stoltman 1966, Peterson 1969).

1. Irene

Investigations began at the Irene site in 1937 as a Works Progress Administration project. The excavation was the largest of a series of excavations carried out in the Savannah area as a part of relief programs. Located on a bluff north of Savannah, Irene contained two mounds. It was reported by C. B. Moore (1898b) and was supposed to have been one of the important prehistoric sites in the coastal region. Excavation showed that, indeed, Irene was important: it exemplified elements of a variant of South Appalachian Mississippian on the Georgia coast (Caldwell and McCann 1941).

Excavations were carried out at Irene under the shadow of extensive archaeological operations in central Georgia at Macon Plateau and other sites, and the emphasis placed on ceramic analysis in central Georgia for reconstructing prehistory was carried to the coast. Waring observed in 1938 (Waring 1968: 107),

' As one looks over Georgia sites, at the hopelessly tangled mass of ten or fifteen centuries of petty migration, influx of one culture, and extinction of another, it becomes increasingly apparent that in pottery styles and stratigraphy (or superposition of a later culture upon an earlier one) lies the great hope of ever creating order from chaos.

In accordance with Waring's philosophy, the initial goal of the coastal investigations was to produce a description of the ceramics and the development of a ceramic ("cultural") sequence for the coastal area that could be correlated with emerging sequences from the remainder of Georgia.
As excavation at Irene and other sites on the coast progressed, the important ceramic types were discussed and described; and a sequence was proposed. In "Some Chatham County Pottery Types and Their Sequence," Caldwell and Waring (1939a) described some of the dominant ceramic types from the lower Savannah River, including Deptford, Brewton Hill, Wilmington, Savannah, and Irene. In conjunction with the ceramic segregation these investigators also constructed a ceramic sequence (Caldwell and Waring 1939b). The sequence was evidently based upon excavations at both the Irene and the Deptford sites. However, information from other sites on the Georgia coast such as Bilbo, Refuge, and St. Simons Island was probably considered in the construction.

The Deptford site stratigraphy provided the principle information for alignment of the early portion of the sequence. In the stratigraphic section of the Deptford site, Waring demonstrated (1968: Fig. 50) the relationship between the Deptford-Brewton Hill types and the type Wilmington Heavy Cordmarked. Wilmington was above the former types in the stratigraphic section. St. Simons Fiber Tempered and a few "late" complicated stamped sherds were also in the stratigraphic section at the Deptford site; but they were in the minority, appearing at the bottom and top of the section respectively. This sequence (Deptford, Brewton Hill, Wilmington) was then supported by partial sections from the Bilbo, Evelyn, and Refuge sites.

Stratigraphy at the Irene site was primarily limited to the mounds, particularly the larger one. Analysis (Caldwell and McCann 1941: 78) of the stratigraphy of the temple mound indicated that the mound structure was primarily associated with Savannah ceramics. The Irene material was distributed in a thin layer over the top of the mound. In
addition to Savannah and Irene types, sherds of Wilmington, Deptford, and St. Simons were also found in the mound. However, these latter sherds were in the minority and, for the most part, were found in the top level of mound fill, probably indicating that the fill had been borrowed from a region containing sherds of this type (Caldwell and McCann 1941: 3). Thus, we see that the meaningful stratigraphy at the Irene site included only Savannah and Irene ceramics, while the stratigraphy from the other important sites on the coast significantly related only Wilmington and Deptford-Brewton Hill types. Minority evidence from both of these sites suggested a chronology moving from the top of the Deptford sequence to the beginning of the sequence at the Irene site, but this portion of the sequence has never been examined in an isolated stratigraphic section. This is indeed unfortunate for the evidence has indicated that major elements of cultural expression which are related to the South Appalachian Mississippian acculturation are associated with the missing portion of the coastal sequence.

At Irene a number of cultural items appear in association and form a rather unique assemblage for the Georgia coast. The temple mound and the complicated stamped surface finish on ceramics appearing in the Savannah and Irene assemblages are new items for the coast. On the other hand, other characteristics of the Irene site, such as the burial mound, urn burial, and ceramics with cordmarking and burnishing, are characteristic of many coastal sites. Thus, as Caldwell has hypothesized through the medium of explanation (1952: 318),

The Savannah II period [the Savannah period represented at Irene] may be regarded as a fusion of the old coastal culture with Middle Mississippian influences from the interior. The pottery and burial complexes were essentially a coastal
development, but the stimulus for the platform mounds and village layout must have been derived from the west.

In support of this hypothesis Caldwell points out (1952: 319),

That this cultural mixture resulted from the actual mingling of diverse peoples was remarkably shown by the skeletons of the people themselves. Hulse found that outsiders had appeared at Irene at this time [Hulse 1941: 67-68] and there was also evidence (a rare tooth anomaly) that an old coastal family line, and thus presumably others, had survived in this area from Savannah I times to the much later Irene Period.

This evidence from the mouth of the Savannah River is probably the most direct evidence concerning acculturation between elements of the Woodland Pattern and South Appalachian Mississippian that has been found in the South Appalachian Province. As such, it represents an important aspect of the prehistory of the Atlantic Coastal Plain and of the Province in general. Although a site containing significantly representative components of both Wilmington and Savannah II associations has not been investigated, the hypothetical blending of cultural types in the Savannah area is convincing. To be sure, we do not have evidence of the process and the broad cultural aspects of this change, but evidence points directly to the existence of acculturation on the coast.

That change occurred after the introduction of the South Appalachian Mississippian elements is reasonable to expect, and the ceramic assemblage at the Irene site suggests that such is the case. The Irene material found at the summit of the mound showed general similarities to the Savannah material beneath. However, the Irene material had incision, filfo/cross stamp, and frequent incidental rim decoration, none of which were characteristic of the Savannah types. That Irene ceramic types are similar to the Lamar types which Kelly had described for central Georgia has often been pointed out (Caldwell and
McCann 1941: 43; Caldwell 1952: 319). The comparison usually carries the implication that the appearance of these elements on the coast is the result of more influence from the interior. This is a reasonable hypothesis and deserves further investigation. We do not know much about the coastal manifestation that includes Irene ceramics, and more published information concerning the process of cultural change will be welcomed.

As a representative of South Appalachian Mississippian, Irene is an isolated site. Located on the coast at the mouth of the Savannah River, this site has the only substantiated temple mound found in close proximity to the Atlantic Ocean. It is isolated in an area in which the rest of the known archaeological record concerns manifestations that appear to fit the Woodland Pattern. The area near the mouth of the Savannah may serve as an excellent laboratory for a study of prehistoric acculturation.

2. Hollywood

The mound site at Hollywood has attracted attention for many years: but, unfortunately, it has never received an extensive investigation. Reynolds initially excavated the two mounds for the Mound Division of the Smithsonian Institution (Thomas 1894: 317-326), and for many years Thomas' interpretation of Reynolds' work affected the interpretation of the prehistory of the region. Thomas reported material, which has often been described as "Southern Cult" material, in the lower levels of the burial mound. Such artifacts as a bottle with a tripod support of human effigy heads, another bottle with a painted circle and cross design, and a beaker with a plumed rattlesnake engraving, definitely have "Cult" characteristics. The majority ceramic ware on the site
consisted of stamped material similar to Savannah and Pee Dee types. Reid (1965: 24-25) has noted that complicated stamped burial urns similar to urns from the Irene and Town Creek sites were found within the same burial mound as the Cult material on the Hollywood site.

Recent excavations at the site by De Baillou included the excavation of a trench into the large mound and two test squares into the burial mound. De Baillou (1965: 6) classified the majority of the material found in the excavation as part of the Savannah series. The overwhelming majority of this material was comprised of checked stamped and plain pottery. Next in frequency was complicated stamped pottery termed Savannah Complicated Stamped. In addition to these types, De Baillou identified several other sherds, including six sherds that he classified as Etowah types.

One of the important aspects of the Savannah ceramics identified by De Baillou at the Hollywood site was the frequency of incidental rim decoration. This decoration included the types of rim treatment discussed by Caldwell and McCann (1941: 42), which appeared on ceramics of the Savannah Series. Following De Baillou's work on the Hollywood site, Reid (1965) pointed out in "A Comparative Statement on Ceramics from the Hollywood and Town Creek Mounds" that similarities exist in rim decoration, surface finish, and vessel form of the ceramics from the two sites. Additionally, he illustrated that the urn burial complex found at Irene and at Town Creek is also present at Hollywood. Negatively, he stated that the "Southern Cult" material which is present at Hollywood is only faintly represented at Town Creek.
3. Town Creek

As Irene is isolated on the coast at the mouth of the Savannah, Town Creek is isolated in the red hills of the piedmont of North Carolina. Unfortunately, Town Creek has never received more than an explanatory description in the published archaeological literature. Yet, careful investigation over a number of years has produced a considerable degree of understanding concerning this site.

Town Creek is located on a tributary of the Pee Dee River just above the fall line in North Carolina (Map 4). This ceremonial center was first described by Coe (1952: 308-309), who outlined the results of archaeological investigations at the site. At Town Creek the occupation associated with Pee Dee ceramics was described as "... one of the best archaeological records of the movement of a people in the southeast ..." Coe stated that these people moved into the Carolina piedmont from the south, displaced the native Uwharrie culture, and after a period of time (originally estimated to be between A.D. 1550 and 1650) retreated in the wake of the advancing historic Siouans. On the basis of cultural relationships and physical types, Coe also suggested that these Pee Dee people were probably Muskogean speakers. To date, with the exception of a shift back in time of the total process with a new beginning ca. A.D. 1450, few of Coe's 1952 conclusions have been altered (Coe personal communication). Unfortunately, as was the case with a large portion of the articles in the Faye-Cooper Cole Memorial Volume on the Archeology of Eastern United States (Griffin, ed. 1952), Coe's comments concerning Town Creek were of an explanatory nature based upon evidence that was not available in the literature. To date only a portion of the primary information concerning the
excavation of the Town Creek site has been presented in the literature (Reid 1967).

Reid's analysis of *Pee Dee Pottery from the Mound at Town Creek* (1967) includes a general discussion of the construction of the mound at the site and a descriptive and distributional treatment of the ceramic material from a portion of the mound. Although he commented (1967: 55) that "more precise statements concerning the architectonics await a future author," he outlined the major construction phases of the mound in order to facilitate his description of the distribution of the ceramics in the mound (Plates VI and VII).

A premound humus extended under the mound in all areas excavated. Upon this surface were built several structures including two mortuary houses. Post dating the mortuary houses was an earthlodge banked on the sides with chunks of sod revealed in the excavation as a laminated earthern [sic] embankment. Nearby, probably contemporary with the earthlodge, was a "trash bin" constructed of posts surrounded on the exterior by clay and finally capped over the top opening with clay. After razing the earthlodge, a retaining wall was constructed and filled in to the height of the first temple structure. There is evidence for only one more structure with a shallow fill separating it from the first.

After having analyzed a variety of ceramics from the mound sample, Reid described two ceramic types for the Pee Dee ware, Pee Dee Complicated Stamp and Pee Dee Plain (Reid 1967: 42-54); he discussed the distribution of these types in the mound and made some temporal generalizations, which he felt were indicated by the structure of this material (1967: 55-63); and he discussed the relationships of the ceramic material at Town Creek to the archaeological manifestations in South Carolina and Georgia (1967: 64-73). In his comparative statement concerning Pee Dee ceramics Reid pointed out (1967: 64) that Pee Dee material is quite similar to other manifestations that occur in the Atlantic Coastal Plain to the south.
Diagnostic features of Pee Dee ceramics are re-recorded [sic] for pottery from sites beyond Town Creek to the extent that in many cases it is difficult to segregate the pottery according to site. In South Carolina and Georgia there are sites with pottery described, according to the typological framework established for Georgia, as Savannah, Irene, or Lamaroid. To this group of ceramic types we can temporarily add Pee Dee so that general similarities may be considered together. Most of these sites are characterized by one or more mounds and, though few have been excavated and fewer still reported, collections and observations do exist for tentative comparative correlations.

Reid also compared the ceramics from Town Creek to types from the Ft. Watson Mound in South Carolina (Map 4) and from the Irene and Hollywood sites on the Savannah River in Georgia. He concluded that generally types from all of the sites are similar. Reid amplified the point that the holistic units of the archaeological manifestations of the Atlantic Coastal Plain region of South Carolina and Georgia have never received adequate treatment in the literature, a fact that has resulted in quite similar assemblages being given different type designations. Town Creek, Irene, and Hollywood, each site on the periphery of the Atlantic coastal region, have provided the major portion of information for these comparisons. Ft. Watson is in the geographic center of the region, but the only information available from this site is a surface collection.

On the basis of his comparative studies Reid has suggested that Pee Dee ceramics have a generic similarity to the Savannah-Irene-Lamaroid wares of South Carolina. So great is this similarity that he (1967: 65) has postulated a "... Town Creek-Irene axis--an area of cultural interaction during prehistoric times." Reid approached comparison of ceramics from these two sites by treating Savannah II and Irene as a single unit because elements similar to Pee Dee ceramics appear in both periods. Obvious similarities between rim form and such
other ceramic traits as stamping have been found by Reid to relate the ceramics from Town Creek and Irene. In discussion of the similarities he stated (1967: 68),

Blatant similarities exist in decoration and rim specialization, which Caldwell and McCann (1941: 42) discuss together for the Savannah and Irene types. The most frequent features of rim specialization consist of single rows of hollow reed punctations or rows of spaced rosettes--irregular pellets of clay impressed with a hollow reed. Also common at the Irene site are large, round reed impressed nodes usually riveted to the wall of the vessel and often employed with hollow reed punctations.

Further, as Reid noted, Caldwell and McCann (1941) have mentioned that nodes and punctations were common during the transition between Savannah and Irene and that they were carried on into the Irene period, when, after a brief period, they were dropped.

Other than rim specialization Reid has pointed out that certain stamps occur in both areas. With respect to Savannah he has stated (1967: 70), "The concentric circles design is only one of the principal stamp motifs of the Savannah period that is duplicated at Town Creek; yet differences in other motifs seem minor and may simply be regional." Concerning the Irene inventory he has commented, "The conventional cross [filfot] and the filfot scroll are the only motifs illustrated for the Irene stamps that are also found in the Pee Dee." Regarding vessel form, Reid (1967: 71) has stated, "Pee Dee vessel forms are more comparable to Savannah forms since the globular jar with an elongated neck, apparently common during the Irene period, is not duplicated at Town Creek. Again, the difference may reflect regional variation."

We noted in the discussion of Sears' early report on the Wilbanks site that the stamps on Savannah Complicated Stamped material are similar to some of the stamps on Etowah ceramics. Although Reid did not
compare Pee Dee ceramics with any types other than Savannah and Irene, a comparison of the stamps he illustrated for Pee Dee (1967: 11, 13) and those Wauchope illustrated for Etowah (1966: 31) shows similarities of style. Plates IV, VIII, and X, showing Pee Dee ceramics from North Carolina and Etowah type sherds from Georgia, also illustrate this comparison. This ceramic comparison is not intended to show any direct relationships, but rather to help the reader form an idea concerning the gross characteristics of the Pee Dee assemblage. Furthermore, we should note that the analysis by Reid of a selected unit of pottery from the mound is only a small fraction of the total collection of pottery from the site, and we should not suppose that the illustrations given by Reid comprise all of the stamp styles found in Pee Dee.

4. Central South Carolina

Irene, Hollywood, and Town Creek are located on the periphery of the Atlantic Coastal Plain region, and our knowledge concerning the prehistory of the region is drawn primarily from these sites. However, as pointed out in the section which treated the early archaeological record, there are indications that the central area is quite important. The only recent excavation in this vicinity was that of the McDowell (Mulberry) Mound executed by the University of Georgia in the early 1950's. The McDowell Mound was the mound group previously reported by Blanding (1848: 107) and excavated by Reynolds for the Mound Division (Thomas 1894: 326-327). A report of the recent excavations of the McDowell (Mulberry) Mound has not yet been presented in the literature, but the ceramics from this site are similar to the Pee Dee ceramics from Town Creek and the ceramics from Ft. Watson (Caldwell personal communication, Stuart 1970).
There is little to say concerning the archaeological record of the central region South Carolina for the simple reason that a published archaeological record simply does not exist. Reid (1967: 77-79) has made a few comments concerning the mound site at Ft. Watson on the shores of Lake Marion. Although this site belongs to the State of South Carolina and is protected, no archaeological investigation has been conducted here. In addition, there are a few misconceptions to be corrected. In his report on "The Archeology of Eastern Georgia and South Carolina" Caldwell (1952: 320) referred to two mounds in the vicinity of Columbia, "... the Greenhill mound and McCollum mounds in Richland District ..." The Greenhill Mound is located in Richland County about twelve miles below Columbia, but this is not an artificial mound. Although the location was undoubtedly used as a prehistoric occupation site, the mound is a natural sand mound created by the meandering of the Congaree River. The McCollum mound is not in Richland County. Caldwell had placed this mound in its correct location in an earlier reference (Caldwell 1952: 318) when he referred to "... the McCollum Site, Chester District, South Carolina."

5. Summary

Acculturation on the Atlantic Coastal Plain, which combined elements of the South Appalachian Mississippian with the indigenous Woodland tradition, is evident in the archaeological record of this portion of the South Appalachian Province. Caldwell found evidence at the Irene site (Caldwell 1952: 319) indicating a physical mixture of people as shown through the study of skeletal material as well as a combination of elements of material culture on the Georgia coast. Additionally, examination of general descriptions of the Town Creek
manifestation (Coe 1952, Reid 1967) and of the reports concerning the Hollywood site (Thomas 1894: 317-326; De Baillou 1965; Reid 1965) indicates that these sites show evidence of a combination of South Appalachian Mississippian traits with those characteristic of the coast. This combination includes the association of temple mounds, complicated stamped ceramics, and Southern Cult material (at Hollywood) with such coastal plain characteristics as burial mounds, urn burials, mortuary houses, and various pottery forms. Yet, with only this supporting evidence we can say little about the process of development and growth of South Appalachian Mississippian in the Atlantic Coastal Plain region.

The Atlantic Coastal Plain is perhaps the poorest known region of the Province. Our confidence in the unity of this archaeological "culture area" has come from historical evidence as well as excavations from the periphery of the region. Town Creek and Irene are the only sites of the area that have been extensively excavated, and a degree of similarity is evident from the results. Reid (1967: 65) has pointed out evidence for a relationship between these two archaeological units. Further, he has pointed out similarities between Town Creek and Hollywood (Reid 1965) and between Town Creek and Ft. Watson (Reid 1967: 77-79). But, the relationships at this point are only superficial and are based on limited excavations at Hollywood and a surface collection from Ft. Watson. Thus, while we have sufficient evidence to hypothesize relationships between these sites that are widely spread across the Atlantic Coastal Plain, we have insufficient evidence for explanation of the nature of the relationships and the part they have played in acculturation on the coastal plain.

In addition to the intra-areal relationships, relationships
between this region and other portions of the Province are evident. Caldwell has indicated (1952: 318) that the expressions of Savannah II and Irene on the coast have ties with the interior, and Sears has suggested that the Savannah material on the coast is an aberrant form of Etowah Complicated Stamped ceramics (Sears 1950: 140-141). While the present author does not agree with Sears' designation of this coastal pottery as Etowah, it does have stamps which are similar to Etowah Complicated Stamps. Further, the ceramic stamps illustrated by Reid for Town Creek and those illustrated for Etowah by Wauchope show a striking similarity.

A significant amount of evidence exists to link sites of the Atlantic Coastal Plain portion of the South Appalachian Province into an acculturated unit of South Appalachian Mississippian; and further evidence exists to link material from sites in this area with sites in other areas of the Province. However, the necessary investigation required to perform such extra-areal comparisons has not been presented, and such a presentation will require a significant amount of research in this portion of the Province.
F. THE MOUNTAINS

For many years the mountain portion of the South Appalachian Province remained virtually unknown archaeologically. As part of the various relief and public service programs of the Depression, the periphery of the mountain area was investigated. Projects that hinted about the prehistory of this area were carried out in eastern Tennessee, in the western extension of North Carolina, and in northern Georgia; but the central portion of the mountains and the eastern slopes have only recently received archaeological attention. These investigations have been carried out by the University of North Carolina in the mountains of North Carolina and by the Universities of South Carolina and Georgia in the southeastern portion of the mountain area in the vicinity of the headwaters of the Savannah River.

In Tennessee the western extension of the Appalachian Mountains was investigated as part of the salvage program during the construction of several of the Tennessee Valley Authority hydroelectric dams. One of the most extensive of these salvage programs was carried out in the Chickamauga Basin in the heart of the eastern Tennessee Ridge and Valley Province. From this survey a short preliminary report on the archaeological survey of the Basin (Lewis and Kneberg 1941) and later a detailed report on the excavations at the Hiwassee Island site (Lewis and Kneberg 1946) were published. Unfortunately, these reports covered only a small portion of the total investigations carried out in the Chickamauga Basin during this period. Many of the important sites, such as Dallas, Davis, Hixon, and Mouse Creek, are treated in detail only in an unpublished manuscript on the Chickamauga Basin on file at the University of Tennessee.
The results of the investigation of the Chickamauga Basin indicated that sometime during the prehistory of the area cultural systems typologically fitting the definition of Middle Mississippian appeared. These systems included the Hiwassee Island and the Dallas phases. The Hiwassee Island phase was assumed by many people to belong to the same period as the intrusion at Macon Plateau, and the Dallas phase was known to be later. The two were put into the classification system developed by Webb for the Norris Basin (Webb 1938), which included early "small log town houses" and later "large log town houses" as a major dichotomy of Mississippian structures. The Hiwassee Island phase was inserted into the former of this classificatory system; the Dallas phase, into the latter. More recently, the dichotomy between these two units, as well as similar units throughout the Southeast, has come to be known as Early and Late Mississippian.

Information concerning the Hiwassee Island and the Dallas phases in eastern Tennessee has been important to the study of South Appalachian Province archaeology. Evidence for relationships between the two areas exists, and the contiguity has given archaeologists of the Province an opportunity to relate South Appalachian manifestations to the Tennessee cultural systems that were apparently in the mainstream of Mississippian development. The ceramic wares of eastern Tennessee during this late period of prehistory are shell tempered, as Mississippian pottery should be. For the most part, the material is plain with some incising (especially during the later period); and the forms are typical of other Mississippian assemblages. However, as a minority, certain attributes characteristic of ceramic treatment in the South Appalachian Province appear with this typically Mississippian
ceramic material. Hiwassee Island Complicated Stamped pottery (Lewis and Kneberg 1946: 104) is shell tempered, but the stamping on the ceramics duplicates the stamping on the Etowah Series complicated stamped material from northern Georgia. Later than the Hiwassee Island Series ceramics, the Overhill Complicated Stamped pottery also shows complicated stamping reminiscent of the Lamar stamps from central Georgia and the stamps on Qualla ceramics from the mountains. Overhill Complicated Stamped material from Tennessee is shell tempered. Other ceramics that conform to the style of Overhill but that are grit tempered have been called Tugalo Complicated Stamped in eastern Tennessee (Broyles 1967: 50). There is probably little difference between this Tugalo Complicated Stamped ceramics and the Qualla Series from the central mountain area.

