Archeology *of the* Funeral Mound

OCMULGEE NATIONAL MONUMENT, GEORGIA

Charles H. Fairbanks

Introduction by Frank M. Setzler
With a New Introduction by Mark Williams

ARCHEOLOGY OF THE FUNERAL MOUND,

Ocmulgee National Monument, Georgia

CLASSICS IN SOUTHEASTERN ARCHAEOLOGY
Stephen Williams, Series Editor

Publication of this work has been supported in part by the Dan Josselyn Memorial Fund

ARCHEOLOGY OF THE FUNERAL MOUND,
Ocmulgee National Monument, Georgia

CHARLES H. FAIRBANKS
Introduction by Frank M. Setzler
With a New Introduction by Mark Williams

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA PRESS
Tuscaloosa

Copyright © 2003
The University of Alabama Press
Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35487-0380
All rights reserved
Manufactured in the United States of America

Originally published by the National Park Service in 1956

∞
The paper on which this book is printed meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Science–Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Fairbanks, Charles Herron, 1913–
Archeology of the funeral mound, Ocmulgee National Monument, Georgia / Charles H. Fairbanks ; introduction by Frank M. Setzler ; with a new introduction by Mark Williams.
p. cm. — (Classics in southeastern archaeology)
Originally published : Washington : National Park Service, 1956.
Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN-13: 978-0-8173-1309-8 (pbk. : alk. paper)
ISBN-13: 978-0-8173-8405-0 (electronic)

Cover design by ander monson
Cover illustration: halstead plain effigy bottle
(Photograph by mark williams)

1. Indians of North America—Georgia—Ocmulgee National Monument—Antiquities. 2. Excavations (Archaeology)—Georgia—Ocmulgee National Monument. 3. Mounds—Georgia—Ocmulgee National Monument. 4. Ocmulgee National Monument (Ga.)—Antiquities. I. Title. II. Series.

E51.A73 no.3
[E78.G3]
975.8'513—dc21 2002073238

Contents

Introduction to the 2003 Edition vii

Preface to the 1954 Dissertation xiii

Introduction to the Second Printing, 1980 xv

Archeology of the Funeral Mound, Ocmulgee National Monument, Georgia [1956] xix

Introduction 1

The Setting 3

The Background 6

Excavations at the Funeral Mound 20

Analysis 37

Summary of Life on the Macon Plateau 56

Bibliography 77

Appendixes 79

Index 91

Introduction to the 2003 Edition

Mark Williams

It is a genuine delight for me to introduce this new edition of the *Archeology of the Funeral Mound, Ocmulgee National Monument,* by Charles H. Fairbanks (1913–1984). This publication has meant a great deal to me, particularly in my formative years as a archaeologist in the 1960s and 1970s. Indeed, this was the very first archaeological site report I ever read. In order to explain further the importance of this publication to me, I must relate a short personal story.

In 1960 my entire family—mother, father, brother, sister, and me—traveled to Macon as tourists from Madison sixty miles to the north to visit the famous Macon Plateau/Ocmulgee Indian Mounds. Our family, led by my father, Woody, had been collecting artifacts from the surface of plowed fields in Morgan County, Georgia, for several years (all now curated at the University of Georgia). I was an impressionable twelve-year-old and was astounded by the experience of the Earthlodge tour, the huge Mound A with its stunning summit view, and the eerily named Funeral Mound. After taking a fascinating tour of the museum, my father perused the publications available in the bookstore and came away with two—the Gustavus Pope handbook on the Ocmulgee sites (Pope 1956) and the *Funeral Mound* report (1956) by Charles Fairbanks. I read Fairbanks's report all the way home, fascinated by its pictures of pottery vessels, arrow heads, skeletons, and the museum displays I had just seen. I was also impressed with all the data in the appendixes and poured over the trait lists in Appendix D. Then the report was shelved on my father's bookcase and stayed there for quite a while.