Thus, from ceramic considerations a cross relationship between the eastern Tennessee area and the South Appalachian Province has been established. Yet, there are other important similarities between the cultural systems of the eastern Tennessee area and the Province. In particular, structures and art forms of the Mississippian manifestations of the Tennessee Ridge and Valley Province have parallels to the southeast. Primarily, this dissertation is concerned with relationships between manifestations within the South Appalachian Province; however, we recognize that the information from the more Middle Mississippian cultural systems to the west are important to the ultimate understanding of the cultural development in the Province. Hence, although we shall not treat the archaeology of the eastern Tennessee area in further detail, we shall keep in mind the close geographical relationship between this area and the Province; and for some special items, such as
the construction of earth lodges and the construction of mounds, we may comment on the similarity of the Provincial expression to that across the mountains.

In addition to the peripheral work on the Tennessee side of the mountains, relief archaeology touched other mountain regions. The Peachtree site (Setzler and Jennings 1941) was excavated in western North Carolina. Wauchope (1966), in the survey of northern Georgia, extended his research into a portion of the mountains. The area near the Nacoochee Mound, which had been excavated earlier by the Heye Foundation (Heye, Hodge, and Pepper 1918), was examined rather extensively by Wauchope. Here Wauchope excavated two mound sites, Stephenson and Eastwood (Wauchope 1966: 344-352, 460-465). Interestingly, in this portion of the northern Georgia area primarily Etowah and Lamar ceramics were found. Wauchope did not report any Savannah ceramics in this portion of Georgia. The mound sites were associated with Etowah in the lower levels and with Lamar in the upper levels. However, apparently the two ceramic types were mixed (1966: 349). Wauchope gave the details of the excavation of the mounds in the final report. Both mounds were small and seem to have represented limited mound-building activities. Neither approached the size of the large Nacoochee Mound in the same area.

Armed with information from the preliminary reports of the northern Georgia survey, the reports from the Chickamauga Basin research, and information from the Peachtree site, students of the South Appalachian Province began to attempt explanation of the prehistory of the area. Many of the discussions centered around the topic of the archaeological identification of Creek and Cherokee groups. In 1961 Coe published a discussion concerning some of the interpretative
problems that archaeologists faced when attempting to integrate the
historic Cherokee and the mountain manifestations in general into the
fabric of Southeastern archaeology. His concluding comment (1961:
59-60) was

I do not believe, however, that work on the periphery will
ever solve the heart of this problem [the Cherokee problem].
A thorough investigation of the Middle and Valley towns of
the Cherokee must be completed before many of the present
questions can be answered.

In a footnote to this comment Coe stated, "The University of North
Carolina is beginning in 1960 a 5-year program of archaeological
research devoted to these problems of Cherokee origin and cultural
tradition." Coe's five-year program has been extended into a research
program that has lasted ten years and is still in progress. The inves-
tigation has resulted in documentation of the archaeology of the cen-
tral mountain area during historic and prehistoric times (Holden 1966,
Egloff 1967, Dickens 1967, Dickens 1970). These reports provide a
meaningful body of information with which we can begin to interpret the
archaeology of the mountain area without resorting to extrapolation
from the periphery.

Dickens' (1970) "The Pisgah Culture and Its Place in the Prehistory
of the South Appalachians" is the most comprehensive report to date on
the archaeological work in the mountain area. The emphasis of this
report is primarily on the cultural manifestation associated with
Pisgah ceramics. Topics of discussion cover ceramics, nonceramic arti-
facts, structures and features, burials, and food remains; and, fortu-
nately, the breadth of investigation in the mountain area has provided
detailed information on these topics from both domestic and ceremonial
sites associated with Pisgah ceramics. Furthermore, the results of
survey and reconnaissance work in the area has provided Dickens with a considerable amount of spatial distributional data, which he has incorporated into his discussion of the more specific data from excavated sites. As part of his report Dickens has placed the Pisgah manifestation into the temporal pattern of cultural development in the mountain area, and in doing so he has presented a cursory discussion of the sequential development of the cultures of the mountain portion of the Province. The information for Dickens' conclusions came from the entire volume of western North Carolina research, including surface surveys, test excavations, and intensive excavations. However, the major portion of the information for the sequence of development came from three excavated sites: the Warren Wilson or Fawcett site (Bnv29) and two of the three Garden Creek Mounds (Hw01 and Hw02).

Each of the ceramic types mentioned in Dickens' discussion of the mountain survey (1970: 14-23) was present on at least one of the three sites listed above. The important ceramic series included Swannanoa, Pigeon, Connestee, Pisgah, and Qualla; and Dickens concluded that they developed in roughly this respective order. (Original reference to Pigeon, Connestee, and Pisgah was given by Holden [1966]; the type description of Qualla was originally presented by Egloff [1967].) The Warren Wilson site produced Swannanoa, Pigeon, Connestee, and Pisgah material. Pigeon, Connestee, and Pisgah were found in the plowed soil of this site stratigraphically above the Swannanoa material. In a region of slump on the periphery of the site Pigeon and Connestee materials were found to be associated together stratigraphically earlier than Pisgah. Thus, the Warren Wilson site produced the sequence Swannanoa, Pigeon and Connestee, and Pisgah.
The other primary information for the development of the sequence in the mountain area was the stratigraphy from the mounds at Garden Creek. Hw02, the smallest of the three mounds on this site, was excavated by the University of North Carolina as a salvage project because the mound was being removed for house fill. The excavation revealed that the pre-mound humus contained Pigeon and Connessetee ceramics, that the mound layers contained primarily Connessetee Series material, and that the plowed soil contained Pisgah ceramics. Synthesis of this distribution led to the suggestion that the sequence of development was roughly Pigeon, Connessetee, and Pisgah. The largest mound on the Garden Creek site (Hw01) produced both Pisgah and Qualla ceramic material. The Pisgah types were associated with the major levels of mound construction while Qualla types were found in the plowed soil and in the slump of the upper levels of the mound. Summarily, the sequence of the mountain area presented by Dickens is based on stratigraphic information from three sites, showing the superposition of the major ceramic types of the mountains.

The ceramic material of the mountain Province shows strong similarities to the ceramics from other portions of the South Appalachian Province. However, some information suggests that these ceramic types in the mountains do not fall into the chronological position that has been suggested for their stylistic counterparts to the south.

Swannanoa ceramics are described by Dickens (1970: 16) as follows:

The sherds are orange to brown in color and have a rather friable texture. They are tempered with abundant grit and usually have a cord marked surface finish. Fabric Marked pieces are next in frequency, followed by plain, bold simple stamped and bold check stamped.

Close parallels to Swannanoa pottery are found in the Vincent and Badin series of the North Carolina Piedmont (Coe 1964) and in the sand-tempered variety of Watts Bar Cord
Following Swannanoa ceramic material in time, Pigeon and Conneetee ceramics show affinities to the south. They are similar to Deptford and Mossy Oak types from central Georgia. Dickens has stated (1970: 17),

Pigeon ceramics are characterized by medium-sized pots with round or flat bottoms and tetrapodal supports. Rims are straight to slightly recurved. Temper is composed of moderate to large amounts of crushed quartz. The outer surfaces of the vessels usually are check stamped, simple stamped or plain. Plain sherds exhibit tooling marks from having been lightly rubbed with a piece of steatite. This left the surface with a slight sheen. Other minority forms of surface finish include linear check stamping, cord marking and complicated stamping.

Whereas affinities for most Swannanoa ceramic traits are to the north and east, the presence of small amounts of check and simple stamping indicates some connections to the south. The more southerly influence became dominant in the development of the Pigeon Series, with obvious similarities to the stamping techniques and vessel forms of Deptford pottery (Wauchope 1966: 47-54).

Conneetee pottery from the central mountain area follows Pigeon material and shows affinities to Georgia material that is later than the affinial material of Pigeon. According to Dickens (1970: 19),

Conneetee pottery is characterized by a vessel form not unlike that of the Pigeon Series. On the whole, however, the pottery is somewhat thinner, there is a greater tendency toward eversion of the rim, and there is a reduction in size of, or loss of, the tetrapods. The ware is dark in color and is tempered with unaltered river sand having fine to medium-size particles. Surface finishes include plain, brushed, cord marked, fabric marked and check stamped, in approximately that order of frequency. There are also occasional complicated stamped pieces on which the motifs resemble closely those of Woodstock and Etowah Complicated Stamped (Wauchope 1966: 60-70).

The small mound at Garden Creek (Hw02), which was associated with Conneetee ceramics, appears to be quite important in the prehistory of the Province. The mound is definitely a platform mound, and it appears to have had an earth lodge at the base (Keel 1967). The association of this type of ceramics with a platform mound is important in the South.
Appalachian Province because similar ceramics seem to have been associated with a platform mound at the Mandeville site in the middle Chattahoochee River valley. Also similar to Mandeville, the lowest mound level at the Garden Creek Mound Hw02 was associated with a variety of "Hopewellian type" artifacts. Keel (1967) mentioned that "A few rocker-stamped and zone-punctated sherds and a large number of flake blades indicate Hopewellian connections." A date of A.D. 805 ± 85 years (No. GX593) for this early mound came from a hearth, which intruded the toe of the early mound and which contained Connestee sherds and a portion of a clay human figurine (Coe personal communication). The total implication is that this was one of the earliest platform mounds of the entire South Appalachian Province.

The focus of Dickens' report is the ceramics of the Pisgah Series (Plates XI and XII). Dickens has concluded (1970: 274),

Ceramics of the Pisgah Series can be grouped, on the basis of surface finish, into four types--Pisgah Rectilinear Complicated Stamped, Pisgah Curvilinear Complicated Stamped, Pisgah Check Stamped, and Pisgah Plain. There are a few sherds with woven-reed (or quill), corncob, cord, fabric, or net impressions.

The basic vessel form is a globular jar with an everted rim, on the top of which has been attached an additional clay strip to form a collar. There are also unmodified and thickened everted rims, straight rims, and inslanted rims. Rim decoration consists of bands of punctations or incised patterns. There are rim appendages in the forms of handles, nodes, vertical lugs, and appliqued strips.

Pisgah pottery as described in Dickens’ report has similarities to the preceding Pigeon and Connestee wares and to other ceramic types in the South Appalachian Province. The stamps on these ceramics are rectilinear as are the stamps from many types of northern Georgia; yet, the stamps illustrated for Pisgah are not identical to types which have been reported from the south. The stamps of Pisgah seem to be unique
to the mountain area. Further, the incidental decoration of applique

dolls on Pisgah ceramics has affinities to the northwest rather than
to the south.

Because the construction of mounds associated with Pisgah material
is important to the development of hypotheses in this paper and because
this information has not been presented in published form, we shall
give a brief statement concerning the mound at Garden Creek, which is
reported by Dickens (1970: 211):

A conjectural reconstruction may now be presented for the
sequence of building activity at HW 01. First, on a portion
of a pre-existing village area, a semi-subterranean, earth-
covered structure was erected. After some unknown period of
time, a second earth lodge was built adjacent to the original
structure, and the two were then used simultaneously.

Following the erection of the earth lodges, and again
after some unknown interval of time, a multicorridored ar-
rangement of posts was set up at the rear of the lodges.
Along the north side, the outer wall of posts came all the
way to the northeast corner of the second earth lodge. In
several instances posts were actually imbedded in the rear
portions of the earth roof-coverings of both lodges. It is
not known whether this elaborate arrangement of posts was
covered with any type of roof. One guess is that there was
some form of light-weight covering, consisting of straw or
small branches. This would have created a large open-air
structure, such as might have been used for public gatherings
during the warmer months.

Either at a point when the earth lodges were becoming
dilapidated, or when some socio-religious event signaled the
need for a new form of ceremonial architecture, a layer of
boulders was placed over the area previously occupied by
the rows of posts. Some posts were left standing; fallen
ones had rocks laid directly on them (Plate XCI).

Basketloads of soil were now brought in and heaped up
on the area outlined by the rocks and by the remaining posts.
This soil (labeled Zones F and G in Fig. 21) was collected
in old midden areas and contained artifact remains from all
previous occupations at the site. The fill was raised to
nearly the height of the earth lodge roofs, and at that
point a cap of clean yellow clay was spread over the top of
the fill (Zone E in Fig. 21). At first, the clay abutted
with but did not cover the top of the earth lodges. On
this surface (Floor 1) a construction was begun, but only
one wall was finished before the earth lodge roofs gave way.
This created two large concavities on the front floor of the
mound. When these depressions had been filled with more
village humus, the old roof areas were covered with a thin cap of clay (Floor 1-A). This provided a clay floor over the entire raised surface, which at this time measured approximately 50 by 70 feet.

Before this surface could be put to any use, however, the earth lodges collapsed further, causing the dejected mound builders to add a completely new cap of clay over the whole surface. This layer (Zone D) was from 1.5 to 2 feet in thickness and was surfaced with a thin layer of white sand. Although the east end of this floor (Floor 2) continued to sag, it was stable enough to serve as the base for the first significant ceremonial activity. At least two buildings were erected at different periods on the more trustworthy western portion of Floor 2, a total of seven burial pits were dug on the eastern side, and a log enclosure was built around the entire top perimeter.

The mound probably went through several building stages subsequent to Floor 2. Its final use was during the Qualla period.

Thus, the construction at Garden Creek associated with Pisgah ceramics was a composite affair combining the construction of a pair of earth lodges with a posterior platform; and only in the later periods of occupation did it support a superstructure on the summit of a platform mound, i.e., was it a temple mound (Plates XIII, XIV, XV, and XVI).

The Qualla ceramic series follows Pisgah ceramics in the mountain chronology; and Dickens has pointed out (1970: 84) that the ceramics from the Garden Creek site can be arranged into a continuum from pure Pisgah ceramic material to Qualla ceramics, a fact which indicates that Qualla did not replace the earlier ceramics but that it developed out of the Pisgah Series (albeit with a possible stimulus from the south).

Egloff's report concerning ceramics from historic Cherokee sites has provided information on ceramics that were definitely being made by the historic Cherokee. The description of Qualla ceramics is important because this ceramic type is so similar to the popular Lamar Series, which has been described in central Georgia. Egloff (1967: 34) states,

The Qualla Series is marked by a number of diagnostic features which clearly separate it from ceramics of an earlier date.
Plate XIII. First mound stage at Hu^1, Garden Creek Site, western N. C.

Plate XIV. Earth lodges at the base of Hu^1, Garden Creek site, western N. C.
Plate XVI. Large earth lodge, Hw01, Garden Creek Site, western N. C.

Plate XVII. Small earth lodge, Hw01, Garden Creek Site, western N. C.
The series possesses the basic attributes of the Lamar style horizon; folded finger impressed rim fillets; large, sloppy, carved stamps, and bold incising. The complicated stamped motif illustrating Lamar Complicated Stamped exhibit a greater degree of regularity and symmetrical design than is found on Qualla Complicated Stamped (Jennings and Fairbanks, 1939). The same holds true with the incised cazuela bowls, though to a lesser degree. Incising accompanied by reed punctations, which is common upon Lamar Bold Incised vessels, was absent in the material analyzed. These differences are very striking and have led to the definition of the Qualla Series as a distinctive ceramic complex.

Surface finish was the prime indicator of a sherds' [sic] category in this analysis. The distinctive qualities of the Qualla paste aided considerably in the classification of this series. The moderate to abundant quantities of grit coupled with a partial burnishing of the vessel's interior make Qualla sherds distinctive even when the exterior surface finish is obliterated.

A portion of the information utilized by Egloff in the description of historic Cherokee ceramics came from the Coweeta Creek Mound (Ma034) near Franklin, North Carolina. This site has been in the central focus of the University of North Carolina archaeological activities in the Cherokee project. Work began at this site in the summer of 1966 and has continued until the present time. The major excavation has consisted of the excavation of the small mound, which has proved to be a series of superimposed town houses (Coe personal communication). These houses had been built one on top of the other until a mound had gradually accumulated. Excavations have revealed that after the razing of successive town houses only enough dirt to cover up debris had been placed on the surface of the mound. Although the profiles of the toe of the mound have indicated that a large mound may have been constructed over this accumulated mound, the later constructions have been truncated by plowing. Historic material has been found on all but the lowest floors of the town houses. This pattern indicates that the period of occupation of the Coweeta Creek Mound may have intercepted the period
of the first trade contact with the Cherokee in this area.

In addition to the work in the mountain area by the University of North Carolina, the Universities of Georgia and South Carolina have performed archaeological work in the eastern portion of the mountains in Georgia and South Carolina. Here the University of Georgia excavated the presumed historic sites of Tugalo, Chauga, and Estatoe. Reports on the excavation of both Chauga (Kelly and Neitzel 1961) and Estatoe (Kelly and De Baillou 1960) have appeared in the literature. Each report gives a description of the excavation of the platform mounds on these sites and a description of the ceramics associated with the various levels of the mound construction. These investigations were part of the salvage operations on the Hartwell Reservoir on the upper Savannah River. More recently, the University of South Carolina has performed excavations in the basin of the Keowee River prior to damming operations on that river in South Carolina. Included in these investigations were test excavations of the presumed historic Cherokee sites of Keowee and Toxaway and the excavation of the site of Ft. Prince George. All of these sites were historically known Cherokee sites, and the recovered material is similar to the Qualla material reported by Egloff. In addition to these excavations the research program reported the excavation of the I. C. Few site, which was in the vicinity of Ft. Prince George. The Few site produced Pisgah ceramics and was the only Pisgah ceramic site excavated by the University of South Carolina expedition.
Summary

A decade ago the archaeology of the mountain portion of the South Appalachian Province was practically nonexistent. Today, on the basis of the problem oriented research of the Research Laboratories of Anthropology of the University of North Carolina it is archaeologically one of the best known areas in the Province, although most of the information has not reached publication. This is especially true with respect to the cultures which were associated with the construction of platform mounds. The excavation of the small mound at Garden Creek (Hw02) has supplied important information concerning one of the earliest platform mounds of the Province. The largest mound at Garden Creek (Hw01) has been associated with Pisgah and Qualla ceramics. Both types, Pisgah and Qualla, fit nicely into our definition of South Appalachian Mississippian. The date of A.D. 1435 ± 70 years (Dickens 1970: 78; No. GX0595) places Pisgah into a temporal period related to the Woodstock, Etowah, Savannah temporal period in piedmont Georgia. The dates for Qualla place it into the late protohistoric and the historic periods of South Appalachian Mississippian manifestations in the Province. Associated with this later Qualla ceramics, the Coweeta Creek Mound completes a rough archaeological picture in the mountain area. This site with its superimposed town houses seems to be typical of the historic Cherokee structures. Both the combination of mound sites as well as information in general from the mountain area constitute an excellent record for developing hypotheses for future research in the Province.
SECTION IV
SOUTH APPALACHIAN MISSISSIPPIAN

In keeping with the philosophy of cultural investigation outlined in previous sections, the author believes that the success of archaeological research in the South Appalachian Province is dependent upon the investigator's knowledge of the portions of cultural systems that have heretofore been defined in the Province. With this information the archaeologist selects his area of activity and makes judgment concerning the types of sites that he will investigate in depth. He then takes his data, accumulated through investigation, and tests his previously constructed hypotheses in order to add to the total body of information concerning the prehistoric South Appalachian Province. In this section we hope to construct hypotheses, hypothetical patterns of cultural development, which can be added to the inventory of those operational hypotheses presently in use. Certainly, archaeologists may evaluate in many ways the archaeological record for the purpose of constructing working hypotheses. But, underlying all schemes of hypothesis generation should be an in depth consideration of temporal, spatial, and cultural interaction on the basis of existing information. This section will provide such a consideration for the South Appalachian Mississippian cultural systems of the South Appalachian Province.

Another "pet" method of hypothesis generation of the author, which will not be treated in depth in this paper, is based on correlation studies of artifact distribution and environmental geography.
Distributional information concerning ceramics and mound sites in the Province is perhaps the most readily available information which we have to link the entire geographical area. Map 4 shows the distribution of platform mounds associated with South Appalachian Mississippian cultural elements (primarily with complicated stamped or plain shell tempered ceramics). Immediately, we recognize a pattern to this distribution. Sites tend to fall into two separable geographic areas. These two areas are comprised of the opposing northwest and southeast segments formed by the intersection of the fall line and the Savannah River. This distribution is, in fact, a gigantic settlement pattern. Not only does it reflect the distribution of mounds in the Province; but it may also reflect the distribution of settlements which supported mound sites, of centers of populations, of political and social units of organization, of religious systems, and of many other culturally related elements.

Because we consider culture to be an adaptive system and to articulate directly with the environment, we may compare the distribution of platform mound sites in the Province with the distribution of elements of the physical environment in order to develop ideas concerning relationships between cultural and environmental variables. Map 5 shows the pattern of forest growth in the South Appalachian Province (U. S. Department of Interior 1967). The site distribution corresponds quite well with the loblolly pine forest of the Southeast. However, underlying variables such as climate, soil type, and physiography may have more direct influence on the distributions of Indians and trees than either has on the other. On the basis of our understanding of the agricultural nature of the South Appalachian Mississippian cultural
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systems, we suggest that climate and soil type may be two very important variables in the total ecological situation as it involves man; and in future archaeological investigations we may show close correlations between these environmental variables and the cultural activity of these prehistoric people.

The development and testing of hypotheses concerning the relationships of South Appalachian Mississippian cultures to their environment may well be one of the most outstanding aspects of Provincial archaeology in the coming decade. Distributional analysis will, no doubt, form a basic hypothesis generator for this research. Yet, the real development of Provincial prehistoric understanding will come when we can consider diachronic distributional studies and can see the operation of culture within the physical environment through time. Presently, we have the basis for rudimentary understanding of changes of culture through time in the extant archaeological record; and this record should be exploited in a search for facts and hypotheses before we extend ourselves further into the prehistoric unknown of South Appalachian Mississippianism.

In previous sections we have treated the Province as a collection of geographical units because geography was the most useful control over the history of archaeological activity in the area. Certainly, in the study of prehistoric anthropology we are interested in applying a diachronic dimension to our studies in an effort to examine the changing aspects of culture. But, as has been pointed out earlier, the strict use of the diachronic approach often forces the pigeonholing of cultural systems into a chronological position before sufficient evidence exists to place them there. In this section we are going to
follow a chronological approach. We are interested in the cultural
development of prehistory, and to talk of development is to talk of
time. However, there will be an effort to construct loose cultural
units which will serve as discussion units but which should be con­sidered only as very general units which may have a considerable degree
of temporal overlap.

In this discussion we will de-emphasize cross-dating in the con­struction of local sequences: that is, we will de-emphasize interpre­
tations which imply that if artifact A at one point in space is similar
to artifact B in another location in space, then the two are contempo­
rary. Cross-dating tends to wash out temporal differences with respect
to artifacts which are similar but are located at different points in
space. This type of dating is valuable when we are concerned with very
gross units of time; but when we are trying to examine more subtle tem­
poral changes, cross-dating tends to indicate that prehistoric devel­
opment proceeded in stages separated throughout by quantum jumps to the
next stage. For instance, the wide distribution of Lamar style ceram­
ics in the Province has led archaeologists to lump most of these ceram­
ics into one contemporary unit and to suggest that this style of ceram­
ics appeared suddenly and immediately spread throughout the South
Appalachian Province. In the discussion of Cultural Unit IV we shall
show that the manufacture of Lamar style ceramics may well have lasted
for as long as 400 years in the South Appalachian Province, and any
suggestion that we should lump all expressions of a ceramic style that
lasted 400 years into one roughly contemporary group does a great
injustice to archaeological interpretation. Thus, we will place more
emphasis on absolute dating and the development of local sequences than
on the less rigorous method of lumping all artifacts that look alike into a common horizon.

Table 2 provides a chronological scale of published absolute dates for the Province. We would hasten to point out that isolated radiocarbon dates are subject to immediate suspect; and, unfortunately, isolated dates are most common in the area. However, if we are to understand the operation of culture in the Province, we must examine and evaluate the absolute dates and begin to construct local sequences absolutely in time. On the basis of the absolute development in local areas, we may be better able to understand the relative positions of local cultural development in the Province.

In the present section we are submitting ideas concerning cultural change during the period of South Appalachian Mississippianism from a point of view which is projected toward future research. We will examine interaction of temporal, spatial, and cultural variables in the development of the various South Appalachian Mississippian cultural units in the Province with special emphasis on the possible articulation of local sequences with one another. Combination of these elements should provide a meaningful base for development of South Appalachian Mississippian archaeological strategy.
### TABLE 2

**SOUTH APPALACHIAN RADIOCARBON DATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Northern Georgia</th>
<th>Mountains</th>
<th>Coastal Plain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Diagram showing radiocarbon dates with vertical bars for different groups and regions.]
A. CULTURAL UNIT I

The understanding of the processes involved in the development of South Appalachian Mississippian must involve the understanding of a variety of cultural systems. Before we can talk about cultural process, we need to be aware of the cultural differences of the participants; thus, the understanding of the cultural systems of the South Appalachian Province prior to the recognition of our operational South Appalachian Mississippian complex is intimate to this study. Unfortunately, our knowledge of the occupation that would be termed Middle Woodland in the Province is one of the weakest points in the description of the cultural systems of this area. In light of the physical limitations of the present study and the limits of information concerning this period of prehistory, our discussion of this Cultural Unit will seek to define some of the relationships that the cultural components of this Unit may have with the subsequent South Appalachian Mississippian. Such definition is with the hope that these limited hypotheses may aid in further analysis of existing material and production of additional information through primary research.

From the number of sites that fall into the broad category of Middle Woodland in the Province, those shown in Map 6 were selected because they have characteristics which may have some relationship to later South Appalachian Mississippian systems. First, these are all sites that were involved in the stamped pottery tradition, and we know that this characteristic of the Provincial tradition became one of the most obvious later elements. Second, all of these sites contain mounds which served or may have served as the substructures for temples. In
some cases, such as Swift Creek, Stubbs Mound, and Garden Creek, their use as substructure mounds has been verified. At Kolomoki and Mandeville the use of the mounds remains open to question. Nevertheless, all of the mounds have platform-mound morphology, which is characteristic of substructure mounds.

Treatment of these sites is not aimed at explanation or description of Middle Woodland occupations of the Province. Not only is that task far beyond the scope of the present paper; but also the sites are specialized, thereby limiting any general treatment. Rather the aim of this discussion is to temper our thoughts concerning later periods by examining selected elements of earlier occupations. Association of platform mounds with early pottery forms may broaden our conception of problems involved in future research. Possibly, this rudimentary expression of platform mound construction marks the beginning of cultural relationships similar to relationships connecting later South Appalachian Mississippian mounds to their respective cultural systems. On the other hand, these early mounds may have no relationship at all to later temple mounds—conclusive evidence awaits future archaeological investigation. We seek to outline the possibilities.

The mound at Swift Creek has long been recognized by most Southeastern archaeologists as an "accretional" mound, which is somehow different from temple mounds appearing later throughout the Southeast. That it is different has never been demonstrated. Evaluation is further hampered by the fact that we have no published information concerning this site. Fortunately, excavation which may provide some published information concerning the nature of this mound is presently underway at the Swift Creek by the National Park Service (Jack Walker
personal communication).

Differing from the Swift Creek mound, Stubbs’ Mound, located down the Ocmulgee River from Swift Creek, shows obvious evidence of a series of thin platform mound stages with structures on top. Kelly’s description of the site (1938: 36-37) does not clarify whether the mound stages were associated with Swift Creek or Early Macon Plateau ceramics. Because Kelly states that the structures are similar to those at the Plateau and because Macon Plateau pottery was present on the site, it would be reasonable to assume that the structures were associated with Macon Plateau and that the Swift Creek material was simply gathered up with the mound fill. On the other hand, Kelly points out that the Swift Creek material was found in the midden deposits on the slopes of the mound as if it were discarded during the period when the mound was in use. The whole matter is confusing. We must say that the matter of mounds and Swift Creek pottery in the vicinity, as well as the chronological relationship between Swift Creek and Macon Plateau, is still poorly understood. We must know more about the situation at Macon before we can continue to analyze the prehistory of the Province. Assumptions about what was shown to be true during the WPA activity are not enough. The material must be analyzed before we can make statements concerning the prehistoric relationships on the site.

Kelly (1938: 33) formulated the famous tripartite division of Swift Creek ceramics on the basis of ceramics found at the Swift Creek site, and he pointed out that the majority of Swift Creek material in the Macon vicinity was Early and Middle Swift Creek. He (Kelly 1938: 45) located Late Swift Creek at the Evelyn site on the Georgia coast and the Kolomoki site on the Chattahoochee River. Evelyn is a poorly
known site containing a mound which has been interpreted as a platform mound but from which no information is available (Waring 1968: 140). The Kolomoki site, on the other hand, is a very well known multiple mound site excavated by William Sears. The Late Swift Creek material at Kolomoki to which Kelly was referring is the Kolomoki Complicated Stamped ceramics of Sears (1958).

Since Sears' excavations at Kolomoki two major explicative arguments have contended that the Kolomoki site is one of the most important sites in the development of South Appalachian Mississippian. One of these cases is proposed by Sears (1956a), the excavator; and the other, by Joseph Caldwell (1958). Both arguments are based on the assumption that construction of the platform mound at Kolomoki represents something new for the South Appalachian Province: it represents, according to these interpretations, one of the earliest expressions of temple mound ceremonialism in the South Appalachian Province. The primary difference in the two interpretations of Kolomoki is with respect to the chronological placement of the two primary ceramic types on the site, Weeden Island and Kolomoki. Sears, the excavator, sees Kolomoki following and developing out of the Weeden Island ceramic tradition on the site, while Caldwell sees the Weeden Island ceramics moving in and replacing the Kolomoki variety. To Sears the developing cultural system associated with Kolomoki Complicated Stamped ceramics is influenced by the developing Mississippian expressions in the Mississippi valley, and there is a propensity for this Provincial site to adopt the newer cultural elements from the valley to the west. Caldwell, using a different perspective, sees Kolomoki as the end product of a developing tradition in the South Appalachian Province. The appearance of Weeden
Island material marks the introduction of cultural elements spreading out of the Gulf Tradition. This spread, according to Caldwell, is associated with the diffusion of the American "Oikoumene" which was bringing the flavor of civilization to the eastern United States.

Because this paper is directly concerned with localized development in the South Appalachian Province, we will not discuss the efficacy of either of these arguments to explain the source of elements which appear in the South Appalachian Province. The arguments of these men are both plausible. From the point of view of the Province we can only say that the most unfortunate aspect of the situation is that two of the very important points linking the site to Mississippianism have never been demonstrated archaeologically: the large mound at Kolomoki has never unquestionably been demonstrated to be a temple mound and no direct evidence from the site indicates the presence of an economic system employing large scale agriculture. At present we can accept these interpretations among the list of hypotheses concerning the pre-history of the South Appalachian Province, but we must entertain other hypotheses which may be equally valid. We cannot assuredly say that prior to the developments at Kolomoki "Mississippian" did not exist in the South Appalachian Province. Nor can we say that the expression at Kolomoki is the first expression in the Province of what we would call "Mississippian." Neither case has been shown to be true.

More recently excavations have given us reason to reevaluate certain notions concerning the nature of cultural systems which would be called Middle Woodland in the Province. The Mandeville site on the middle Chattahoochee River (Kellar, Kelly, and McMichael 1962) and the Garden Creek site (Hew2) in western North Carolina (Keel 1967) have produced
Middle Woodland assemblages in association with platform mounds. Ceramic material from both sites would be considered by most archaeologists of the Southeast to be quite early: Deptford and Early Swift Creek types were associated with platform mounds at the Mandeville site (Kellar, Kelly, and McMichael 1962: 341); and Connestee ceramics, whose closest relationship is with Mossy Oak, were associated with the lower mound stage at the Garden Creek (HvO2) site (Keel 1967, Dickens 1970).

The platform mounds at these two sites consist of thin layered stages. Although the superimposed Mandeville mound stages showed no evidence of a structure, a post-type construction, obviously associated with Connestee ceramics was found on the lower mound stage at Garden Creek. The second mound stage may also have been associated with Connestee ceramics, but evidence also indicates that it may have been associated with the later Pisgah ceramics (Dickens 1970).

With respect to two factors the Mandeville site and the Garden Creek site show similarity. Both have mounds associated with ceramics considered to be early types for the South Appalachian Province; and both have produced, in association with the components just mentioned, a collection of material similar to elements of the Hopewellian pattern of the Ohio and Mississippi valleys. At Mandeville the most obvious items which show Hopewellian influence are prismatic blades of Ohio Flint Ridge flint, and human figurines. Representatives of these artifacts were found in both mounds at the site (The site contains two mounds: Mound A, the platform mound, and Mound B, a burial mound.) and were associated primarily with the Deptford ceramic material. In pits associated with the smaller mound (Mound B) other such characteristically Hopewellian items as copper beads, platform pipes, pan pipes, and
bicymbal copper spools were found. The conclusion is that some association existed between the cultural expression related to Deptford ceramics at Mandeville and the Hopewellian of the central United States. Likewise, the mound at Garden Creek has produced material characteristic of Midwestern Hopewell. Prismatic blades of Flint Ridge flint, rocker-stamped and zone-punctated sherds, and human effigies were all associated with the earliest mound stage (Keel 1966, Coe personal communication).

Of course, the disclosure of platform mounds in the South Appalachian Province at the Mandeville site has posed a problem which was not included in the synthesis by Caldwell (1958) of the prehistory of the eastern United States. Mandeville contained a platform mound expression, earlier, according to the tenets of South Appalachian Province archaeology, than any other mound in the Province. Yet, this problem has been quickly solved by McMichael (1960) who simply has extended the influence of the "Oikoumene" back to a time prior to the date of the Mandeville mound. He has proposed that the complicated stamping idea came from an ultimate Mesoamerican origin and that the Crystal River site in Florida was important in this introduction. In addition to complicated stamping, McMichael attributes the introduction of flat-topped temple mounds and a variety of other items to the "Crystal River Carpet Baggers." But, because of the early date and the seemingly apparent lack of subsequent development of platform mounds in the South Appalachian Province, McMichael says (1960: 51),

In general though, this Crystal River intrusion appears to have been "too much, and too soon". The eastern area was not quite ready for what the "Crystal River Carpet Baggers" had to offer, and it took another possibly similar, intrusion in the Eastern United States to bring this area to the
"Urban Formative" stage (Mississippian), with its temple-priest cults, large villages, plazas and elaborate ceremonial centers, city states, etc. While the Crystal River instance of Mesoamerican contact does have its effects and some far-reaching ones at that, it was too much for the indigenous hunters, gatherers and collectors to assimilate in one dose.

At this point let us emphasize that this paper does not argue with speculation. Speculation is the formulation of hypotheses, and it is a healthy aspect of any scientific endeavor. But, there is always the danger that speculation will become accepted fact before it has been suitably tested. Fact has no alternative; speculation always has alternatives; and the two should be clearly labeled.

Ideas concerning the elements of the South Appalachian Province included in Cultural Unit I involve a variety of sources, but many interpretations seem to attempt to locate the extra-Provincial source of various cultural traits and to explain at least a portion of the nature of the local culture on the basis of information from these removed locations. Many explanations concerning the Province tend to suggest that practically everything that appears as a new element was developed outside of the Province and introduced in its fully developed form. After introduction the trait is usually considered to have been integrated into the indigenous system which remains relatively static until the introduction of another cultural trait from some removed source. It seems that at this point in the archaeology of the South Appalachian Province it would be preferable for us to try to explain the Province in terms of archaeological evidence produced by the Province. The present author does not necessarily consider that all of the developmental pattern in the South Appalachian Province was independent invention, but he does feel that there is ample reason to
seriously consider relatively independent local development of certain cultural styles in the Province. The South Appalachian Province has its own complicated story of cultural development, and one of the important points of this paper is a request that we not explain away South Appalachian archaeology before we have investigated it.

The Provincial Middle Woodland serves as an example; the platform mounds at Mandeville are early in time and crude in appearance. Further, they are associated with burial mounds. In the light of the truncated mound over burials at Kolomoki (Sears 1956a) we can point out that it is a small step from building a mound to climbing on top of it. And, if you like it on top, there is no reason not to level the top surface. Having developed a pattern of activity that takes place on the top of a mound, someone might reasonably consider putting a building on its summit. The platform mounds at Mandeville are crude and would be prime candidates for the earliest experimentation with temple mounds if they had been found in Mexico, but not in the eastern United States. The mounds at Mandeville and Garden Creek (HvO2) are small and simple. The mound at Swift Creek is similar. The mound at Kolomoki could be an elaboration. We may reasonably suggest that a long period of development of mounds during the Middle Woodland of the Province consisted of the construction of small platform mounds in conjunction with burials and/or summit buildings. Furthermore, we shall show in the treatment of later sections that some of the mounds recognized as true South Appalachian Mississippian are much like these early mounds. Based on this information a reasonable hypothesis for the independent development (not necessarily invention) of temple mounds in the Southeast can be made. A series of stimuli may have come into the Southeast
similar to stimuli introduced in the Mississippi valley. Although there was parallel development in the two areas, emphasis is placed on the Mississippi valley because the development led to a much more impressive climax than it did in the Southeast. Actually, we are not going to know much about the detailed relationships between the Mississippi valley and the South Appalachian Province until we know a great deal more about these two areas separately. Explaining the Southeast in terms of the Mississippi valley and then relating the two is circular thinking.

Radiocarbon dates for the manifestations with which we are concerned in these Units are outlined in Table 2. An examination of the number of these reveals that we do not have a sufficient number of dates to make any conclusive statements concerning the possible accuracy of any absolute pattern for the entire South Appalachian Province. Some obvious inconsistencies in the pattern are immediately apparent. Mandeville dates fall into a neat pattern except for the one later date for a Deptford association (Kellar, Kelly, and McMichael 1962: 354), which places it in the Tenth Century A.D. Our immediate notion is that the date is in error. I would request, however, that we reserve definite condemnation of the date until more facts are in. Note the date (A.D. 805 ± 85) from western North Carolina for the association of the mound with Connestee ceramics. We have suggested that these ceramics have their closest similarity with Mossy Oak ceramics of central and northern Georgia. The trend of archaeological opinion is that Mossy Oak is older than Deptford and that it is in turn older than Swift Creek, but such has never been shown to be true in northern Georgia. Wauchope, in his report on the survey of northern Georgia, had
inconclusive evidence to indicate that Mossy Oak was older than Deptford. The problem is that with the present information, to make generalizations covering all of the Province is practically impossible without turning to the explanations of expected cultural lag and a variety of interpretative tricks. The solution is to recognize that we simply need more information before we can begin to make broad generalizations. Specifically, we need to know more about local systems, and we need to know more about the locus of these systems absolutely in time.

We shall leave the discussion of this Cultural Unit of the prehistory of the Province with the suggestion that we reserve judgment on the Middle Woodland of the Southeast. We do not know how much the systems of this cultural expression donated to the later South Appalachian Mississippian systems or the exact mechanism through which they acquired their systemic components. The ceramic inventory suggests little change (Wauchope 1950: 21-22). Other factors such as the large mounds of the later periods suggest significant change. A more holistic explanation awaits further information.
B. CULTURAL UNIT II

Archaeological manifestations that have been excavated at certain sites in central and western Georgia represent a relatively pure form of Middle Mississippian culture in the South Appalachian Province (Map 7). In central Georgia the isolated sites of Macon Plateau and Brown's Mount represent this Mississippian expression. To the west in the valley of the Chattahoochee, excavations at Rood's Landing, the Mandeville site, and the Singer-Moye site have produced artifact assemblages that represent rather pure Mississippian characteristics.

The Macon Plateau and Brown's Mount sites are located on hilltop plateaus overlooking the valley of the Ocmulgee River. The locations of the sites are especially suited to defense, and many archaeologists have hypothesized that their locations were probably selected with this in mind. The artifact assemblage associated with these sites is similar to Mississippian manifestations to the west nearer the drainage of the Mississippi River. These large sites consist of specialized earthen structures in a court arrangement; the structures include large platform mounds with temples and associated burials and earth lodges. The ceramic inventory of the assemblage consists of forms fitting the generalized definition of Early Mississippian ceramics. Ceramics are plain and shell tempered, with a variety of shapes including globular jars with loop handles, shallow bowls, and water bottle forms. Dating the occupation of the Macon Plateau and Brown's Mount sites has been aided by the analysis of two samples of charcoal, one from each site. A sample from one of the burned timbers of the earth lodge at Macon Plateau produced a date for the destruction of that structure of A.D. 1015 (935 ± 110 years B.P.: 1-981) (Wilson 1964), while a sample
from a hearth at the Brown’s Mount site produced a date of A.D. 980
(970 ± 150 years B.P.; M-940) (Wilson 1964). The relative agreement of
these two dates indicates that this is a reasonably good estimation of
the age of the occupation of the two sites.

As far as central and northern Georgia are concerned little evi-
dence indicates interaction between the Mississippian cultural system
in the Macon vicinity and the indigenous cultures. The occupation
appears as a discontinuity in the local sequence, and the ceramic style
does not appear to have been adopted by any of the later inhabitants of
the area. In his report on the excavation of the Funeral Mound at
Macon Plateau, Fairbanks (1956: 55) makes the following statements con-
cerning Macon Plateau, which are generally accepted either as estab-
lished fact or as reasonable hypotheses by South Appalachian archae-
ologists.

1. Macon Plateau represents a rapid invasion of
   Georgia by an Early Mississippian people.
2. They seem to have come from the west, although no
direct evidence is available as to the place of origin.
3. The Tennessee sites [for example, Hiwassee Island]
   represent one wing of the eastward push, Macon Plateau another.
4. They possessed a full corn agriculture and a politico-
   religious organization of considerable complexity.
5. This social system is expressed in: platform mounds,
   large towns, fortifications, insignia of rank, and large
   populations.
6. The southeastern wing had, or acquired, a burial
   complex associated with platform mounds; multiple burials,
   bone cleaning; burial offerings of ornaments, tools and
   food (pottery containers); and possibly retainer burial
   with chiefs.
7. Early sites like Macon Plateau show very little
   intimate contact with the native displaced populations.
8. Later sites of the period show more contacts with
   local populations--cord marking (?) at Hiwassee and Norris
   Basin.
9. The next period, Etowah-Kolomoki, shows a rather
   complete acculturation of local and Early Mississippian
   elements.

The only one of these statements with which we would take issue is the
last one. The picture pertaining to Etowah and Kolomoki has changed since Fairbanks wrote the report on the Funeral Mound. Today little evidence suggests that Etowah and Kolomoki are of the same time period; an equally reasonable hypothesis would be to suggest that they are of different temporal periods. Further, nothing indicates that the expression at Kolomoki is later than the Macon Plateau occupation. If anything, we would hypothesize that Kolomoki is either contemporaneous with or somewhat earlier than the central Georgia manifestation. On the other hand, we would probably suggest that the Etowah ceramics of Georgia are contemporaneous or later than the Macon Plateau occupation; but as will be pointed out in the discussion of Cultural Unit III, to say that Etowah represents a "rather complete" acculturation may be premature at this time.

West of the Macon area in the valley of the Chattahoochee River is another manifestation represented by artifact assemblages from the Rood's Landing, Mandeville, and Singer-Moye sites. Like the central Georgia sites these sites are located on "plateau type" areas. Unfortunately, we lack a definitive study of the assemblage from this western expression comparably as complete as the information from Macon Plateau. Caldwell (1955b) in his report on limited excavations at the Rood's Landing site only outlined the nature of the material. He noted that the ceramics from the lower levels of the Rood's site were similar to those from the Macon Plateau site in that they were plain, shell tempered, and exhibited loop and strap handles. For the site Caldwell defined Early and Middle period occupations and suggested that the Early occupation was most similar to the Macon Plateau pottery types while the later material seemed to represent a development out of the earlier
base. The obvious interpretation is that the ceramics which are similar to Macon Plateau followed through an uninterrupted development in the Chattahoochee River valley that was for some reason cut short in the central portion of Georgia.

From Caldwell's statements concerning the ceramic types found at the Rood's Landing sites as well as information from the Mandeville site and the Singer-Moye site, we may reasonably hypothesize, as do McMichael and Kellar (1960: 213), that Mississippian cultures established themselves in the Chattahoochee River as well as in central Georgia and that this western establishment outlasted the eastern development and may have taken part in the direct development of the cultural systems of the South Appalachian Province. In the formulation of this hypothesis McMichael and Kellar (1960: 213) state

Ultimately, the Rood's Focus originates in the west as a part of the Mississippian expansion; but the precise mechanics of this may be more involved. As a hypothesis we suggest that the initial Mississippian invasion bypassed, or at best only briefly stopped on the Chattahoochee and moved to the Macon Plateau, creating there an involved outlying ceremonial center. Eventually though, there was a retreat to the Chattahoochee River which made the Mississippian group less isolated from their fellows. With this retreat the Rood's Focus begins.

In general this hypothesis seems reasonable. After outlining this hypothesis, McMichael and Kellar suggest that Rood's Focus, Averette, and Etowah ceramics were possibly being made contemporaneously. They also suggest that a combination of ceramic elements from the south and from the east impinged upon the cultural system making Rood's ceramics and that the end result of this development was the Chattahoochee River variety of Lamar (referred to as the Bull Creek Focus).