After I graduated from high school and began college at the nearby University of Georgia, I intended to major in Physics. Two years of calculus and physics courses aptly demonstrated to me that this was not my calling. In considering my future at this point, I was visiting home and happened to see the old *Funeral Mound* report on my father's bookshelf. Out it came immediately. A quick rereading elicited the same sense of wonder and curiosity I had experienced eight years earlier, and my new major and career were suddenly clear. As I sit here 34 years later writing this introduction, that same now tattered copy of Fairbanks's classic is by my side.

The publication date of the original was 1956 and represented the third publication in the beautifully conceived and executed Archaeological Research Series of the U.S. National Park Service that was published between 1952 and approximately 1970. The publication was a reworking of Fairbanks's Ph.D. dissertation at the University of Michigan, completed in 1954. Although I finally met Fairbanks in 1969, long after his interests had turned to other archaeological issues, he is now deceased for 18 years as I write this. His famous publication is still being actively used by modern archaeologists and is referred to frequently (for example, Weisman 1989; Smith 1990; Anderson 1994; Bense 1994; and Peregrine 1996). A new generation of young archaeologists, perhaps a few old archaeological codgers, and members of the general public can now read his famous report with its renewed publishing herein. Just who, then, was Charles Fairbanks?

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Charles Herron Fairbanks was born in Bainbridge, New York, on June 3, 1913. His interest in archaeology was apparent by the time he graduated from high school, and after attending Swarthmore College for one year, he transferred to the University of Chicago in 1931. He studied Anthropology there under Fay Cooper-Cole, Thorn Duel, A. R. Radcliff-Brown, Harry Hoijer, and Robert Redfield, among others. Many of his student

Charles H. Fairbanks (courtesy of Florida Museum of Natural History)

colleagues at Chicago went on to found modern archaeology in the southeastern United States. Fairbanks did not finish his degree rapidly because of lack of funds and because of the delightful distraction of involvement in the massive federally funded archaeological excavations underway in the Southeast during the 1930s (Lyon 1996). After extensive work in Tennessee, he came to Macon in October 1938 at the invitation of Jesse Jennings, who had come there just before him as Superintendent of Ocmulgee National Monument. While at Ocmulgee, Fairbanks met and married Macon native Evelyn Timmerman. Fairbanks's primary task was to organize the cataloging of the vast archaeological collections from five years of federally sponsored excavations in the Macon area, including those from Mound C. The mound itself had been excavated by Arthur Kelly (1900–1979) from late 1933 off and on until about 1936; therefore, Fairbanks was not involved in the actual excavation of Mound C.

He somehow finished his University of Chicago A.B. degree while still on the staff of Ocmulgee in 1939 and immediately began thinking of graduate school. He continued to work for the National Park Service, conducting excavations at Kennesaw battlefield and at the Lamar site (9Bi2) before joining the Army in 1943. He had already completed the majority of what was to become the *Funeral Mound* report before he entered the military; however, we are uncertain about why he selected this unit of all the Ocmulgee excavations to use for his dissertation. He had also been fascinated by the Macon Earthlodge and wrote a report on it before entering the military. He published a brief version of the earthlodge report immediately after the war (Fairbanks 1946) but apparently kept the Mound C report as a potential dissertation. Certainly the earthlodge and Mound C were the two most interesting excavations conducted by Kelly at Ocmulgee.

In March 1946 Fairbanks went back to work for the National Park Service, becoming the superintendent at Fort Frederica on the Georgia Coast. It was evidently here that he became fascinated with historic archaeology, a mainstay of his later career. Although he had intended to enter the University of Michigan to pursue graduate work in fall 1947, he was unable to do so until the following fall. All the classwork for his doctorate in Ann Arbor was conducted from September 1948 until June 1950. He then immediately went to back to work for the National Park Service and moved to Washington, D.C., to supervise the construction of the first exhibits for the new Ocmulgee National Monument Museum. After a year in Washington, he traveled with the exhibits to Macon in June 1951 to oversee their installation as an assistant regional archaeologist. He stayed there until 1954, conducting various excavations for the National Park Service in Georgia and Florida. He also spent time rewriting and updating his old Mound C report for his dissertation during this period.