One of the most striking features about the sites included in this discussion is the physical size of the constituent mounds and the
extensive area usually occupied by the layout of the mounds. The only site in the South Appalachian Province which compares in size to either Macon Plateau, Brown's Mount, Rood's Landing, or Singer-Moye is the Etowah site in northern Georgia. Yet, even the Etowah site, if the total amount of area occupied is the comparative factor, is small when compared to these sites. The areas of these sites suggest populations of considerable numbers; and the limited distribution of their remains suggests that if large populations were associated with these mound sites, they were compact populations settled in a few large villages.

One reason for the compact nature of these occupations may have been that they were in a hostile neighborhood. The people may have had to remain together in order to present a unified front against the indigenous people who were resentful of the territory which had been pre-empted by the foreigners. Another, and possibly complementary, hypothesis is that these compact villages may have been the established settlement pattern for these Mississippian cultural systems, which had been adapted to the wide fertile valleys of the central portion of the United States. The occupation in central Georgia may have been an attempt to apply this settlement pattern to the South Appalachian Province—an attempt that failed due to factors of either the cultural or the biophysical environment. If the non-adaptability of the established Early Mississippian settlement pattern is one of the factors which caused the inhabitants of the Macon area to abandon their newly acquired territory, then the cultural development in the Chattahoochee area to the west may be one of special significance to the understanding of the later cultural systems. As McMichael and Kellar have suggested, the Early Mississippian cultural system established in the
Chattahoochee valley may not have disappeared but may have remained in place and taken part in the cultural evolution of the South Appalachian Province. We recall that earlier developments in southwestern Georgia, those involving the Kolomoki site and the Mandeville site, already seemed to be moving toward a cultural system that had some of the characteristics of Mississippianism. As a result the cultures of this area may have provided a receptive atmosphere for the acculturation of the Middle Mississippian culture moving into the area. If indeed, the cultural systems responsible for the large mound sites of Rood's Landing, Singer-Moye, and Mandeville developed into the later cultural system of the area associated with the Lamar variant of ceramics, then the settlement pattern of these people as well as the ceramic assemblage may have been undergoing a process of change, which molded it to fit the situation in the South Appalachian Province. With changes in ceramics and settlement pattern we hypothesize changes in other aspects of the technological, organizational, and ideological patterns of the cultural system.

We cannot suppose any process of cultural development in any portion of the Province to have been simple. The initial introduction of large scale agriculture into the Province may have provided a special stimulus to the cultural systems of the area. Although the pattern of the cultural system which made agriculture successful in the west may not have been successful in the extreme Southeast, cultural systems probably actively evolved in the direction of combining other economic means such as hunting, fishing, gathering, and trading in a fashion that would efficiently exploit the technological means available to the people. Concurrently, the organizational and ideological
patterns of the cultural systems were probably being formulated so as to allow the culture to supply the needs of the people without undue inefficiency. We would expect that this cultural development meant a reduction in the size of as well as a dispersal of villages. Ceremonial centers may have become smaller and in better proportion to the ability of the economic base to support ceremonialism. The economic systems may have had a tendency to "hybridize" so that agriculture was supplemented by hunting and gathering. These hypotheses are based primarily upon the information that McMichael and Kellar (1960) have presented for the nature of the Lamar site distribution in the Oliver Basin report.

If this process of change were occurring in the valley of the Chattahoochee River, we may also hypothesize that a similar process of change was taking place in other portions of the Province. In central and northern Georgia cultural changes may have been occurring in which cultural systems were incorporating the foreign cultural elements into the local developmental pattern. Certainly, this development was different from that occurring in the middle Chattahoochee area because the systems were removed in space and could not have been receiving identical stimuli and because they were probably based on two different strains of initial cultural systems.

On the bases of these hypotheses, we would suggest that one of the best laboratories in the entire South Appalachian Province for examining the process of acculturation which fused Middle Mississippian elements with the more indigenous cultural elements of the Southeast is in the middle valley of the Chattahoochee River. Here, we suggest that the process of cultural change proceeded from the combination of a
rather unadulterated Middle Mississippian cultural system and a recep-
tive South Appalachian cultural system to the manifestation which was
later recognized as being associated with the Bull Creek variety of
Lamar. The process was one of the adaptation of a cultural system to a
specific environmental situation, and a study of the developing cultures
of this area of the South Appalachian Province should be a most reward-
ing investigation.
C. CULTURAL UNIT III

When South Appalachian Mississippian is mentioned, the author immediately thinks of the contents of Cultural Units III and IV. These Units contain such type names as Etowah, Savannah, and Lamar--types of complicated stamped pottery which the literature has continuously associated with the development of "Mississippianism" in the South Appalachian Province. Characteristics of cultural systems associated with these ceramics reflect evidence of some type of western influence. Such specific items as ceramic forms, temple mounds, the Southern Cult, and corn agriculture indicate a relationship between the cultural systems of the Southeast and the systems to the west--relationships with Mississippians who were making shell tempered pottery, building large truncated temple mounds, growing acres and acres of corn, and doing all of the other things that good Mississippians should do. In the study of the South Appalachian Province we have moved from the problem of recognition of relationships to a problem of the degree of relationships. We eventually hope to define how these various cultural systems are related; but before we can understand the extra-areaal relationships, we must develop a rather firm understanding of the relationships within the Province. In the present discussion we shall attempt to point out the level of understanding of certain aspects of the South Appalachian Mississippian systems of the Province. In the temor of the present approach the discussion will not be so much explicative as it will be evaluative and suggestive.

We have mentioned that South Appalachian Mississippian should include the contents of both Cultural Units III and IV. Cultural
Unit III will include a discussion of the associations of the ceramic types Woodstock, Etowah, Savannah, Wilbanks, Pisgah, and Pee Dee. Cultural Unit IV will include a discussion of Lamar.

Sites to be considered in Cultural Unit III are shown on Maps 8, 9, and 10. Elements of this Unit spread over a large part of the Province, including portions of the coastal plain, the piedmont, and the mountains. The temporal and spatial pattern of this spread is critically important; but, unfortunately, we have a dearth of reliable information upon which to document this dispersion. In many instances we have formal similarities of artifacts and assemblages; but for documenting the temporal factors of the spread of similar cultural elements, cross dating begins to lose its efficacy. We need local relative dating and absolute dates to tie these systems into an absolute pattern of development. While we have been reasonably successful with the former, we need more of the latter.

One of the most important relative sequences in the Province has been that developed in piedmont Georgia. Through a series of investigations beginning with the northern Georgia survey conducted by Robert Wauchope, a ceramic sequence beginning with Etowah, continuing with Wilbanks and/or the northern Georgia variety of Savannah, and ending with Lamar followed by the historic Ocmulgee Field's types has been documented. Unfortunately, this sequence has not been directly related to earlier types of ceramics in northern Georgia, such as Woodstock, Napier, Mossy Oak, and Deptford.

Outside of northern Georgia relative sequences also document local development. On the Georgia coast Savannah ceramics have been relatively placed between the predominantly cordmarked Wilmington series
and the protohistoric Irene series. In North Carolina, Pee Dee ceramics have been identified as intrusive between two varieties of ceramics with more affinities to the Middle Atlantic region than to the South Appalachian Province to which Pee Dee is obviously related. In the North Carolina mountains Pisgah ceramics have been related to a sequence, fitting between the cord marked, tetrapodal Connestee ceramics and the Lamar-related Qualla type, which extends into the historic period. The important factor is that in several localized areas we have a general idea of the relative progression through time of various pottery types and, to some degree, of the cultural systems associated with these types. To be sure, we need many more such local sequences. We need to know more about the local sequence of development in practically every location in the South Appalachian Province. Yet, if we could tie the relative sequences that we now control into an absolute chronology, we would move a major step forward in our attempt to understand the trend of South Appalachian Mississippian development.

Absolute dates presently available for this prehistoric Cultural Unit are outlined in Table 2. Generally, the dates from northern Georgia for Etowah and Wilbanks associations begin slightly earlier than other dates associated with this Cultural Unit. Those peripheral cultural systems with Pee Dee and Pisgah associations date somewhat later than the earliest dates from northern Georgia. These dates as well as the similarity of ceramics between Pee Dee material and Etowah and Wilbanks material from northern Georgia suggest that the Town Creek manifestation and its affiliations may have a relative genesis near the Georgia piedmont. Further, dates associated with Pisgah ceramics from the mountains of North Carolina also place this mountain cultural
system in a position slightly postdating the cluster of early dates from northern Georgia and contemporaneous with the system represented at Town Creek. However, formal similarities do not suggest a "genetic" relationship between Pisgah and the northern Georgia varieties. That minority ceramic material from Pisgah sites in the mountains relates temporally to this cultural manifestation of Pee Dee ceramics will be shown later. All indications are that these peripheral developments may be later than development of a similar cultural type in northern Georgia; however, only a partial test of this explanation has been fulfilled.

1. Mounds and Thin Brown Sherds from Northern Georgia

If someone examines a sherd from northern Georgia that is thin, brown, and complicated stamped, it will probably be either a Woodstock or an Etowah type sherd. Map 8 shows mound sites which are associated with Etowah and Woodstock as well as mound sites which are hypothesized to be associated with these ceramics. These two types, along with the infrequently found Napier Complicated Stamped ceramics, are the hallmark of the variety of ceramics in northern Georgia which Sears has termed the core of the "angular tradition" of complicated stamping (Sears 1952b). Together these types have been designated through interpretation as forming a developmental sequence in northern Georgia. Both Sears and Wauchope have traced different genealogies for these types. Sears suggests a sequence of development that leads from a beginning in Napier through Woodstock to Etowah (Sears 1958: 167). Wauchope (1966: 438), alternatively, contends that development of Etowah may have depended upon both Woodstock and Napier predecessors and that Woodstock did not take over completely from Napier before the appearance
of Etowah ceramics.

Historically, this variation in hypotheses concerning the development of Etowah can readily be analyzed. Etowah was recognized quite early (Wauchope 1948) as an important type in Georgia prehistory. The type itself was assumed to be associated with the construction of the large mounds at Etowah, and such assumption led to the contention that these Etowah sherds were strongly associated with Mississippianism. A search for predecessors of this important type was natural; and the types Napier and Woodstock, which were much less frequently found, were immediately assumed to be the "ancestors" of Etowah. Because no good archaeological information documenting the developmental pattern existed, Wauchope turned to style interpretation in order to explain the background of Etowah (Wauchope 1950). Later, Sears, with a somewhat different slant on the interpretation of possible stylistic development, suggested that the development proceeded in a linear fashion from Napier to Woodstock and then to Etowah. From the point of view of the present approach, we must admit that so little is known about both these ceramic types and their associations that we cannot unequivocally base an accepted sequence of development on either explanation. We have previously mentioned that only 902 sherds of Napier Complicated Stamped material were found in the entire northern Georgia survey; and Wauchope has pointed out that (1966: 438), "Actually, Woodstock remains are so scarce that we have little to go on in such speculations." Here he was referring to speculations concerning the development of Etowah.

Actually, casual references in the archaeological literature indicate that considerably more information concerning Woodstock ceramics and their associations is known than has been published (Caldwell 1950).
In a synthesis of the archaeology of the eastern United States, Caldwell (1958: 47) referred to the Summerour Mound in the Buford Reservoir.

At the Summerour Site on the upper Chattahoochee near Buford there is a temple mound of this horizon [Woodstock] complete with building on top. The problem at Summerour is to determine whether the temple is Gulf or Mississippian. The Mississippian intrusion into central Georgia represented by the Macon Plateau and Browns' Mount sites is uncomfortably close in time.

Woodstock is important in the prehistory of the South Appalachian Province, and important Woodstock sites have evidently been excavated, but the results of excavations are not presently available in the archaeological literature.

Because of its analyzed position as prior to the development of Etowah, Woodstock has been termed Early Mississippian in the Province; and Etowah has been labeled Mature Mississippian. All later manifestations are usually termed Late Mississippian. The meaning of this classification seems to vary from person to person depending upon who is using the term. We assume that these terms represent general conceptions, more specifically period designations, which would connote a general placement in time as well as general associations. In this respect Wauchope says in his review of the survey of northern Georgia (1966: 439),

At this point we should clarify our use of the term "Mississippian." So far we have been using it to refer to a period of Georgia prehistory not necessarily the classic Mississippian culture that intruded into the southeast characterized by traits such as flat-topped pyramidal mounds, shell-tempered pottery of distinctive shapes—including water bottles and hooded bottles—small polished celts, and the socio-political and religious organization that some of its traits imply. Thus, our earliest Mississippi period Woodstock culture in Georgia apparently partook of few of these classic Mississippian culture hallmarks, but, together with much of the Etowah period culture, was rather an apparently small village, domestic complex that
can be placed chronologically between Middle Woodland and the later Savannah and Lamar developments. Woodstock and Early Etowah manifested some traits in common with classic Mississippian culture—small triangular arrow points, and rectangular houses, for example—but these traits must thus be considered general time-markers rather than criteria of the foreign Mississippian overlords themselves.

Thus, Wauchope's usage of the Mississippian terms are rather directly in the sense of archaeological periods rather than indications of some broad interpretive archaeological classification. Somewhat differently, when Sears uses the term "Mature Mississippian," which he coined and which fits between the older terms Early and Late Mississippian, he is referring to a specific level of cultural development (Sears 1958: 136).

In Georgia and elsewhere it [Mature Mississippian] is the period of the Southern Cult and of the flamboyant expressions of a different ceremonial complex at Kolomoki (Sears 1951a, 1951b, 1951c). In Tennessee, Alabama, and neighboring regions it is the period of the Southern Cult again. It is separated, in broadest terms, from Early Mississippi by the development of elaborate ceremonial complexes; from the protohistoric developments by the reverse situation, the decline of this ceremonialism, lack of the great mound sites, and probably by villages that were smaller but much commoner. In any event, in most areas of the Southeast it is not too difficult to separate a climactic Mature Mississippi period from the related but ceremonially and artistically simpler culture of the protohistoric period.

The classification clearly means something with respect to the quality of cultural development. In a qualifying statement Sears says (1958: 136),

The writer feels that he should point out here that he is fully aware of the inherent dangers of classification in archaeology, particularly in that it often becomes an end in itself. ... For analytical work in archaeology, we need, and all create, terminological pigeonholes, each term representing a class.

The present writer understands and sympathizes with Sears' statement that we need names in American archaeology, and we need classification
systems which allow us to consolidate similar manifestations into broad units. On the other hand, knowledge of the "inherent danger" referred to by Sears should keep us from allowing the classification to influence the interpretation of the archaeological data.

It has already been pointed out that Sears (1958) has hypothetically interpreted the cultural system associated with Etowah to be a rather pure representation of the Mature Mississippian type. We have already questioned the amount of archaeological evidence available for testing such an interpretation. Part of the argument is based on the fact that Etowah was thought to relate to the Southern Cult. It has more recently been shown that the majority of the Southern Cult material that can be associated with a South Appalachian Province pottery type is associated with either Wilbanks or Savannah. Another factor in the discussion was that Etowah ceramics were associated with the construction of the large mound center at Etowah. Recent investigation has shown that indeed some of the construction phases in Mound C at Etowah were associated with Etowah, but the associations of the major mounds of the site are yet to be demonstrated. In the following few paragraphs we will try to outline the nature of the distribution and characteristics of a few specialized Etowah sites. We shall not refute or confirm any argument. The purpose of this discussion is to point out the level of understanding of the mounds, a portion of the cultural system, which are associated with Etowah ceramics.

After an analysis of the quantity of sherds of Etowah type and the location of these types in northern Georgia from the survey information (Wauchope 1966), we find that Etowah ceramics were second only to Lamar in frequency (Table 1). Furthermore, they have been found over the
entire northern portion of the state above the fall line. Sherds of Etowah type have been reported from the Columbus area as well as in small numbers at the Neisler site, the Lamar site, the Shinholser Mounds, and the Hollywood Mound—in effect at most of the late period sites along the fall line. With the exceptions of the Chauga site, which was excavated as part of the Hartwell Reservoir project, and the Etowah site, which was excavated by the Georgia State Historical Commission, most of the sites showing definite associations were excavated by the northern Georgia survey conducted by Robert Wauchope. (We should caution that the distribution of Etowah ceramics appears to be much wider than this distribution of mounds.)

To this point, we have used the terms mound structure and platform mound when referring to the ceremonial edifices of the period. The terms South Appalachian Mississippian and Etowah usually bring to mind temple mounds. By temple mounds the usual conception is of a rather tall truncated rectangular pyramid with a ramp approach: Mound A at Etowah is an archtypical example (Plate XVII). Further, the mind's eye usually affixes a rectangular temple on the top of such a structure, and the conception of the temple mound is complete. Analyzing the construction of such a mound, we tend to think of a series of thick sterile layers forming the composite structure of the mound.

The archaeological evidence associated with Etowah ceramics has given little support to the stereotypic conception of temple mound structures. In the northern Georgia survey Wauchope excavated four mound sites showing evidence of Etowah structures: Wilbanks, Horseshoe Bend, Long Swamp, and Eastwood. Interestingly, each of these mounds, with the exception of Eastwood, which was not completely excavated, had
a structure interpreted as an earth lodge associated with Etowah ceramics at its base. The Wilbanks earth lodge is well known (Sears 1958), and Sears has indicated that it was associated with Etowah II and III (Sears 1958: 170). The earth lodges at Long Swamp and Horseshoe Bend received passing comment in Wauchope's final report. With respect to the earth structure at Long Swamp, Wauchope (1966: 457) stated that initially

the Indians built a round house or earth lodge on the level summit of a clay substructure [1.8 feet high (Wauchope 1966: 457)] with ramp approaches.

The roof was evidently weighted down with large stones. A basin-shaped burned clay hearth was at the center of the house, and a center post had been driven through it into the substructure. The pottery used by the Indians during these phases of occupation was predominantly Mature Mississippi Etowah ware.

After the midden had accumulated, another structure was rebuilt on top of the earth lodge; then the platform was enlarged; and still another structure was built. Wauchope (1966: 303) has said,

The fact that one house was thus rebuilt several times leads me to believe that it may have been of religious or civil importance, possibly the main town house of the village. Again the associated pottery was almost entirely Etowah in type, with only a sprinkling of earlier potsherds evidently brought in by accident from the surrounding ground during the remodeling of the platform.

Thus, at Long Swamp we do not have the construction of thick layers of earth forming the base of a temple but rather the construction of only a small platform supporting an earth lodge. Later, superstructures were again constructed on the mound surface; but the increase in height of the mound was only enough to construct a new floor over the old one containing the debris of the earlier structure. The mound structure was only about three feet tall when it was excavated by Wauchope.

Although there were later occupations of this site, Wauchope did not
mention any evidence for post-Etowah mound construction.

At Horseshoe Bend the process of construction was somewhat similar to that at Long Swamp. After the construction of a house on the old ground surface, two units of red clay, which Wauchope (1966: 324) suggested were "probably the low walls of an earth lodge," were added. On top of the debris of the destruction of this first construction, the Indians put down a new clay floor, which was then occupied. Wauchope stated (1966: 324),

The materials deposited at this level were again of the Mature Mississippi (Etowah) types, but with the edition [sic] of Late Mississippi Savannah pottery, which, as I have noted before, Sears considers a related but distinct product ("Wilbanks" pottery) of a different culture.

Later there were more patchwork additions to this mound, making it larger in plan and somewhat taller. Wauchope (1966: 325) suggested,

It was probably at this time that Protohistoric Lamar ceramics began to be used at Horseshoe Bend. According to our excavated association, they by no means displaced the Etowah pottery, and I believe that the two groups were used simultaneously here for some time.

The Eastwood site in northeastern Georgia contained a mound which Wauchope mentioned "could scarcely be distinguished from the ridge on which it stands." Unfortunately, Wauchope was unable to investigate the lower levels of this mound. He recounts (1966: 347),

The first mound structures we have record of are two mound-shaped masses of dark red clays. . . . Each of these sub-mounds sloped gradually on one side, more steeply on the other. One was at least 36 feet long, the other at least 40 feet long. . . . The Indians combined the two platforms by filling in between them and enlarging them at the same time, achieving one big structure. *

On this new structure were three or four superimposed clay floors,

*Note: We might tend to interpret these walls as the walls of an earthlodge, but the steep sides of the clay ridges were not facing each other but were facing the outside of the structure.
which Wauchope interpreted as the floors of separate town houses. He emphasized that these floors were covered with a maze of post holes, and through schemes of isolation he was able to locate at least seven distinct house patterns. The ceramic materials associated with these structures were both Etowah and Lamar. Sherds of both types were found on all levels excavated; however, the frequency of occurrence of Lamar sherds was approximately 2 1/2 times that of Etowah sherds.

Other Etowah associated ceremonial centers such as Chauga and Etowah also show evidence of earth lodges or low mounds. At Chauga (Kelly and Neitzel 1961) the evidence was similar to that at sites previously mentioned. Most of the Etowah ceramic material was found associated with the first three structures. These constructions were thin and basin-shaped, and the profiles (Kelly and Neitzel 1961: Plate 9) suggest possible earth-covered or earth-walled structures at the base of the mound. Although the authors did not interpret the lower structures to be earth lodges, they did mention that (1961: 11) "a shallow trough or swale of from two to five feet in width defined the basal perimeter of the mound." Furthermore, they indicated no evidence of a structure on the surface of either of the first two mounds of the sequence. Evidence of a post-supported structure on the surface was found with the third mound stage. A variety of ceramic types have been reported from Chauga; but the major types identified have included Etowah, Savannah, and Lamar. Etowah materials showed up strongest in the lower levels with Savannah and Lamar increasing in frequency toward the top (Kelly and Neitzel 1961: 36-37, Plate 11).

The Etowah site itself has not been the center of much detailed discussion in the archaeological literature; therefore, we have little
information on the archaeological manifestations. Evidence from recent excavations in Mound C (Larson personal communication) have indicated that the first few structures of this mound were associated with Etowah ceramics while later structures were associated with Savannah or Wilbanks. Moorehead retrieved the Southern Cult material from these later constructions. Larson has also noted that no evidence exists for any type of earth covered structure in Mound C, although the structure on the pre-mound surface had a floor excavated a few inches below the surface of the old humus. In summary, we cannot be sure to what extent the large structures at the Etowah site were the product of cultural systems with Etowah associations and to what extent they were the result of other cultures. While the typical temple mound may be associated with Etowah ceramics at the Etowah site, this fact has not been substantiated in the archaeological literature.

Reviewing the evidence for Etowah ceremonial structures, we can make generalizations which may be formulated as hypotheses for future investigation in the Province. In every case in which Etowah ceramics have been found to be associated in a multicomponent situation, the Etowah specialized structures always subtend structures of later components. Evidence shows that no Etowah related mound structure has ever been built over a mound associated with an earlier ceramic type. The pattern tends to suggest that Etowah associated mounds may represent the earliest widespread construction of specialized earth-composed structures in northern Georgia. We might hypothesize that they form the germ for the development of later ceremonial centers of the area since these later centers are often constructed immediately on top of earlier Etowah structures. This should not be interpreted as
saying that the Etowah structures are the earliest of this type in northern Georgia. Simply, as far as the archaeological evidence goes, they have the widest distribution of the early structures; and they seem to be related to the later constructions associated with Wilbanks and Lamar ceramics.

The spread of Etowah ceramics and the cultural system associated with these ceramics could be due to several factors. The population may have been large; it may have dispersed; or the practice of making Etowah ceramics may have persisted in time long enough for a small group of people to have frequented a variety of locations in northern Georgia. Because there are so many factors, possibly interrelated, we cannot make anything but these limited suggestions until we have more information on Etowah sites and on the pattern of distribution of these sites in time and space.

Although archaeologists have thought that the large mounds at Etowah may have been built by people making Etowah ceramics, recent investigations have shown that the upper levels of Mound C were constructed by people who were making Wilbanks pottery. As a result of this new insight into Etowah archaeology, we have reason to question just how much of the site was built during the period of Etowah ceramics and how much was constructed during the later periods when either Wilbanks or Lamar ceramics were being made. With this new perspective on Etowah we must consider that presently we do not have any indication that the cultural system associated with Etowah was responsible for a ceremonial center as large as what is visible at the Etowah site. The fact that the upper structures of Mound C were associated with Wilbanks ceramics suggests that these ceramics may also
be associated with at least the later stages of construction of the other mounds. With an element of doubt as to the size of the Etowah structures at the Etowah site and the information which we have acquired through the investigation of other mound sites associated with Etowah, we must hypothesize at this point that most of the Etowah structures are small; and we are forced to recognize that the size of Etowah structures de-emphasizes the size of the population and the control that a centralized power structure may have had over the people of northern Georgia during this period.

This hypothesis of a limited size for Etowah ceremonial centers and populations is partially contrary to a hypothesis that Sears (1962) has proposed concerning the nature of the organizational pattern associated with the Etowah site. Sears has suggested that the size of the Etowah site and the distribution of smaller Etowah mounds about the larger ceremonial site at Etowah might indicate a theocratic state associated with the Etowah and/or Wilbanks cultural system(s) with its central power vested in persons controlling activities at the Etowah site. Sears' hypothesis came prior to the established recognition that the Southern Cult was associated primarily with Wilbanks ceramics in northern Georgia. The efficacy of Sears' hypothesis, however, is not seriously diminished by this disclosure. Only the emphasis on the role of the cultural system associated with Etowah ceramics in such a hypothesis is affected. We might still hypothesize an initial development toward such a cultural system during the period in which Etowah ceramics were being manufactured, but we would suggest that it is more likely that this political system was associated with Wilbanks or Lamar ceramics.
We know that the cultural system in northern Georgia associated with Etowah ceramics was different from earlier cultural systems in northern Georgia. The quantity of sites and material, the construction of specialized earthen structures, and the adoption of new elements into the artifact assemblage indicate that the system was undergoing some process of change. One of the important problems of Provincial archaeology is to attempt to identify the effect of outside forces in this change as opposed to the strength of the evolutionary pattern which was continuing in the Province itself. The widespread distribution of earth lodges during the period of Etowah ceramics was apparently a new form of cultural emphasis. We think that it was associated with an ideological, organizational, and possibly technological change. Yet, the degree to which this development was the result of outside stimulus and the degree to which it was the result of relatively independent development in the Province are unknown. Certainly, other earth lodges which we have supposed to have been earlier than these Etowah structures have been found in the Province. Most familiar are the earth lodges associated with Mississippian intrusion in central and western Georgia. Earth lodges have been excavated at both the Macon Plateau (Fairbanks 1946b) and the Singer-Moye sites (Schnell 1968). Another earth lodge has been found in a more indigenous context in western North Carolina at the base of the small mound (HW02) at the Garden Creek site, and the mound structure above this earth lodge has been dated at A.D. 805. The evidence suggests that the pattern of constructing earth lodges and the repetition of the construction of mounds over earth lodges may have been quite early in the South Appalachian Province, or it may have been associated with the introduction of Middle
Mississippian elements with the intrusion at Macon Plateau and along the middle Chattahoochee River. Unfortunately, the degree of relative independence of this development is unknown; we can only suggest that the development of the late prehistoric systems in the Province was probably the result of a number of factors—the indigenous development, the Middle Mississippian intrusion, the later influence from sources within the Province as well as sources outside the Province.

Obviously, this discussion is based on sites that have received archaeological attention, a pertinent fact to any archaeological discussion. Most of the mound sites known to be associated with Etowah ceramics have been small, and this size may be due to the fact that only small sites have been selected for investigation. Many large mound sites have produced Etowah material as well as other Cultural Unit III and IV material but have not been investigated. Usually, because of a predominance of non-Etowah material, these mounds have been interpreted as non-Etowah. The large sites along the fall line, such as Neisler, Lamar, Shinholser, are examples. Some or all of the layers of mound construction on these sites may be associated with Etowah ceramics rather than the more frequently found Lamar. Only archaeological investigation will demonstrate beyond question the true associations, and the excavation of these sites could possibly turn the tide of "Etowah thought."
2. Temple Mounds and Wilbanks Ceramics

(--- or is it Savannah Ceramics?)

In his concluding section of the report on the survey of northern Georgia, Wauchope stresses the fact that the culture associated with Etowah ceramics was not pure Mississippian. However, he considers Savannah ceramics a different case. In a preface to his discussion of Savannah, Wauchope clearly portrays his interpretation of the cultural system associated with this ceramic type (Wauchope 1966: 439).

Now, however, we are about to mention some sites that were apparently minor centers of the Mississippian Culture itself, the elaborate system administered from the great political ceremonial centers like Aztalan, Spiro, Moundville, and Etowah. Wauchope then continues with a discussion of the archaeological investigation of the sites of Two Run Creek, Wilbanks, Long Swamp, Horseshoe Bend, and Free Bridge.

"Minor centers of the Mississippian Culture itself" is Wauchope's description of the sites associated with Savannah material. Regarding this statement, the author will admit that these sites make better candidates for Mississippian than any other manifestations in the Province (with the exception, of course, of Macon Plateau and Rood's manifestations). Yet, the fact should be stressed that we know little concerning the total cultural system associated with this archaeological assemblage. Primarily, Savannah material, which has been used as comparative data, has come from sites that have been interpreted as ceremonial centers and from burials. These data should be important in interpreting the ideological pattern of the cultural system; but as we pointed out in Section II, ideology comprises only a portion of the constitution of the sub-systems of culture. The gross elements of organization and the more mundane aspects of technology are not as
available from the excavation of such specialized sites. Further, we would like to have more information concerning the nature of the articulation of the various aspects of the cultural system with the environment. Thus, while we say that this manifestation makes a better candidate for Mississippian than any other in the Province, we say this on the basis of a comparison of only a small part of the total cultural system. The ceramics associated with these sites are indeed different from the ceramics associated with pure Middle Mississippian culture; and, primarily on this basis, we have suggested the use of the term South Appalachian Mississippian to designate a specific and unique cultural system.

Savannah is a geographical term. It is the name of a city on the coast of Georgia as well as the name of the river that forms the boundary between Georgia and South Carolina, and, as we have pointed out earlier in this paper, the name of a ceramic series. The type description of Savannah pottery was given in the report of the excavation of the Irene mound a few miles outside of Savannah, Georgia (Caldwell and McCann 1941). In keeping with the accepted tri-nomial system of naming ceramics, the types of the series were called Savannah Burnished Plain, Savannah Check Stamped, Savannah Complicated Stamped, and Savannah Fine Cordmarked. The names included a geographic term and two descriptive terms, a good system of classification.

In northern Georgia Wauchope (1948) found a variety of complicated stamped material similar to Savannah ceramics from the coast, and thus gave it the name Savannah; yet, the complicated stamped variety was the only ceramic type in northern Georgia similar to the Savannah Series on the coast. Because of this isolation of a single type from
a series and because the material from the Wilbanks site in northern Georgia was somewhat different from the coastal variety of Savannah. Complicated Stamped, Sears (1958) designated the northern Georgia series as Wilbanks. The types were Wilbanks Plain and Wilbanks Complicated Stamped. The present author feels that the geographic names Wilbanks and Savannah give valuable spatial information and that the two ceramic assemblages should come under different titles; henceforth in this paper the name Wilbanks will be used for this series of ceramics in northern Georgia.

Our interest in this thick, sand tempered, curvilinear stamped pottery that we are calling Wilbanks is in the association of these ceramics with the construction of mounds. Are the mounds associated with Wilbanks ceramics more similar to true Mississippian mounds than those associated with Etowah ceramics? Investigation of the reports of excavations of Wilbanks sites in northern Georgia indicates that, indeed, these mounds do appear to be quite similar to the typical Mississippian mound. They are usually rectangular truncated pyramids with ramp approaches and with rectangular superstructures on the summits.

In two instances, Two Run Creek and Free Bridge, in northern Georgia Wilbanks ceramics have been shown to have been associated with truncated pyramidal mounds with rectangular structures on top. Wilbanks ceramics were not so widely distributed in northern Georgia as Etowah. In gross quantity approximately five times as many Etowah sherds were found in the northern Georgia survey as Wilbanks sherds, and about three times as many Lamar sherds were found. As fewer sherds of Wilbanks were found during the northern Georgia survey, also fewer sites were producing this type. Map 9 shows the sites in northern
Georgia in which this ceramic type was associated with a mound structure and sites hypothesized to have mound building phases associated with Wilbanks. Of these, only the two previously mentioned, Two Run Creek and Free Bridge, are typical temple mounds.

The Two Run Creek mound was apparently associated with only Wilbanks ceramics, and the construction was typical of the "classic" temple mound (Wauchope 1966: 224).

The mound underwent at least 10 stages of expansion or heightening or both, as the Indians built a series of rectangular structures on the summits of ramped platforms. . . . They first expanded the area covered by the earlier platforms, then built it higher and higher; during certain stages there was a basin-shaped floor, banked at its lower margin by a clay retaining wall, adjacent to the platform. A new element was the fire-basin, scooped into the floor and provided with a raised and rounded rim.

With the construction of the mound at Two Run Creek we have a true temple mound with truncated top, ramp, and rectangular temples. Further, the mound is of considerable size, measuring approximately 8 feet tall in the profile drawing by Wauchope (1966: 447).

Because earth lodges associated with Etowah ceramics have been found at the base of several mound structures, they appear to have been quite important in the development of northern Georgia ceremonial structures. Wauchope has made an interesting observation concerning a portion of the structure at Two Run Creek: some of the floors were basin-shaped. Wauchope has suggested that this basin-shaped floor may have represented an earth-walled or earth-covered structure, which was on top of one of the platform mounds. Such a structure would not be unusual for this general period. The idea of covering, or at least partially covering, a structure with earth may have been present as a form of construction while Wilbanks ceramics were being made. However,
no evidence of such a structure associated with Wilbanks ceramics
located at or beneath the original surface of the ground exists.

The Free Bridge site, like the Two Run Creek site, did not have an
Etowah component. All of the material found in the mound structure was
either Wilbanks or Lamar. The mound was 6.4 feet high and exhibited a
series of constructions somewhat like the Two Run Creek Mound (Wauchope
1966: 245-246). A square house on the pre-mound surface was associated
with Wilbanks ceramics. Upon this house site a red clay platform serv-
ing as the substructure for another building was constructed. Higher
in the mound was evidence of still a third floor and structure.
Wauchope suggested at least three more enlargements, which had been
truncated by plowing activities. Again, the structure of the mound is
reminiscent of the pattern of construction with which we associate true
temple mounds. Wilbanks material was present on the pre-mound level at
Free Bridge, and the first two mound stages were exclusively Wilbanks.
The third level produced Wilbanks material in association with the first
occurrence of Lamar ceramics. Thus, a transition from Wilbanks to
Lamar material seems to have occurred on the site.

At Horseshoe Bend the mound was constructed directly over an
Etowah earth lodge with little elevation. With respect to this con-
struction Wauchope has said (1966: 324) that Savannah (Wilbanks) mate-
rial began to appear in the upper levels of the mound. At Long Swamp
Wilbanks material appeared on the site, but it was not associated with
any of the excavated components of the mound construction.

The Wilbanks site appears to be a similar situation to Long Swamp.
Sears (1958) has interpreted the only structure on the site to have been
associated with Etowah ceramics and to have been an earth lodge.
According to Sears, the Wilbanks material was the product of a later occupation of the surface above the collapsed earth lodge. In his final report on the earlier excavations of the Wilbanks site, Wauchope (1966: 280-289) reports ten stages of mound construction.

The platforms thus constructed were flat-topped, with sloping sides, steeper on the south than on the north. The platforms therefore probably did not face south. It seems likely that they looked toward the river, to the north, or to the village and graveyard to the west. The mounds evidently served as substructures for religious or civil houses and earth lodges built of perishable materials.

Wauchope does not address himself to the fact that Sears (1958) did not interpret any mound structures—only the earth lodge.

The only other Wilbanks component in northern Georgia that has been shown to have been associated with a mound structure is the upper portion of Mound C at Etowah (Larson personal communication). The levels destroyed by Moorehead which produced the impressive Southern Cult material were evidently associated with Wilbanks. To assume that these construction phases of this mound were in the pattern of the typical Mississippian temple mound is reasonable; but because Moorehead excavated a crater in the top of the structure, the floors and structure patterns were not available for examination in recent excavations. Although we can say that the upper structures of Mound C were probably typical temple mounds, we cannot be absolutely certain.

Few mounds have been associated with Wilbanks ceramics. But, from the information that has been produced, Wilbanks mounds seem similar, if not identical, to the average archaeologist's stereotype of a Mississippian mound. We can say that by the time Wilbanks pottery had been adopted in northern Georgia, the true temple mound was employed as a ceremonial and/or political structure. Hence, from the standpoint of
mounds Wilbanks seems to have been more closely associated with the Middle Mississippian practitioners to the west than any of the other components of this Cultural Unit. In addition to the association with mounds, other evidence associates Wilbanks with the truer cultural characteristics of Late Mississippian. Southern Cult and Late Mississippian material have been found on Wilbanks sites in northern Georgia other than the Etowah site. Caldwell mentioned as early as 1950 (1950: 13) that Wilbanks graves contained distinctive Late Middle Mississippian vessels from sites in the Allatoona Reservoir. In his analysis "Trend and Tradition in the Prehistory of the Eastern United States," Caldwell has noted (1958: 48),

As the cultures of the Mississippian Tradition to the westward gradually changed, distinctive forms of Mississippian artifacts appeared at Southern Appalachian sites at successive times. A narrow-necked, shell-tempered water bottle and small vessels with strap handles occurred in Savannah Period graves in the Allatoona Reservoir. Stone box graves appeared with Southern Cult burials in the Wilbanks Period level in Mound C at the Etowah Site (Larsen [sic] communication). During Cult times at Etowah, domestic pottery (Figure 12: Wilbanks) continued to be within the Southern Appalachian Tradition, while still showing evidence that Mississippian ceramic styles had long been circulated in the area.

This, then, gives us some initial recognition of the association of South Appalachian Mississippian Wilbanks material with Late Middle Mississippian manifestations.

The northern Georgia survey also produced some material which showed an association between Wilbanks ceramics and elements of Late Middle Mississippian cultural systems. The Two Run Creek Mound produced a Mississippian shell tempered water bottle and a shell tempered sherd; at the Sandtown site (Wauchope 1966: 400) a burial was associated with a Mississippian water bottle, and one burial was arranged in a sitting position with a stone slab backrest. Wauchope also listed
copper-covered wooden earspools, a wooden-hafted copper ax, a conch vessel or trumpet, columella barrel-shaped beads, and steatite vessels as characteristic of the Late Middle Mississippian manifestation in northern Georgia. He interprets, "Thus the classic Mississippian Culture appears to have arrived in northern Georgia fairly well along into the Mississippi period."

Artifacts associated with Wilbanks ceramics seem to show the first real thrust (with the exception of the Macon Plateau related material) of Mississippian cultural elements into the South Appalachian Province. There is definitely a Late Mississippian cast to the artifacts associated with Wilbanks ceramics. But, how far can we extrapolate this information to make comments concerning the domestic activities and the organization of the people involved in this cultural system? Was the economic system based on the extensive cultivation of maize? Was there the beginning of the agglutination of a population living together and showing allegiance to a theocratic political system operated from the location of the large mound centers? Or was the area just beginning to pick up the flashy ideological trappings of their neighbors to the west without significantly changing their technological or organizational patterns? We all tend to think in terms of the first interpretation. But, we need to keep in mind the alternative hypotheses. Certain elements of Mississippianism were possibly taking hold in the Province without changing the whole system. A drastic change in the technological patterns of a culture directly affects their articulation with the environment--their livelihood. On the other hand, a change in ideology might have more subtle effects, and it may have a more subtle causal factor.
3. Savannah and Pee Dee Ceramics and Mounds of the Coastal Plain

In the eastern portion of the South Appalachian Province, platform mounds are found in association with both Savannah and Pee Dee ceramics. Major sites include Irene, Town Creek, Hollywood, the mounds of the Camden area, and Ft. Watson (Map 10). Archaeological assemblages of the coastal plain area form an interesting phenomenon within the South Appalachian Province. These cultural systems are similar to manifestations in northern Georgia that we have called South Appalachian Mississippian, and this title fits them well. Yet, these assemblages have a quality which sets them apart from their neighbors to the west. They apparently reflect a process of acculturation that has combined elements indigenous to the coastal plain with platform mounds and other characteristics which we call South Appalachian Mississippian.

Ceramics of this period on the coastal plain seem to provide the most available example of the fusion of the material culture of the northwestern and southeastern portions of the South Appalachian Province. The most obvious resemblance between the ceramics of the two areas is complicated stamping. The similarity of Savannah Complicated Stamped to Wilbanks Complicated Stamped is evident from the controversy over the application of these two names to the same ceramic material in northern Georgia. Additionally, Sears (1950) has suggested a significant similarity between the Savannah Complicated Stamped material and Etowah Complicated Stamped. Thus, although it is not well understood, there can be little doubt that some type of relationship exists between the Savannah Complicated Stamped type of the coast and the Cultural Unit III material from northern Georgia.

This ceramic comparison can be carried one step farther in the
case of Pee Dee ceramics. Reid (1965, 1967) has pointed out similarities between Pee Dee ceramics of North Carolina and Savannah ceramics from Hollywood and Irene. Further, in this paper we have noted the similarity between the stamping styles illustrated by Reid (1967: 11, 13) for Pee Dee material and the patterns given by Wauchope (1966: 31) for Etowah. In general, the style of complicated stamping relates the ceramic material from the coastal plain to that of northern Georgia.

The indigenous characteristics of Pee Dee and Savannah pottery are as striking as the characteristics relating them to the northern Georgia varieties. The Savannah Complicated Stamped type was associated in a series with a type called Savannah Fine Cordmarked, and Caldwell (1952: 317-318) has suggested that the cordmarked type of the Savannah series was directly related to the earlier Wilmington type of ceramics. Cordmarking on a late time level seems to be a coastal characteristic, and the combination of cordmarking and complicated stamping in the same ceramic series seems to be one example of acculturation on the coastal plain.

Cordmarking is not as prevalent in the Pee Dee ceramic series as it is in Savannah, but other elements of the pottery of the coastal plain are relatively unique to the coastal plain and tend to unify the geographical region. Several elements of rim decoration on pottery from Town Creek, Irene, Ft. Watson, and Hollywood are characteristic of most of the Cultural Unit III sites of the coastal plain (Reid 1967: 69). These include the addition of single rows of hollow reed punctations, rows of spaced rosettes, the addition of reed punctated nodes, the application of a punctated rim fillet, and the addition of small pellets to the shoulder region of bowls. Although they appear in
collections from northern Georgia, the frequency seems to be much higher on the coastal plain. We would not hesitate to suggest that the locus of the centroid of the distribution of this type of rim decoration will probably be within the coastal plain region of the South Appalachian Province.

Besides the ceramic similarities that seem to tie these mound sites of the coastal plain into a common unit of cultural interaction, other characteristics primarily related to burial practices—mortuary houses, urn burials, and burial mounds—are found much more frequently on the coastal plain than in the upper country. Mortuary houses have been excavated at Irene and at Town Creek. These are the only mortuary houses known from the South Appalachian Province and are, so far as we know, a unique coastal plain characteristic. Urn burial has been found in numerous cases in the coastal plain region. On mound sites urn burials have been recorded from Town Creek, Irene, Hollywood, Ft. Watson, and sites in the Camden area.

Burial in this vicinity of the Province seems to have been accorded special attention. Although burials are not accompanied by the ornate burial goods characteristic of the Wilbanks-Southern Cult burials from northern Georgia, they seem to get special attention with respect to structures and containers. The significance of this burial manifestation of the coastal plain is unknown, but this emphasis may be related to the practice of constructing burial mounds. Evidently an early characteristic on the coast, burial mounds are associated with Wilmington ceramics at the mouth of the Savannah and with Deptford and Swift Creek ceramics in northern Florida and southern Georgia. In a later context, burial mounds have been found in association with platform mound
constructions at Irene and Hollywood, and some of the smaller mounds in the Camden area and at Ft. Watson may also prove to have been primarily mounds for interring the dead. The burial mound at Hollywood contained burials that combined Southern Cult objects with urn burial and Savannah pottery (Reid 1965, Thomas 1894). The combination demonstrates the association of the Southern Cult with coastal plain burial mounds and with the ceramics associated with most coastal plain platform mounds.

Platform mounds are the most outstanding similarity between the late cultural systems of the coastal plain and those in the piedmont of Georgia. Limited investigations indicate that at least some of these mounds conform quite closely to the pattern of mound construction found in the piedmont and mountain portions of the Province. Structures at Irene, Town Creek, and Hollywood have recently been excavated and show evidence of canons of construction leading to the hypothesis that they were transmitted to the coastal plain from farther inland.

The large mound at Irene was shown to have been a composite of three types of mound construction. This trilogy of construction patterns is evident in the profiles presented in the Irene report (Caldwell and McCann 1941: Fig. 1) (Fig. 3). The four lower stages were basin shaped, while the next three stages are level on the summits. The eighth and last stage was dome-shaped.

The basin shape of the lower levels of the mound suggests a common element in their construction, which contributed to this similarity in form. Caldwell and McCann (1941: 8-9) describe the construction:

Mound I consisted of a pentagonal embankment of sand and shell surrounding a single rectangular building. . . .