Charles Fairbanks received his Ph.D. from the University of Michigan in June of 1954, having turned in and defended the Mound C report. He immediately took a teaching position with Hale G. Smith at the newly formed Department of Anthropology at Florida State University in Tallahassee, where he remained until May 1963. He then moved to the Department of Anthropology, University of Florida, in Gainesville, to replace the ailing John Goggin, who died soon after Fairbanks's arrival. Fairbanks continued there as an excellent researcher and inspiring teacher to an entire new generation of archaeologists until his death on July 7, 1984. With his quiet smile and a demeanor that inspired loyalty and built confidence, he was always willing to help any dedicated young archaeologist. He was buried (with his wife Evelyn) in Riverside Cemetery, Macon, Georgia, only 1.55 miles west-northwest from the Funeral Mound that he had made famous. Incidentally, I don't believe any other archaeologist has been interred so close to their dissertation site!

The publication of his doctoral dissertation in 1956 by the National Park Service took place while he was establishing his academic career at Florida State. The published report included photographs of the Ocmulgee Museum's new displays and dioramas. The inclusion of these photographs in the National Park Service publication was criticized as unnecessary by Jesse Jennings in his 1957 review of the publication (Jennings 1957). It must be remembered, however, that Fairbanks had a major role in the creation of these exhibits in 1951, and the photographs certainly helped make the publication more accessible to the general public, including me when I was a young visitor to the site.

COMPARISON TO DISSERTATION

I was interested in comparing the 1956 published version of the *Funeral Mound* report with his original 1954 dissertation and obtained what was likely Fairbanks's own copy from the Florida State Museum of Natural History, courtesy of Jerald Milanich. The changes had not been substantial, but a few are perhaps noteworthy. The first difference is that the original title was *The Excavation of Mound C, Ocmulgee National Monument, Macon, Georgia,* without the use of the term *Funeral* in the title. His dissertation committee at the University of Michigan consisted of Albert C. Spaulding as chairman, with David F. Aberle, Emerson F. Greenman, Volney H. Jones, and Frederick P. Thieme serving as additional committee members.

An interesting and useful three-page preface to his dissertation was dropped from the 1956 publication. I have taken the liberty of including it in this edition, following this introduction. Presumably it was omitted in 1956 due to the inclusion at that time of the introduction by Frank Setzler, which contains some of the same information as Fairbanks's own preface. I prefer Fairbanks's own preface and believe it should be here reintegrated with his work.

Fairbanks does not use the phrases *Master Farmers* or *Early Farmers* in his dissertation, for this terminology was developed as part of the public exhibit in 1950. Nevertheless, despite the title of his dissertation, he does occasionally refer to Mound C as the Funeral Mound. I will comment further on this momentarily.

A common problem in the mid-1950s was inadequate termi-

nology, and Fairbanks was bedeviled by the appropriate terminology to use to refer to the many archaeological cultures included in his study. Many instances of the term *Complex* in the 1954 dissertation, for example, were changed to *Period* by 1956, although some instances were changed to *Pottery Complex*. He also changed some instances of *Focus* to *Period* (Stallings Island for instance) but retained the terms *Focus* and *Aspect* in other cases. Fairbanks's two versions of the *Funeral Mound* report sadly demonstrate the schizophrenic terminological shortcomings of the classification system of archaeological cultures established in the late 1930s by William McKern. Later, a simpler, more utilitarian system was presented by Gordon Willey and Philip Phillips (McKern 1939, Willey and Phillips 1955, 1958). I merely point out this historically anecdotal information so modern readers will not be overwhelmed by the confused wealth of such terms in this report.

Table 1, the chronological chart in the 1956 report, was a heavily edited version of the one from his 1954 dissertation and included earlier dates for the Woodland, Archaic, and Paleo-Indian periods ("Horizons"). Clearly this table was being created as the then-new technology of Radiocarbon dating was causing a complete reassessment of the dates of known archaeological cultures throughout the world. The reader familiar with modern chronologies will note that the dates in his 1956 publication are still too recent in many cases. I have chosen not to attempt an updating here, however. Readers are referred to a plentiful supply of more modern chronologies.