The central building was rectangular with squared corners and measured twenty-six by twenty-five feet. It was
Fig. 3. Pattern of construction of the large mound at the Irene site (Caldwell and McCann 1941: Fig. 1).
squarely aligned with the long sides of the embankment. . . .

. . . It had a central, raised fire basin, a prepared clay floor, and a series of inner roof supports placed close to the walls. The fire basin was circular with an overall diameter of thirty-three inches. The diameter of its cavity was fifteen inches. . . .

Mound 2 was almost identical with Mound 1 but was slightly larger and had a more elaborate central structure. It was constructed by placing additional sand upon the embankment and probably upon the ramp. . . . The central structure was exactly superimposed over the position of the building below, and was aligned in the same directions. In spite of the increased height of the embankment, it lay only two inches higher than the first building, and since it was built directly upon the floor, the whole arrangement retained a saucer-like appearance. . . .

A low, carefully modeled ledge of clay, probably for seating purposes, ran along the entire interior of the wall and was packed around the bases of many of the inner roof support. . . . The upper surface displayed impressions of reed or cane which repeatedly recrossed at right angles to each other.

These constructions, Mounds 1 and 2, were walled with oyster shell and sand; and they were both characterized by modeled clay furniture.

Mounds 3 and 4 were similar to the first two constructions, each having a gross basin-shaped contour. Following Mound 4, Mounds 5, 6, and 7 were structures with definite flat-topped configurations. Mound 5 was only a few inches above the top of Mound 4, but the next two mound stages were of considerable thickness. These mounds and the rectangular structures on their summits conform nicely to the pattern of temple mounds stereotypic of Mississippian temple mounds.

The final mound stage of the large mound at Irene, Mound 8, did not conform to the general pattern of the earlier mounds. While the earlier structures had been pentagonal in plan and flat-topped, the last structure was circular and dome-shaped. It was not associated with Savannah ceramics but rather with the later Irene series, and it may have been a burial mound rather than a temple mound.

The only other temple mound that has been thoroughly excavated in
the coastal plain region of the Province is that at Town Creek. Reid (1967: 55-56) has described the general pattern of construction at Town Creek (Fig. 4).

A premound humus extended under the mound in all areas excavated. Upon this surface were built several structures including two mortuary houses. Post dating the mortuary houses was an earth lodge banked on the sides with chunks of sod revealed in the excavation as a laminated earthen [sic] embankment. Nearby, probably contemporary with the earth-lodge, was a "trash bin" constructed of posts surrounded on the exterior by clay and finally capped over the top opening with clay. After razing the earthlodge, a retaining wall was constructed and filled in to the height of the first temple structure. There is evidence for only one more structure with a shallow fill separating it from the first. This second, and last, structure was partially covered and preserved by back dirt from a pit post dating the aboriginal occupation. The flanks of the mound yielded scattered remnants of an undisturbed layer of debris discarded when the temples were in use.

The earth lodge and the succeeding structures at Town Creek were all rectangular. The rectangular structure of the temples were unusual in that they were constructed of an alternating double row of posts rather than a single row. The construction at Town Creek represents a rather abrupt change. Following an earth lodge at the base of the mound two temple mounds consisting of truncated rectangular pyramids with temples on the summits were constructed.

Before discussing the evidence for temple mounds in other portions of this coastal plain area, let us point out the similarities between the mound at Irene and the one at Town Creek. The general pattern of construction is the same. Both mounds had basal structures of earth lodge form. The structure at Town Creek was a true earth lodge. While the first four constructions at the Irene site may not be called earth lodges, they were of the same general pattern. These structures had a general rectangular form with shells and sand placed against the sides
in the manner of an earth lodge. The only characteristic lacking was the earth on the top of the structure.

The general pattern, then, is one of earth lodge type structures followed by platform mounds with temples. The mound at Irene appears to show a transition stage between the types of structures, while the change in structure type at Town Creek was abrupt. At Irene the initial development of a mound was evidently not the result of a conscious effort to construct a platform mound. Rather, one structure was built on top of the ruins of another, and the debris of the earlier lodge created a mound-like effect for the base of the second. The third and fourth mounds were similar. The fifth mound was a level platform mound, but the thin construction layer of this mound seems to indicate that it was built to cover up the remains of the structure on top of Mound 4 rather than to add more height. Following this, Mounds 6 and 7 were respectable but thin stages of mound construction, which were surmounted by rectangular temples. There seems to be an evolution of types. Initially, the intention at Irene was not to build a mound. Structures evolved toward the mound morphology because they were constructed on top of one another. The location rather than the height of the structure seems to have been important. Then, after a series of these superimposed constructions had been built on the same location, a platform mound with a temple superstructure was intentionally added. Town Creek had an earth lodge. It was razed; a flat-topped platform mound with a ramp approach was intentionally constructed; and upon this mound a rectangular temple was constructed. There were no intervening stages.

Evidence concerning the construction of other mounds in the coastal
Fig. 4. Schematic representation of mound building phases at the Town Creek site, North Carolina.
plain region of the Province is relatively scarce. De Baillou's small excavation in the toe of the large mound at Hollywood has disclosed partial evidence for two mound stages (De Baillou 1965: Fig. 2), but the actual configuration of the mound at Hollywood will require more intensive excavation than De Baillou was able to give in his initial investigation. Data from other mounds is negligible. At the Adamson Mound, the author has observed the remnants of a packed clay floor and the faint outline of a ramp, but this superficial observational information is all that is available. Down the Wateree River from the Adamson Mound, the Ft. Watson Mound also has the faint outline of a ramp on the south side of the mound; but, fortunately, there is no evidence of an exposed floor. Other mounds in the area are open to question. There is no data from the McDowell (Mulberry) site to indicate whether or not this was a burial mound or a substructure mound. Investigators from the University of Georgia cleaned up enough of the profile of the eroding mound, which is exposed in the river bank, to discover that it was a layered construction with burials. Although Thomas reported (1894: 326) that the mound was not a burial mound and was possibly a domiciliary mound, early investigators were prone to identify any mound in which they did not find a significant number of burials as a domiciliary mound. The true purpose of the mound is open to question and will await further research. Several other mound sites in the Camden area may eventually be shown to be platform mounds, but at present evidence for any of them is inconclusive.

The nature of the ceramics, the non-ceramic artifacts, the construction of the temple mounds, and the distribution of those mounds in the coastal plain region lead to hypotheses concerning the
prehistory of the Province. These elements of the archaeological assemblage were important in the placement of these manifestations in Cultural Unit III with the associations of Etowah and Wilbanks ceramics in northern Georgia and Pisgah in the mountains. The distribution of the mounds provides some suggestions concerning the direction of the introduction of South Appalachian Mississippian traits. The area centering around the intersection of the fall line and the Savannah River seems to have been the "corridor" into the coastal plain region of the Province (Map 11). From the vicinity of the fall line and the Savannah River the distribution of sites together with the geographical pattern presents two hypothetical routes of dispersal of South Appalachian Mississippian characteristics into the low country. One is directly down the Savannah River to the Irene site, and the other is along the fall line to the Camden area and beyond. If these two directions form the basic pattern of dispersal, then secondary movements would be supposed to branch away from the basic pattern and to form a rather complicated network of relationships within the coastal plain.

With this model of the geographic pattern of the transmission routes of South Appalachian Mississippianism into the coastal plain, we expect that the intensity of the relationships between sites will be shown to be roughly proportional to their proximity to one of the lines of dispersal and to their distance from one another. In other words, because Irene and Town Creek are the farthest removed sites in the area and because they are on the ends of the two routes of dispersal—the Savannah River and the fall line—we would expect that they would be the most distantly related of the sites in the area.

Once we have the evidence for acculturation and a suggested route
for the cultural transmission, there is the question of the specifics of the introduction of the new cultural information. Diffusion, stimulus diffusion, or migration could have accounted for the transfer of Mississippianism to the coastal plain. Actually, the process of acculturation probably involved a variety of mechanisms in bringing the two cultural systems into contact. Yet, in two cases, Irene and Town Creek, migration has been suggested as the mechanism for transmission of the South Appalachian Mississippian system. While at the Irene site Caldwell (1952: 318) noted a mixture of people as well as cultural traits, Coe saw a cultural segregation at Town Creek (1952: 308):

One of the best archaeological records of the movement of a people in the southeast is that of the Pee Dee Culture. It moved into the upper Pee Dee River Valley with household and baggage about the middle of the Sixteenth Century, forcing the Uwharrie descendants into the hills of the Piedmont.

In view of these two interpretations, we should seriously consider that the introduction of many of the cultural traits of the coastal plain South Appalachian Mississippian may have been the product of a direct migration of people into the area. Quantitatively, we have no idea how many of the cases of introduction involved the mingling of people as at the Irene site or the relatively complete segregation of people as at the Town Creek site.

The understanding of the process of coastal plain acculturation will involve knowledge of the changing faces of a variety of systems. Primarily in the archaeological record, we see evidence of a new ideological system on the coastal plain, the temple mound complex. But, what of the other aspects of culture on the coastal plain? The mound sites of the coastal plain are localized and are in the center of
of soil types that seem well-suited to agriculture. Thomas (1894: 327) found corn cobs at the McDowell site, and corn has been found numerous times in the ceremonial center at Town Creek (Coe personal communication). At least in these two locations the economic system is indicated as directly related to the production of maize, and a maize-based agricultural system for these cultural systems is an "excellent odds" bet. However, the actual proportion of the economic systems supported by corn agriculture as opposed to other types of subsistence is unknown. No evidence in the archaeological literature suggests agriculture at the Irene site. Ward (1965), pointing out that the soil at the Irene site is not well-suited for corn agriculture, has suggested that another economic base for the people who built the mounds at Irene may have existed.

The location of Irene at the mouth of the Savannah River, directly downstream from the Hollywood site and the dispersal point into central and northern Georgia, suggests that Irene may have been important in the movement of trade goods from the sea to the upland portion of the Province. Through a relationship with South Appalachian Mississippian people to the north, the coastal cultural systems may have begun to pick up certain South Appalachian Mississippian characteristics without the maize economic base; the "flashy" elements of temple mound building and the associated ideological elements may well have been introduced to the people without the other elements of the system. Ideology from a functional standpoint is rather easily changed. It does not involve direct articulation with the environment as does organization and technology in providing the subsistence of a people. Involved in a trade system with other portions of the Province, Irene people could have
taken up the ideological trappings of their sophisticated neighbors to
the north while subsisting on the natural fruits of the tidewater
region.

If this could have happened at Irene, it could also have happened
in other portions of the coastal plain area. Many people of the
coastal plain may have been in one way or another related to the true
South Appalachian Mississippian cultural system but may have been
unable, due to reasons of cultural conservatism or the physical environ­
ment, to adopt all of the characteristics of the new system, which would
qualify them for the nomination South Appalachian Mississippian. Such
is the mechanism of acculturation. To analyze it further will require
a great deal of fieldwork in eastern Georgia, South Carolina, and south
central North Carolina.

We have hypothesized two major arteries of cultural transmission
from the central Georgia area into the coastal plain region. Testing
the validity of these arteries will require an archaeological survey in
the total area of South Carolina and eastern Georgia. We would then
hope that the pattern of these proposed arteries would show up against
the background of a holistically surveyed area. The philosophy here is
not only to show that an intense amount of activity occurred along these
routes, but also to show that these paths are the major axes of cul­
tural interaction. We need to show that more cultural activity
occurred along these routes than along other possible patterns of move­
ment in the coastal plain. We would suggest that if our hypotheses are
correct, the area where rivers and larger creeks intersect with the fall
line would have been intensively occupied by South Appalachian
Mississippian cultural systems. In the case of the line of interaction
down the Savannah River to the Irene site, we would suppose that if our trade hypothesis is correct, sites between these two areas would show evidence of contact with people on the ends of the route; but they themselves would not have adopted the major portions of the South Appalachian Mississippian cultural system, especially the agricultural system. In the area surrounding these lines of cultural transmission, there may be a distribution of traits which radiate from the major locus of the distribution in what we would initially hypothesize as an inverse relationship with distance: that is, we would expect elements of South Appalachian Mississippianism to spread up the coast from Irene and to diminish with distance from this center. The field of traits relating to the Irene site would intersect lines of diffusion of influence from the sites located along the fall line on the drainage of the Santee and the Pee Dee Rivers; therefore, a generalized model network of cultural interaction may be suggested.

The coastal plain remains one of the largest archaeological blanks in the South Appalachian Province. No systematic archaeological survey of any sizeable portion of the area has ever been conducted; and our knowledge of the area comes from a patchwork of information which has been picked up through the persual of century-old documents, the activities of pot hunters, and the casual references by professional archaeologists. Our hypotheses are primarily based on information which has come from the periphery of the area--Irene, Town Creek, and Hollywood. We can readily see that these sites alone will not explain the acculturation of the coastal plain. We need evidence from the blank places in the eastern portion of the South Appalachian Province, and this author hopes that the suggestions of this portion of this paper will
provide some working hypotheses that can be employed in future research in the area.

4. South Appalachian Mountaineers

The mountain portion of the South Appalachian Province is a distinctive geographic region of the southeastern United States. The region consists of a series of lofty mountains separated by a maze of valleys and coves cut by the swiftly flowing water courses of the area. The valleys are narrow but fertile; and the tortuous patterns of most of the rivers, as well as the existence of severe gorges in certain locations, make these mountain reaches relatively rugged barriers between the South Appalachian Province and the level land and broad valleys to the west. In this mountain barrier lived a people who had a cultural system which apparently received cultural influence from the northwest as well as from the South Appalachian Province: these people were the makers of Pisgah pottery (Holden 1966, Dickens 1970).

As part of his study of the Pisgah phenomenon, Dickens has closely examined the distribution of Pisgah ceramics. An examination of his map (1970: Fig. 7) of the distribution of Pisgah ceramics indicates that Pisgah material is distributed in a general north-south pattern from southwestern Virginia, into eastern Tennessee, the central mountain area of North Carolina, and the mountain foothills in northeastern Georgia and northwestern South Carolina. One of the most notable facts about the distribution of Pisgah ceramics is that they are confined to the mountain portion of the Province. As soon as we reach the foothills, Pisgah material apparently ceases to be an important element in collections.

From information derived from excavations at the Garden Creek site
Dickens has reported detailed information concerning the construction of a Pisgah mound structure. Combining this information with survey data, recent extant excavation data, and historical documents concerning early excavations in the area, he has compiled a list of hypothetical Pisgah-associated mound structures. Those mounds are shown on Map 10 with the addition of sites that the present author would hypothesize to be associated with Pisgah ceramics. All of these mounds have the morphology of platform mounds and upon excavation may show similarities to the excavated mound at Garden Creek. A comparison of the distribution of these mounds with the distribution of Pisgah ceramics indicates that the locus of distribution of mound sites hypothesized to be associated with Pisgah ceramics more or less coincides with the distribution of Pisgah ceramic sites, the general centroid of the ceramic distribution coinciding with the centroid of the mound distribution. However, as Dickens cautions, we must consider that the distribution of these sites is influenced by the area of survey, that many more ceramic and mound sites may be found, and that such would possibly change the presently available distribution.

The ceramics of the Pisgah Series apparently have a complex ancestry (Dickens 1970: 80-87). Similar to the preceding Pigeon and Connestee Series, the vessel form and the paste of the ceramics seems to have been indigenous to the mountain area. The surface finish, on the other hand, has more complicated stamping than either of the mountain predecessors; and this increase in complicated stamping would seem to indicate more intense relationships with the heart of the Province. Interestingly, although the complicated stamping associated with Pisgah is rectilinear, as are many of the types from northern Georgia
(e.g., Napier, Woodstock, and Etowah), the stamps on these ceramics are, so far, unique to the Pisgah Series. The most striking of Pisgah characteristics is incidental rim treatment. Rims are usually modified by the addition of a collar or an applique strip often punctated in a variety of designs. Additionally, there may be a number of different forms of handles, nodes, and lugs. This rim treatment and decoration is characteristic of ceramics found to the north and west of the mountain area, and Dickens notes (1970: 86) that material quite similar to Pisgah ceramics is associated with the Oliver Phase of central Indiana. The ceramic material implies that the cultural system of the mountains was receiving stimuli from a variety of sources including the heart of the South Appalachian Province as well as the Midwest.

The temporal placement of Pisgah has been based on a series of radiocarbon dates from several sources in the area, and the dates are outlined with other radiocarbon dates from the Province in Table 2. A sample from the Garden Creek mound, which is unmistakably a Pisgah mound, has yielded a date of A.D. 1435 ± 70 years (Geochron Laboratories No. GX0595). Ranging from A.D. 830 at the Chauga site in northwestern South Carolina to A.D. 1210 from a site in Lee County, Virginia, earlier dates are not so definitely associated with Pisgah ceramics.

In addition to the dates from these Pisgah sites, Dickens has noted the dates from the Town Creek site in central North Carolina. Pee Dee ceramic material has been found in association with Pisgah ceramics at the Warren Wilson and Garden Creek (Hw01) sites (Dickens 1970) 70), and the Pee Dee dates have been used by Dickens to check the dates from the mountains. Pee Dee dates at Town Creek begin at A.D. 1205 for the pre-mound level and end at A.D. 1350. Synthesizing this
information, Dickens (1970: 279) has concluded that the dates for the activity of the Pisgah-associated cultural system in the mountain portion of the Province may be approximately set between A.D. 1100 and A.D. 1400. Thus, we see from Table 2 that the Pisgah occupation of the mountains is possibly contemporaneous with other components of Unit III--Etowah, Wilbanks, Savannah, and Pee Dee. Further, as we shall show in the next section, Pisgah occupation may also be contemporaneous with the early developmental phases of the Lamar Series in central Georgia.

Drawing on information from the Chickamauga Basin, Dickens has compared the Pisgah cultural assemblage to the Dallas cultural assemblage in eastern Tennessee and has concluded that striking similarities existed between the two. In addition to some specialized architectural similarities, Dickens has noted (1970: 281) that both areas shared the Lick Creek style of gorget. He states (1970: 281),

> Aside from obvious differences in the ceramics of the two cultures (Dallas pottery is a shell-tempered ware which is plain or cord marked), there is little to keep this writer from considering Dallas to be the somewhat more Mississippian-oriented Overhill counterpart of Pisgah--i.e. protohistoric Overhill Cherokee.

In making this comparison of the two cultural systems Dickens (personal communication) has compared all of the published information concerning the Dallas culture with the corresponding information for Pisgah. Thus, in addition to examining architecture, shell work, and ceramics, he has compared stone and bone assemblages, burial data, and other pertinent information. Unfortunately, due to lack of information Dickens was not able to compare the Pisgah cultural system with any of the contiguous cultural systems except Dallas. The Pisgah cultural system may have shown equal similarities to the cultural systems associated with Etowah, Wilbanks, Savannah, Pee Dee, and/or Lamar ceramics if the information
had been available for comparison.

The terminal phases of Pisgah are as important as the developmental period. In the Tennessee area and the southern area Pisgah manifestations seem to have merged with or to have been replaced by new forms in the beginning of the 15th Century. In the Tennessee area when Dallas and Pisgah ceramics are found in a stratigraphic situation, Dallas is superimposed over Pisgah. Dickens has suggested that in the southern portion of the Province the rectilinear pottery of the Pisgah Series was gradually replaced by curvilinear styles related first to the Savannah and/or Wilbanks styles and later by the Lamar style which was to become recognized as the Qualla Series in the mountains. At the large mound at Garden Creek (Hw01) (Dickens 1970: 84) the ceramic material can be placed in a progressive series from Pisgah to Qualla with very apparent elements of style transition.

Analyzing the information of the Pisgah ceramic type, we see a cultural system ceramically unique within the South Appalachian Province. In some cases this ceramic difference might cause the postulation that significant difference existed between the cultural system of this area and those in the other portions of the Province. This postulation would be especially relevant when we consider that the geographic setting of this cultural system is so different from others in the Province. But, the ceremonial structures of the area show a striking similarity to other areas, including sites as far removed as the Ridge and Valley Province of Tennessee and the embayed region of Georgia near the mouth of the Savannah River.

The mound at Garden Creek (Hw01) has been extensively excavated, and the details of the archaeological reconstruction of the mound have
been given in the section of the archaeological record covering the mountains. Basically, the construction was one of an earth lodge followed by the addition of an anterior platform, which was then surmounted by a platform mound with ramp approach and a rectangular summit structure. This sequence is important because of its similarity to an aforementioned sequence for the construction of mounds in the piedmont of Georgia and on the coastal plain area. The mountain information tends to confirm the suggestion that these mounds were not begun as mounds in the true sense of the term temple mound; rather, earth lodges and patchwork addition preceded the construction of true temple mounds.

The details of the construction of the earth lodge at Garden Creek has parallels in many portions of the Province. Several sites with rectangular earth-covered or earth-walled lodges and molded clay furniture have been found in other portions of the Province. The basal structures of the mounds at the Dallas, Davis, and Hixon sites in Tennessee (Lewis and Kneberg 1941) and the Peachtree site in western North Carolina (Setzler and Jennings 1941) show striking similarities to the earth lodges at Garden Creek. In a context removed from the mountain area, the basal structure of the mound at the Irene site (Caldwell and McCann 1941: 8-11, Plate II) is constructed in the same pattern. In addition to these structures other Cultural Unit III earth lodges have been discussed for Town Creek, Wilbanks, Horseshoe Bend, Long Swamp, and Eastwood.

One of the most impressive construction elements of the mound at Garden Creek was the stone mantle which was placed on the original ground surface prior to the addition of the platform mound anterior to the earth lodges. Evidence of the extensive use of stone in structures
associated with Cultural Unit III is numerous. Setzler and Jennings (1941) have found a rather thick layer of stones above the earth lodge construction at the Peachtree site in the extreme western portion of North Carolina, and a similar layer has been found at the Hixon site in Tennessee. In both cases the stone mantle has been associated with an earth lodge similar to the one at the Garden Creek site. Elsewhere in the mountain area layers of stones have been found to be important constituents of the Nununyi Mound, the Nacoochee Mound, a mound reported by Thomas (1894: 350) in the vicinity of Asheville, and the Greenwood Mound (Colburn 1936).* In addition to layers of stones in the construction of mounds in the mountain area, the construction of the structures at Wilbanks, Chauga, and Long Swamp have been associated with the placement of large stones in the fill of the mound.

From the mountain investigations we derive conflicting hypotheses. In addition to the geographical isolation of the area, the ceramic evidence tends to indicate that the cultural systems were only distantly related to the cultural systems of the contiguous areas. The remainder of the cultural assemblage, however, does show similarity to the cultural assemblage associated with Dallas ceramics in eastern Tennessee; and we have pointed out the similarity between the specialized earth lodge structure at the base of the mound (Hw 1) at the Garden Creek site and the lower levels of the mound at the Irene site. This relationship between cultural traits is further substantiated by the fact that ceramic articles representing Pisgah traits have been

*Note: A layer of stones was discovered to cover one of the mound stages at the Estatoe site (Kelly and De Baillou 1960), but this seems to have been associated with a later manifestation than Cultural Unit III.
found on the coastal plain and that coastal plain ceramic material has been found in association with Pisgah in the mountains. This pattern of similarities brings forth an apparent anomaly in the prehistoric situation in the mountains. While the mountain culture associated with Pisgah ceramics was physically located quite close to the cultures of northern Georgia, most of the associations seem to be with eastern Tennessee and the coastal plain. This anomaly may be related to the limited sample of material from mountain sites, and the examination of the strength of this relationship should be one of the primary considerations of mountain archaeology.
Lamar is probably the most familiar term in South Appalachian Province archaeology, and the reason for this familiarity is quantity. Pottery similar to the Lamar series (Jennings and Fairbanks 1939: 4) constitutes the most widespread ceramic style in the Province. In addition to the material from the Lamar type site, similar ceramic series include Irene from the Georgia Coast (Caldwell and McCann 1941: 46-47), Overhill and Tugalo from eastern Tennessee (Lewis and Kneberg 1946: 105, Broyles 1967), Caraway from the North Carolina piedmont (Coe 1964: 33-34), and Qualla from the mountain portion of the Province (Egloff 1967). The general style is spread rather uniformly over the entire geographical area. Map 12 shows the distribution of mound sites which have been demonstrated to be associated with Lamar style ceramics, as well as those hypothesized to have this association. Because of overlapping identifications of these ceramics, there has been no attempt to identify the specific variant on each site, rather the several type names are located in their general spatial locations.

One of the intriguing aspects of the Lamar phenomenon has been the spread of this ceramic style. For a variety of reasons Lamar has been suggested as a late manifestation. Caldwell (1950: 11) has mentioned that "Several lines of evidence suggest that many Lamar sites in Georgia are post De Soto (1540 A.D.) . . . ." With the recognition that by A.D. 1690 the Lamar style had been replaced in central Georgia by the Ocmulgee Fields pottery of the historic Creeks, scholars were left with a time span of approximately 150 years for the deposition of all of the Lamar type ceramic material on the many sites in central Georgia. Further, the Lamar style was not only found in large quantity in central
Georgia but also in most other portions of the Province. This short period of time and the apparently rapid spread of the Lamar style called for the designation of the Lamar phenomenon as a horizon, and many archaeologists prefer to think of Lamar in terms of a "horizon style."

From the perspective of more recent archaeological field work, other hypotheses can be made concerning the length of time of the development and spread of the Lamar style. The temporal position of Lamar has been placed between Macon Plateau and Ocmulgee Fields in central Georgia and above and/or contemporary with Etowah and Wilbanks in northern Georgia. This means that in absolute chronology the placement of Lamar must be at least as late as these manifestations. The absolute dating of the Macon Plateau manifestation in central Georgia is 11th Century A.D., while the latest dates for Etowah and Wilbanks in northern Georgia fall in the 14th Century A.D. As a result we could reasonably suggest that the developmental phases of Lamar in central Georgia may have been occurring as early as the beginning of the 15th Century, or perhaps even earlier. Although this date may seem quite early for the beginning of Lamar, no outstanding evidence refutes this hypothesis. As far as the present archaeological record from Georgia is concerned, the Lamar style could conservatively have first appeared sometime between the beginning of the 15th Century to the middle of the 16th Century, a span of approximately 150 years.

Having outlined the hypothetical limits of the beginning of the Lamar style, we may now consider the terminal dating. The introduction of the Ocmulgee Fields type of pottery into the central portion of Georgia took place ca. A.D. 1690, and this date may be considered to be an upper terminal date for the use of Lamar ceramics in the central
portion of Georgia. Yet, we cannot extend this termination date to the remainder of the Province for all ceramic types that participated in the Lamar style. There is evidence that in the upper piedmont of Georgia, in the piedmont of North Carolina, and in the coastal plain area the Lamar style lasted much later than 1690. The Caraway Series of the piedmont of North Carolina has been dated by Coe (1964: 55) between A.D. 1700 and A.D. 1725, and this is only for the Caraway occupation of the Doerschuk site. The Caraway Series may have lasted later than this in the vicinity. Egloff (1967) has conducted a study of the ceramics from the surface of historic Cherokee towns and has concluded that the Qualla Series ceramics were used practically until the time of Cherokee removal. Examination of the types of the Qualla Series indicates that this series carries on the stylistic characteristics of the Lamar Series. In fact, the Qualla material is much more similar to the Lamar material than the Ocmulgee Fields ceramics of central Georgia.

Concerning this extension of the Lamar ceramic style in time and space from the central Georgia region, Wauchope (1966: 440) has generalized that Lamar material became less frequent toward the fall line while the Ocmulgee Fields types became much more abundant. Wauchope interprets (1966: 441),

Since Indians continued to live in the Appalachian region well into historic times, one is forced to the conclusion that the Protohistoric Lamar pottery persisted there while new styles such as the Ocmulgee Fields series and Chattahoochee Brushed developed at a very late date. . . . Combining this circumstance with the apparent founding of many new Lamar villages in the north, and with our further observation that European goods appeared in quantity in the Monroe County Advanced Protohistoric refuse pits but were almost wholly absent in the north, I suggest that archaeology here reflects a greater degree of Indian acculturation of European life in the Piedmont and south, while the aborigines of the Appalachians
withdrew from such contact and sought escape in new homes off the beaten paths of conquest and colonization.

Here Mauchope presents a reasonable hypothesis, and one which will probably be further substantiated by more extensive archaeological field work.

If we take into consideration the information from northern Georgia and from the mountain portion of the Province, the persistence of the Lamar style into the recent historic past can hardly be disputed. As a result of Egloff's work we can place a conservative termination date on Qualla ceramics of approximately 1800.*

If the Lamar style made its first appearance in central or western Georgia near the beginning of the 15th Century and lasted in the mountains until the beginning of the 19th Century, then there is a possible 400-year period for the development and distribution of the ceramic style that is associated with Lamar. Four hundred years is a rather long time, even in the relative lengths with which archaeologists are accustomed to working. If, on the other hand, Lamar did not make its appearance until the middle of the 16th Century, there are still approximately 250 years of persistence of the basic style, a period longer than the United States has been in existence.

The designation of Lamar as a horizon in the prehistoric South Appalachian Province may be useful. But, in consideration of a ceramic style that may have lasted as long as 400 years from beginning to end, we should entertain the thought that Lamar may not be much different from most other ceramic types that are known prehistorically. It

*Note: Dickens (1970: 23) places a termination date of A.D. 1880 on Qualla ceramics on the basis of Qualla pots which were made for the Valentine Museum of Richmond, Virginia in that year. On the basis of this information our termination date of 1800 is quite conservative.
merely seems to have had a more far-reaching effect.

If we combine the possible 400-year temporal span of the expression of the Lamar style with the widespread use of this style in the South Appalachian Province, we see the distinct probability that a wide variety of cultural systems were associated with this ceramic expression. In the initial report of the excavations in the Macon area, Kelly (1938) has suggested that the Lamar ceramics and the associated cultural entity was essentially a "refocalization" of the Mississippian germ into the cultural and physical geography of the South Appalachian Province. Evaluation of the historical facts as well as the information from archaeological investigation leads to the hypothesis that the cultural expression found with the developing Lamar style of ceramics may have represented the active process of adaptation of a hybrid cultural system to the environment of the Province. We may see that the techniques available to the people, including farming, hunting, gathering, and trading, were being combined in a manner that represented an efficient division of these skills. Furthermore, social and ideological adjustments may have combined to make the system articulate more efficiently. And, of course, we must keep in mind that at some time during the manufacture and use of Lamar style ceramics, the Europeans were encroaching on the land of the Indians; and a process of acculturation which involved changes in the environment as well as in the total cultural systems of the aborigines was beginning.

Several large mounds in the vicinity of the fall line may be associated with Lamar ceramics (Map 12). Many of these sites exhibit the double mound pattern often associated with "classic" Lamar. Sites include Neisler, Lamar, Shinholser, Brightwell, Shoulderbone, and
Brightwell. Unfortunately, no excavation of any of these mounds has ever been reported. Yet, these mounds are probably associated with Lamar ceramics, especially since Lamar comprises practically the only ceramic type on the sites. The author has examined collections from the Neisler, Lamar, and Shinholser sites and has noted that the types from these sites are almost exclusively Lamar. The notable exceptions are Macon Plateau material from the Lamar site and a minority of Etowah material from all of the collections.

The distribution of these large mound sites associated with Lamar ceramics suggests that in this vicinity the Lamar series of ceramics was associated with the construction of large and impressive mounds, many of which had opposing mounds across a plaza. The stratigraphic position of Lamar in this area (over Macon Plateau with no intervening material) in addition to the appearance of these large mounds suggests that Lamar may have made an early appearance in this central Georgia area; and we might suggest that the central Georgia Lamar type may have been contemporaneous with the northern Georgia types of Etowah and Wilbanks. Additionally, the distribution of types and the sequence in the Chattahoochee valley as indicated by the Oliver Basin survey (McMichael and Kellar 1960) implies that the Lamar style may be earlier to the west along the fall line and in the vicinity of the intersection of the fall line and the Chattahoochee River than to the east. Kellar and McMichael (1960: 214) have already hypothesized an early development of Lamar in the middle Chattahoochee valley area.

At about 1350-1400, several forces begin to impinge upon Rood's Focus, which eventually alters it into a Lamaroid expression. Coming from the south, moving up the Chattahoochee River, Fort Walton begins to appear in many sites, especially incised types and Lake Jackson Plain. This force is so strong that a movement of peoples is probably indicated.
Secondly, coming from the east and north is the resurgent stamping tradition, complicated and check-stamped, from type Lamar, Savannah and Wilbanks sources; again a movement of people is indicated and the Rood's Focus is acculturated into the Lamar tradition, but with addition of Fort Walton-like traits. The culmination of this is probably to be seen at Bull Creek, on the southside of the City of Columbus.

The hypothesis for the early development of this style in the Columbus area is quite reasonable; however, the suggestion that the new elements which were incorporated into the ceramic inventory of the Rood's Focus to make up the Bull Creek variant of Lamar were the product of people moving into the area has little support. In a rearrangement of this hypothesis we could suggest that the development of Bull Creek ceramics in the middle Chattahoochee was the result of the local culture simply picking up foreign traits rather than a migration into the area. The incorporation of complicated stamping from the east and northeast is quite reasonable. Perhaps the Bull Creek style of the middle Chattahoochee was developing contemporaneously with Lamar in central Georgia and with late Etowah and Wilbanks in northern Georgia. Through this contemporaneous development an interchange of ideas probably brought about the fusion of South Appalachian complicated stamping with such characteristics as the cazuela bowl and bold incising, which have relationships to the west. Further, the court arrangement of temple mounds, which is a characteristic association of the central Georgia variety of Lamar ceramics, may well have been related to the similar arrangement of mounds at the Rood's sites of Rood's Landing and Singer-Moye.

Archaeological evidence from northern Georgia indicates that the Lamar manifestation stratigraphically follows the Etowah and Wilbanks ceramic series. We have mentioned in the discussion of Cultural Unit III that the cultural systems associated with both these ceramic types
seem to represent the incorporation of Mississippian ideas into the indigenous tradition of the Province. The construction of temple mounds and the association of these ceramic types with the Southern Cult indicates that the Wilbanks series is most closely associated with the development of the organizational and ideological structure that is most characteristic of South Appalachian Mississippian. As Sears (1962) has pointed out, an excellent hypothesis suggests that there was a focus in this area on large ceremonial structures, such as those at the Etowah site and that there were satellite ceremonial centers in the hinterland, which recognized some sort of allegiance to the manifestation of the ideological and organizational systems of the larger site. We have hypothesized that this ceremonial system is in some way related to the acquisition of a new agricultural system. The questions as far as the later Lamar style is concerned are how much farther was this cultural system developed in the area and were there any significant additions or deletions to the operation of the system? We have mentioned that in northern Georgia very little evidence has linked the construction of thick staged platforms with ceramic types. Where this evidence has been found, the mounds have usually been associated with the Wilbanks ceramics rather than the Etowah variety. Temple mounds associated with Lamar have often been the topic of discussion but have seldom been excavated. Map 12 shows a distribution of mounds associated with ceramic types of Cultural Unit IV. As with the earlier Etowah variety ceramics, few sites with thick, true platform mound stages associated with Lamar ceramics have been excavated. In the northern Georgia survey Wauchope has reported Lamar ceramics with the mound sites of Stephenson and Eastwood (Wauchope 1966: 344-352,
460-465). Each of these sites had only thin stages of building con-
struction associated with Lamar. Sites that appear to have been the
reconstruction of town houses rather than the construction of temple
platforms were numerous in northern Georgia. To the east in the vicin-
ity of the headwaters of the Savannah River, excavations at the Chauga
site and the Estatoe site have indicated that these mound stages were
more similar to the superposition of buildings rather than the con-
struction of new mounds. In fact, at the Estatoe site the same post
holes had apparently been used in the recurring constructions of the
superstructures (Kelly and De Baillou 1960). Farther north on the
Little Tennessee River, the Coweeta Creek site has exhibited the same
characteristics of reconstruction (Coe personal communication). So,
from northern Georgia as well as from the mountains, associations with
Lamar style ceramics have been with mounds that are more similar to
superimposed town houses than to true temple mounds.

From this evidence from the northern portion of the Province, we
might question whether there is any association of Lamar ceramics with
the construction of large, true temple mounds. Certainly, there are
larger mounds in the northern portion of the Province, both in the
piedmont and in the mountains. Our past experience would lead us to
hypothesize that the major construction phases of these mounds will be
shown to be associated with either Wilbanks or Pisgah ceramics, although
we leave open the possibility that large mounds may have been asso-
ciated with Qualla and Lamar styles from this area. One problem in
locating the late occupations of mounds is that evidence of this is the
first to feel the destructive forces of plowing and natural erosion.

The distribution of Lamar and the lag with respect to the absolute
dates for the coastal plain portion of the Province points to a pattern of introduction of Lamar traits to this area that somewhat parallels the case for northern Georgia. Map 12 shows the sites of the coastal plain which have been shown to be associated with a Lamar style ceramics. Stuart (1970) indicates that material from the upper levels of the McDowell (Mulberry) and Adamson Mounds is Lamar style material. Furthermore, the present author has found ceramic artifacts from the Greenhill site near Columbia, South Carolina on the Congaree River which are similar to the Lamar ceramic style.

To the north the Caraway variety of ceramics, which is characteristic of the historic Siouans of the North Carolina piedmont, is similar in some elements to the Lamar style. Thus, we might conclude that a kind of age-area pattern was involved in which Lamar characteristics farther away from central and western Georgia are later.

In the vicinity of the mouth of the Savannah River, Irene series ceramic material is usually associated temporally with the Lamar expression in the interior. We have already mentioned that the Savannah complex of the coastal plain was different from comparable complexes to the north. Associated with Irene ceramics is the uppermost mound of the Irene site. This mound was different from the mounds upon which it was superimposed. The first seven stages of the mound at Irene were associated with the construction of a building on the substructure, while the later Irene mound was dome-shaped and contained a variety of burials. Although the mound stage was associated with a palisade enclosure marking a plaza in the foreground of the mound and with a rotunda at the opposite end of the plaza, there was no evidence for an Irene associated structure on the summit of the mound.
Our review of the Lamar situation in the South Appalachian Province reveals a general pattern of hypotheses. Lamar is a ceramic series characteristic of central Georgia, and elements of the style of this series are found throughout the Province so that they are removed in both time and space from the central Georgia material. The mound sites of Neisler, Lamar, Shinholser, Brightwell, and Shoulderbone appear to be the "classic" Lamar sites; and these sites seem to have been associated with the peak of temple mound building in the Province. Thus, we are led to hypothesize that the construction of Lamar sites in central Georgia may be shown to be roughly contemporaneous with the construction of the mounds associated with Wilbanks material in northern Georgia. Further, we would hypothesize that if these cultural systems are contemporaneous, some interaction may have occurred between the two and that the Lamar material, which has been identified in northern Georgia, may have been developed out of Etowah and Wilbanks as a result of influence from the south.

The evidence from the northern portion of Georgia, the mountains, and the coastal plain suggests that sometime during the development and employment of the Lamar style, the construction of large temple mounds was dropped from the inventory of activities of the cultures of the South Appalachian Province. Lamar material is superimposed over the Wilbanks and Etowah structures of northern Georgia, and in this area a large temple mound with Lamar ceramics has never been demonstrated to have existed. Evidence from the Coweta Creek mound in western North Carolina is that the town houses associated with Qualla were built one on top of the other and that the resemblance of these structures to a mound is merely the result of the recurring
constructions. Sites from the coastal plain have shown the same development. The true temple mound structures from this area, such as those at Hollywood, Irene, Town Creek, and probably Adamson and Ft. Watson, appear to be earlier than the introduction of Lamar style ceramics into the area. Stuart (1970) has mentioned that the material most similar to Lamar appears in the upper levels of the McDowell Mound (Mulberry), but there has been no investigation of the true nature of the mounds of this site. We hypothesize that the Lamar-like material of the coastal plain is later than the peak portion of mound construction in the area and that the Lamar expression of this area is later than the "classic" Lamar sites of the central Georgia region.

Understanding the appearance, development, and expansion of Lamar style ceramics and the associated cultural systems is one of the outstanding problems of the South Appalachian Province. The most reasonable hypothesis concerning this style is that it developed earliest in central and western Georgia and later spread to the north and east. On the basis of our discussion of Cultural Unit III we may further suggest that the spread of Lamar is directly related to the activity of the cultural systems related to Etowah, Wilbanks, Pisgah, Savannah, and Pee Dee pottery: that is, the operation of these cultural systems developed a network of relationships which included northern Georgia, the mountains, and the coastal plain. Since this network had been developed during an earlier cultural system, when the Lamar style began to spread, it was probably distributed rapidly along the established network of Cultural Unit III contacts. Unfortunately, at this point the style of ceramics and the form of the mounds is practically all we can consider when referring to Cultural Unit IV and its development in the Province.
We may suggest that this Lamar style was associated with other changes in the cultural systems which better enabled the people to adapt an agriculturally based economic system to the South Appalachian environment, but the substantiation of this hypothesis will require more intensive investigation into the archaeological manifestations associated with "Lamar" style ceramics.
SECTION V
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In the preceding sections three facets of archaeological study have been presented: a statement of the philosophy of culture of the author and a model formulated in accordance with that philosophy, an examination of the content of the archaeological record relating to the period of interest, and a synthesis directed toward the development of hypotheses that may be used in future archaeological investigation.

In the discussion of the archaeological model it has been pointed out that culture may be viewed as a system with subsystems intersecting the basic categories of ideology, organization, and technology. These systems draw elements from each category of culture, and the subsystems operate on the environment in order to supply the needs of the culture. These needs are biologically as well as culturally derived. Recognition of this point of view has led to the suggestion that because the technological category of culture directly affects articulation with the environment, it is the most independent category, while organization and ideology are, respectively, less independent. The resulting effect is that while technological changes will probably have a significant effect on organizational and ideological structure, change in ideology and organization will not necessarily have a significant effect on technology.

The recognition of the relative independence of these cultural categories has special significance to South Appalachian Mississippian
South Appalachian Mississippian is a term that has been used loosely in this paper to include those cultural systems of the Province that were beginning to place a significant amount of emphasis on an agriculturally related economy and also beginning to pick up organizational and ideological characteristics, such as large villages and temple mound ceremonialism, consistent with agriculturally based economies. The apparent increase in population and cultural complexity associated with those archaeological sites included in South Appalachian Mississippian are generally considered to be related to the fruits of an agriculturally based economy, and I concur with this assumption.

In examination of the mechanism of change that brought the culture of the South Appalachian Province from a small scale hunting and gathering population to the South Appalachian Mississippian cultural system, it would be desirable to examine change in all aspects of the cultural systems in the Province that produced this cultural complexity. An in depth examination would include identification of those subsystems for producing corn, those for gathering, those for hunting, those for house building, those for mound building, etc. This analysis would then be followed by an examination of how these systems changed through time and how the elements of the cultural system covaried. Combining this information would lead to an analysis of the influence of the geographical situation on the rate of cultural change. In effect, such an analysis would be a holistic study of the mechanism of change in the Province.

Such a cultural investigation as that described in the previous paragraph is not beyond the scope of archaeology, but information for
presently undertaking such a study in the Province is not readily available. With data that is readily available, however, preliminary steps toward such a holistic analysis have been taken in the present paper. Two cultural traits, mounds and complicated stamped ceramics, have been utilized to gain a preliminary view of the pattern of cultural change that led to the complex agriculturally oriented cultural system termed South Appalachian Mississippian. Unfortunately, on the basis of our understanding of the independence of cultural traits, the existence of temple mounds in association with complicated stamped pottery does not disclose the strength of the association of these particular traits with agriculture. I have simply hypothesized a propensity for a cultural system to be associated with agriculture if temple mounds are characteristic traits of that system. The more detailed question of the quantitative degree to which a culture with temple mound ceremonialism is agriculturally directed is open to question and is an important topic for further archaeological investigation.
A. SOUTH APPALACHIAN MISSISSIPPIAN MOUNDS
AND THEIR DISTRIBUTION

The present examination of sites in the Province that fit the defined criteria of temple mounds with complicated stamped ceramics has led to the discovery of a definite pattern of South Appalachian Mississippian mound distribution. These sites fall into an hourglass pattern roughly outlined by the fall line and the Savannah River. South Appalachian Mississippian mound sites generally fall to the northwest and southeast of the intersection of these two lines. The only notable exception to this distribution is the location of sites on the middle Chattahoochee River in the extreme southwestern portion of the Province. Recognition of this distribution promises to have significant impact on the archaeology of the Province, for I suggest that, in fact, these sites outline a basic settlement pattern and that the distribution of these mound sites in space reflects the structure of the South Appalachian Mississippian cultural system with the environment.

The factors involved in this distribution appear to be quite complex, and a simple explanation of the situation cannot be offered. However, some suggestions concerning the distribution may be concluded from the present analysis. Basically, the distribution of cultural systems is hypothesized to have been determined by the selection of an environmental situation (both physical and cultural) conducive to the goals of the cultural system. I have assumed that the majority of the cultural expressions of South Appalachian Mississippian were involved in a hybrid economic system that involved the exploitation of agriculture, hunting, and gathering; and because the earliest apparent adaptation of this type of cultural system took place in central and northern
Georgia, I would hypothesize that those cultures were adapted agriculturally to a piedmont environment. However, because the economic operation is assumed to have been involved with hunting and gathering as well as with agriculture, it could also be expected that a geographical location such as the fall line region, which included a variety of ecological niches, would have been particularly advantageous. In the vicinity of the fall line practitioners of South Appalachian Mississippianism were near the fertile soils of the piedmont as well as the fruits of the fringes of the coastal plain. On the other hand, in Georgia the fall line may also have served as a boundary to the expansion of these cultural systems. While the cultural systems may have enjoyed the variety of the transition zone between the piedmont and the coastal plain, they may not have been equipped to efficiently exploit the central portion of the Georgia coastal plain. The agricultural technology of the northern and central Georgia cultural systems was probably not applicable to the coastal plain; therefore, the coastal plain served as a geographical barrier to their expansion.

After an examination of the distribution of South Appalachian Mississippian sites in Georgia, the distribution of similar sites to the east reveals an apparent anomaly. While South Appalachian Mississippianism did not occupy the coastal plain of Georgia, this type of cultural system did occupy the coastal plain of South Carolina; and to add to the anomaly there is no intensive South Appalachian Mississippian occupation of the piedmont of South Carolina. Apparently, the geographic factors influencing the distribution of sites in the Georgia portion of the Province were not equivalent to those in the east. Because of this distribution and our ideas concerning the
technology of the South Appalachian Mississippian culture, I would hypothesize that the piedmont in this eastern portion of the Province was not occupied because there was a cultural barrier prohibiting expansion. Coe's (1952) interpretation of the Town Creek site located in the fringe of the piedmont of North Carolina is one of an intrusive South Appalachian Mississippian culture surrounded by the indigenous occupants of the North Carolina piedmont, who were hostile to the invaders. This situation may possibly be shown to have existed as far south as the Savannah River, and it is possible that the entire eastern piedmont portion of the Province was "off limits" to South Appalachian Mississippians.

While the northeastern piedmont seems to have been relatively void of South Appalachian Mississippian development, the eastern coastal plain was receptive to the employment of this cultural system. Although there is some tendency for these sites to cluster near the fall line, there are sites located in the center of the eastern coastal plain; and this distribution immediately implies that there is some significant difference between the coastal plain of South Carolina and that of Georgia. There is graphic evidence that the coastal plain of South Carolina is similar to the piedmont of Georgia. The forests of the coastal plain seem to have more similarity to the forests of northern Georgia than they do to the forests of the coastal plain region of Georgia. The author suggests that if forest types correspond, other geographical factors such as climate and soils, which would make this area a desirable location for the operation of the South Appalachian Mississippian system, may also correspond. Unfortunately, this author has not been able to examine all of the factors that may have affected
the employment of the cultural system on the South Carolina coastal
plain; however, such an examination shows significant promise in the
understanding of the prehistory of the Province.
B. THE INDIGENOUS FOUNDATION OF SOUTH APPALACHIAN MISSISSIPPIAN

It has been hypothesized that the initial appearance of platform mounds in the Province with associated stamped ceramics may have some relationship to the development of the later cultural systems that we recognize as South Appalachian Mississippian. Mounds in association with complicated stamped ceramics appeared quite early in the South Appalachian Province. On the Gulf Coastal Plain Deptford and Swift Creek ceramics were associated with burial mounds. These mounds and the information concerning the cultural associations suggest that they were associated with a type of ceremonialism related to Hopewellian in the midwest. Yet, on some sites with these types of ceramics there appear mounds with level summits, which may have been related to "temple mound" ceremonialism. These sites include those classified in Cultural Unit I: Garden Creek (Hw02), Kolomoki, Mandeville, Swift Creek, Stubb's Mound, and Summerour. The appearance of these early sites with platform mounds suggests a simple development in the Province toward the construction of ceremonial centers that included the use of truncated pyramidal mounds.

Recognition of these early platform mounds brings up a crucial point concerning South Appalachian Mississippian. For many years there has been a tendency to consider development in the South Appalachian Province as if it had occurred in a vacuum prior to the intrusion of Mississippian characteristics at the Macon Plateau site. As an alternative suggestion it is quite likely that many of the same stimuli effecting the growth of the Mississippian cultures to the west were also impinging upon the South Appalachian Province at a relatively early date. Thus, while the cultures of this region did not change as
rapidly or as drastically as the systems to the west, they, nevertheless, may have been undergoing a similar developmental process.

The result of the examination of these cultures that formed the indigenous foundation of South Appalachian Mississippian is a recognition that when Mississippian traits intruded into the Province at Macon, along the Chattahoochee, and in eastern Tennessee, these newcomers were probably not greeted by people who were completely unaware of the cultural style of the Mississippians. Rather, the author suggests that while on the surface a variety of reactions may have included open hostility, with respect to basic cultural configuration the two systems may not have found one another incomprehensible. As a result I would hypothesize that the indigenous cultural system of the South Appalachian Province was basically receptive to the new ideas of the Middle Mississippians.
C. MIDDLE MISSISSIPPIAN IN THE SOUTH APPALACHIAN PROVINCE

Sometime about A.D. 1,000 there was an intrusion of Middle Mississippian culture into the South Appalachian Province in central and southwestern Georgia and in eastern Tennessee. The appearance of this cultural system in the Province seems to have had lasting effects on the culture of the area. On the basis of information in Cultural Unit I and developments in later Cultural Units, I have hypothesized that the intrusion of Middle Mississippian into the Province did not abruptly introduce something new to the local culture; rather it seems to have served as a catalyst. Although the Middle Mississippian manifestation at Macon Plateau and Brown's Mount in central Georgia seemed to have been short-lived experiments, the Middle Mississippian occupation of the middle Chattahoochee valley seems to have stimulated significant cultural change in the area.

Examination of the situation of Middle Mississippian culture and the South Appalachian Province leads to the conclusion that the physical environment of cultural activity seems to have been quite important. Recognition that the major region of development of Middle Mississippian was in the wide and fertile valleys of the Tennessee, Ohio, and Mississippi Rivers leads to the assumption that the Middle Mississippians were adapted to an environment with extensive flood plain farm lands. This assumption, in turn, leads to the assumption that the settlement pattern of the Middle Mississippian culture reflected this adaptation. These wide fertile valleys probably facilitated the development of a large village-oriented settlement pattern in which people could live together in large population centers and be supported by the surrounding farmlands. The author hypothesizes that
after the Middle Mississippian movement into the South Appalachian Province, this type of settlement pattern was first employed. And, Macon Plateau is noted as a probable example. It may be hypothesized that this large site was the result of a large village of people attempting to squeeze a living from farming the narrow valley of the Ocmulgee River. The apparently abrupt termination of this pattern of settlement may, then, be hypothesized to have been related to the fact that this type of settlement pattern was simply not efficient in the narrow valleys of the central portion of the South Appalachian Province.

McMichael and Kellar (1960) have suggested that the Middle Mississippian occupation of the Southeast did not terminate in the Chattahoochee area, and that in this area these Middle Mississippians became adapted to the Province. If, indeed, this is the pattern of cultural development in the southwestern portion of the Province, then it would be reasonable to suggest that a major cultural readjustment took place in the Chattahoochee River valley and that in this area the Middle Mississippian cultures became integrated with the local culture and adapted a settlement pattern as well as other cultural patterns leading to more efficient operation in the Provincial environment. In agreement with McMichael and Kellar I have suggested that the development of the Lamar style of ceramics may have a strong relationship to this southwestern Georgia cultural situation, and I feel that the cultural system associated with the "classic" Lamar sites is also a result of this combination of Middle Mississippian and local culture. Of pertinence is the fact that this area was active during the Cultural Unit I phase, and the expression at Kolomoki was similar in complexity to the newer Middle Mississippian expressions. The local and foreign
cultures may have been ripe for merger. Ceramically, this hypothesis is quite reasonable. The major stronghold of curvilinear Swift Creek style stamping was in the southwestern Georgia area, and we find that the Lamar style is basically the combination of Late Mississippian style characteristics with curvilinear stamping and other attributes of the South Appalachian Province. Thus, the Lamar style may have been developing in western and central Georgia as early as A.D. 1100-1300.

On the basis of this approach to the Middle Mississippian phenomenon in the Province, I would hypothesize that the cultural systems which will eventually be shown to be associated with the developing Lamar style of ceramics in central and western Georgia are the expected outgrowth of a direct association of a receptive indigenous South Appalachian culture and a changing Middle Mississippian culture. Through archaeological investigation we should be able to test this hypothesis by examining the changing ceramic distribution, the alteration of settlement patterns related to domestic as well as ceremonial dwellings, and the changing economic system of western and central Georgia.
D. SOUTH APPALACHIAN MISSISSIPPIAN: ETOWAH, WILBANKS, SAVANNAH, PEE DEE, AND PISGAH

During the period following the intrusion at Macon Plateau significant cultural activity was taking place in northern Georgia. This northern Georgia cultural development was probably contemporaneous with the cultural associations of developing Lamar to the south. However, the mechanism of cultural change in northern Georgia seems to have been quite different from that in the central and southwestern portions of the Province. Instead of northern Georgia moving toward the South Appalachian Mississippian cultural pattern through the direct mixing of cultural systems, I would suggest that the development here was relatively indigenous, receiving stimulus, but not direct intervention, from the Middle Mississippian intrusive cultures in the Province. The cultural base of this development is probably found in the cultural systems associated with Napier, Woodstock, Mossy Oak, and Deptford style pottery; yet, until more archaeological investigation is performed, we cannot be sure of the nature of the relationship of these manifestations with the later South Appalachian Mississippian expression.

Etowah ceramics have a wide distribution in northern Georgia, and they are associated with the earliest widespread occurrence of ceremonial centers in the Province. Etowah structures, however, are not typical temple mounds. More often the mounds on Etowah sites are the result of the collapse of an earth lodge; the superimposed construction of buildings on top of one another; or, in a few cases, the construction of a low house platform. The wide pattern of Etowah-associated ceremonial centers suggests that the development and spread of centers
and Etowah ceramics is the result of an economic system based on agriculture and contributing to the expansion of the culture.

The expansion of the cultural system making Etowah ceramics may further be seen in the contacts that this cultural system made with their neighbors. Ceramic similarities to Etowah show up in the Chattahoochee valley in the Abercrombie Series, in Tennessee as Hiwassee Island Complicated Stamped, and on the coastal plain in the form of the Savannah and Pee Dee Series. As a result of this far-reaching network of contacts it seems apparent that the cultural system associated with the Etowah style was receiving the influence of a wide variety of different cultural systems.

That Etowah forms the base of South Appalachian Mississippian development in northern Georgia may be seen in the fact that the Etowah ceremonial structures seem to have been built on locations which had not previously been used for construction. When later temple mounds were constructed in this portion of the Province, they were usually placed on top of an already existing mound formed by the collapse of a ceremonial structure associated with Etowah ceramics.

The most intense association of true temple mound ceremonialism in northern Georgia seems to have been with the appearance of Wibanks ceramics. Wilbanks is a ceramic type in northern Georgia with a limited distribution in the vicinity of the Etowah site. The type is associated with true temple mounds as well as with the Southern Cult, a hallmark of Late Mississippian. Wilbanks ceramics and the associated ceremonial expression comprise a rather strange phenomenon in northern Georgia. It appears to have been intrusive, but there is no apparent source. The ceramics most similar to Wilbanks are the
Savannah Series from the coast, but most of the cultural stimulus in this cultural relationship appears to have been directed from northern Georgia to the coast rather than the reverse. Thus, Savannah does not appear to have been a reasonable source for Wilbanks. Other associations of Wilbanks, such as the temple mounds and the Southern Cult, seem to have affinities to the west, southwest, or northwest. On the basis of these ceremonial affinities and the curvilinear style of stamping, I would hypothesize that the Wilbanks phenomenon is the result of contact between northern Georgians and the developing cultures in southwestern Georgia.

The Wilbanks phenomenon is one which must be explained by archaeologists in northern Georgia. The understanding of the South Appalachian Mississippian in this area will require an understanding of the relationship between the cultural systems associated with Etowah and those associated with Wilbanks. As with the Chattahoochee area the Wilbanks as well as the Etowah phenomena may be related to significant changes in the cultural system that are not directly represented by potsherds and temple mounds, but as we have had to say before, an analysis of this more complex picture will require much more rigorous data retrieval and data assimilation than we have had in the past.

Although many of the specifics concerning the cultural systems in northern Georgia associated with Etowah and Wilbanks are not known, these cultural systems were evidently successful as far as success is reflected in large numbers of sites and potsherds. Etowah and Wilbanks seem to have been associated with a rapid expansion of South Appalachian Mississippian in the Province. Etowah-associated ceremonial structures have been mentioned as the most widespread of
the early ceremonial centers in the Province, and this ceramic type comprised the second most popular type found by Wauchope in the northern Georgia survey. Even farther reaching effects of the success of this cultural system are evident in the eastern portion of the Province. Sometime during the period when Etowah or Wilbanks ceramics were being made in northern Georgia elements of South Appalachian Mississippian were showing up on the coastal plain of South Carolina and on the periphery of this region. On coastal plain sites including Hollywood, Irene, and Town Creek structures and ceramics having similarities to northern Georgia appeared. Ceramics from these sites, while showing similarities to the coastal plain in decoration and form have complicated stamped designs similar to the northern Georgia types.

Further, the construction of mounds in this peripheral area is similar to that in northern Georgia. At both Irene and Town Creek the initial construction phase was a low structure, which has been interpreted as an earth lodge at Town Creek and a shell and earth-walled lodge at Irene. I have noted the similarity of these structures to northern Georgia constructions associated with Etowah. Later mound construction also parallels the appearance of temple mounds. At Irene the sequence of mound development seems to have been one of slow progression toward the temple mound. Lodges were constructed on top of one another, and it was not until the later stages that true mound stages were constructed. At Town Creek the initial construction was an earth lodge followed by two phases of mound construction.

In movement of cultural traits of South Appalachian Mississippian onto the coastal plain, there has been the recognition of evidence for acculturation. These eastern sites have typical coastal plain
characteristics, such as burial mounds, mortuary houses, and urn burial, associated with temple mound ceremonialism and complicated stamped pottery that is reminiscent of the northern Georgia area. With respect to this acculturation we have noted that in at least one case, Irene, evidence of a genetic mixture of populations associated with the mixture of traits suggests migration of a population into the area. Evidence from Town Creek gives a specific case of direct migration on the coastal plain. On the basis of this information I would suggest that the introduction of South Appalachian Mississippian traits onto the coastal plain involved, at least in some cases, the direct migration of populations from northern Georgia and the direct mixture of these populations with at least some of the indigenous people of the locality. The path of the movement of northern Georgia traits onto the coastal plain has been suggested by the geographical study in this paper (Map 11). I have hypothesized that there was a corridor from northern Georgia to the coastal plain area in the vicinity of the intersection of the fall line and the Savannah River, and through this corridor the influence of South Appalachian Mississippian spread.

Concerning the factors behind the movement of South Appalachian Mississippian onto the coastal plain, I immediately suspect that since agriculture seems to have been related to the developments in northern Georgia, a search for new agricultural lands or the effects of a rising population or both were the primary causal factors for the increase in Mississippian characteristics on the coastal plain. The anomalous position of the Irene site on the coastal plain offers another hypothesis concerning the basis for movement. I have mentioned that one of the basic elements of South Appalachian Mississippian is a technological,
organizational, and ideological pattern conducive to the relatively large scale production of corn. Yet, the Irene site is apparently located in a position not particularly suited geographically to large scale agriculture. The site, however, is in close proximity to the Atlantic Ocean from whence many of the specialized items of South Appalachian Mississippian ceremonialism were gathered. As a result I hypothesize that the growth of Mississippian ideology on the coast at the mouth of the Savannah River may be related to the acquisition of trade goods rather than to the establishment of a new colony primarily for the production of corn. The system of satisfying the needs of the population at Irene may not have been in the production of large fields of corn but in hunting and gathering in the tidewater region and trading with the South Appalachian Mississippian cultures to the northwest. As a result the subsystems of culture in this coastal vicinity may have utilized Mississippian ideology as part of a local system, which exploited the environment through hunting and gathering and limited horticulture. But, it is apparent that this coastal system probably had a link to the agricultural cultures of the hinterland. Thus, at Irene we may be seeing a representative of the increasing heterogeneity of the economic pattern.

If this type of division between ideology and technology existed at Irene it may also be hypothesized that it had a wide distribution on the coastal plain. The cultures of the coastal plain were influenced by the South Appalachian Mississippian cultural system which, through agriculture, had a significant amount of energy at its disposal. A quest for power on the coastal plain would have encouraged local cultures to draw elements important in contributing power from the alien
cultural system. Yet, it is not assumed that the people of the local
cultural systems immediately recognized agriculture as the source of
the power of the cultural system. More likely they picked up attrac­tive and compatible traits and integrated this information into their
own cultural system. These cultural systems were possibly incapable
because of their physical location to effectively use agricultural
technology, for, as has been pointed out, a change in technology
directly affects a cultural system's articulation with the environment
and with the primary source of supplying needs. Acting within environ­
mental constraints, the cultural systems may not have been able to
withstand a drastic change in basic technology. On the other hand, the
ideology of the system, perhaps the culturally recognized source of the
new power, could be added to the existing ideological systems of the
coastal plain without seriously upsetting the articulation with the
environment. In this manner acculturation on the coastal plain may
have taken place by degree, with local cultural systems slowly picking
up the items of South Appalachian Mississippian culture that they could
afford. And, in the process the cultural manifestation which we refer
to as South Appalachian Mississippian was becoming more complex and
diversified.

Evidence from the Town Creek site, the Garden Creek site, and the
Warren Wilson site has suggested that while the coastal plain was
participating in the South Appalachian Mississippian cultural develop­
ment, the mountain portion of the Province was also practicing corn
agriculture, mound ceremonialism, and manufacture of complicated
stamped pottery. Yet, the information presented so far does not seem
to indicate a strong relationship between these mountain cultural
systems and the developing South Appalachian Mississippian systems of northern Georgia. The relationships with South Appalachian Mississippian seem to have been more with the coastal plain Savannah and Pee Dee associated cultural systems than with Etowah and Wilbanks in northern Georgia.

Ceramically, the Pisgah Series in the mountains fits our definition of South Appalachian Mississippian because it is complicated stamped, and the ceramics are associated with temple mound ceremonialism. Other aspects of the pottery, such as vessel shape and decoration, tend to relate this series with types to the northwest rather than to the southeast. Furthermore, the stamps on Pisgah vessels, while generally similar to the rectilinear stamps of northern Georgia do not have any of the specific northern Georgia designs. Stamp designs on Pisgah ceramics seem to have been a unique mountain development. The ceramic associations of Pisgah with the remainder of the Province have been limited; however, when associations have been found (at least in the central mountain region) they have been with the coastal plain varieties of Savannah and Pee Dee rather than with the northern Georgia types. The explanation of this phenomenon will require further archaeological investigation. Perhaps this situation is the result of having only a limited sample of material; and when we begin to further investigate the more southerly portions of North Carolina and the mountain portion of South Carolina, we will find more ceramic associations of Pisgah with northern Georgia.

Ceremonially, the mountain cultural system also seems to have been associated with manifestations to the west and northwest and with those on the coastal plain. The similarity of the basal structures at the
Garden Creek site (HW01) in the mountains with the lower structures in the mound at Irene has been pointed out, and the fact that these structures are also similar to the structures at Peachtree, Dallas, and Hixon has been indicated. This information also seems to skew the associations of Pisgah and to indicate that there is not a strong association with northern Georgia. However, the pattern of mound construction at Garden Creek is congruent with that in northern Georgia, with earth lodges subtending the construction of later temple mounds. Unfortunately, although many earth lodges have been excavated in northern Georgia, the Wilbanks structure is the only one with which we can compare the Garden Creek lodges. Enough specific information has not been presented in the literature concerning the other northern Georgia earth lodges with which to make comparisons. As a result when more is known concerning the archaeology of northern Georgia, we may well find more associations with Pisgah than we have been able to observe. Thus, the result of our consideration of the Pisgah associations in the mountains is that these cultural systems have relatively strong relationships to the northwest and southeast and relatively weak relationships to the south in the central portion of the Province.
E. SOUTH APPALACHIAN MISSISSIPPIAN: LAMAR

It has been suggested that the Lamar ceramic style developed in the southwestern and central portion of the South Appalachian Province in the vicinity of the fall line and the middle Chattahoochee River. Perhaps the beginning of the development of this ceramic style took place quite early (i.e., ca. A.D. 1100--1300) in association with a rearrangement of cultural systems that was fusing indigenous cultural elements with those of intrusive Mississippian and was turning the mixture into a brand of South Appalachian Mississippian strongly flavored with Middle Mississippian elements. Furthermore, the location of this manifestation on the western fringe of the Province suggests closer contact with the Middle Mississippians and quick acquisition of new cultural traits from the west. Nevertheless, there appeared in this portion of Georgia a brand of South Appalachian Mississippian exhibiting court-arranged temple mounds and complicated stamped pottery with vessel shape that was characteristic of the Late Mississippian style to the west. Thus, the development of the Lamar style may be viewed as a specific localized development of South Appalachian Mississippianism. Yet, the Lamar ceramic style spread over the entire South Appalachian Province, and as archaeologists we must evaluate the quality of this dissemination and determine the cultural implications.

Basically, I hypothesize that the Lamar ceramic style spread, not on the strength of some powerful cultural tour de force associated with Lamar ceramics, but rather on the basis of the network of cultural relationships that had been established during Cultural Unit III.
During the development of this earlier Unit ties were established between northern Georgia and the coastal plain and between the coastal plain and the mountains, and I have suggested the possibility of ties between Georgia and the mountains not observable in the present archaeological record. The South Appalachian Mississippian cultural character had, essentially, established itself in the Province and had developed a strong set of cultural relationships. I feel that by this time the entire Province was under the influence of an agriculturally oriented economy. The major cultural alteration, that of changing from a hunting, gathering, and horticultural economy to an agriculturally oriented economy, had occurred during Cultural Unit III. As a result, I do not see the expansion of the new and sophisticated Lamar style ceramics as associated with a drastic alteration of the cultural systems; rather I think the expansion of Lamar is representative of the close association that cultural constituents of South Appalachian Mississippian had developed.

These concluding statements concerning the development of South Appalachian Mississippian represent the integration of a significant amount of archaeological material that has been collected over a period of more than two-hundred years. My purpose has been to assemble information that would efficiently make implications concerning the pattern of prehistoric development and to suggest some problems that would stimulate future research. I look upon the structure of this research as operational. In time our concept of South Appalachian Mississippian may be restructured in order to more closely fit the actual cultural situation. Likewise, in time the hypotheses presented in this paper will be tested archaeologically. This paper represents one point in
developing archaeological research in the South Appalachian Province. I do not necessarily expect that the cultural divisions utilized in this paper will prove to be the most useful during future research. The approach used in this paper is oriented toward the present state of knowledge. Likewise, although I hope that the hypotheses presented here will be validated, I do not necessarily expect that they will all be demonstrated to be true. To the author the value of this paper will be measured by the degree to which it serves to stimulate rethinking and rigorous examination of the prehistory of the South Appalachian Province.
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