Fairbanks added a few references in the 1956 version not included in his dissertation, and the section on the Bynum Mounds was completely new in the published version. Also, the section breaks of the report were heavily edited from his original dissertation, which had just four overly long chapters. Further, the average paragraph lengths in his dissertation were radically reduced for the 1956 publication by simply breaking them into shorter ones. No text was omitted in this manner, however. The index, of course, was created by the National Park Service for the 1956 report, and the appendixes were all completely rearranged and renumbered.

All of these differences I have mentioned are minor, however, and the published version is in fact very similar to his completed dissertation. I was surprised that his dissertation, as accepted by his doctoral committee, had not included a normally expected long-winded theoretical perspective as an introductory chapter. Further, it surprisingly did include the excellent final chapter as a lyrical description of the lifeways of the Macon Plateau occupants. Both of these make the report far more accessible to the general public.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL ISSUES WITH THE FUNERAL MOUND REPORT

The *Funeral Mound* report was planned as the first of a series of reports on all the units excavated at Ocmulgee in the 1930s. Many of these were written by National Park Service archaeologists in the 1960s and by Florida State University archaeology graduate students in the 1970s, but none were as widely disseminated and written with as broad a perspective as was the famous *Funeral Mound* report. Nevertheless, much new data have been gathered and many new perspectives have evolved on Georgia and Southeastern archaeology since the mid-1950s. Time and additional research have yielded changed perspectives on a few specific interpretive issues presented by Fairbanks in the *Funeral Mound* report. I will outline a few of these here so that new readers will not be unwittingly misled in their study of the past.

The first of these changes relates to the dating of the famous Kolomoki site in southwestern Georgia, excavated by William Sears from 1948 through 1952 (Sears 1956). In his 1954 dissertation, Fairbanks follows the lead of Sears, dating Kolomoki to the Mississippian period. Despite a partial withdrawal from this position in 1955 (Fairbanks 1955:290), he chose to leave unchanged this section of his dissertation in the 1956 published version of the *Funeral Mound* report (Fairbanks 1956:542, Sears 1956). As we now know, the Kolomoki site (specifically the Kolomoki component) dates well before the Funeral Mound, perhaps by more than 500 years. Stephen Williams had pointed this inaccuracy out in his 1958 review of Sears's *Excavations at Kolomoki: Final Report* (Williams 1958). Sears was simply wrong in his Kolomoki chronology, as he graciously admitted in 1992 near the end of his long and distinguished career (Sears 1992). It is worth noting, however, that Fairbanks died in 1984, some eight years before Sears publicly reversed his course about the dating of Kolomoki.

Fairbanks and Sears were fellow students at the University of Michigan, thus it may have been natural for Fairbanks to accept the erroneous views of Sears on the dating of Kolomoki. Nevertheless, Fairbanks was certainly familiar with the site, having conducted limited excavations there himself in 1942 (Fairbanks 1942). There might be a further explanation: Apparently, Fairbanks did not have a great deal of respect for Arthur Kelly, excavator of the Funeral Mound at Ocmulgee, supervising archaeologist for all the Georgia WPA excavations, and a mainstay in Georgia archaeology from 1933 until his death in 1979. This is made clear in an interview with Fairbanks conducted in September of 1982 by Bob Wilson (Wilson 1982). Indeed, I have noticed that Fairbanks deleted from the 1956 published version Kelly's name in more than a dozen places compared to his dissertation. While Fairbanks was certainly not the first (nor the last) to have strong opinions about Kelly, he perhaps naturally let these feelings influence his perspective of Kelly's son-in-law, archaeologist Joseph Caldwell. Caldwell (1918–1973), another bastion in the twentieth-century history of Georgia archaeology, using data from the Fairchild's Landing site (9Se4) in Lake Seminole in the early 1950s, had already demonstrated (albeit in grey literature) that Kolomoki was clearly a Woodland period site. Sears (and Fairbanks) sadly rejected this data and precipitated more than 30 years of confusion about the Kolomoki site. First-time readers of this republication of the *Funeral Mound*

report simply need to be aware of this curious historical issue in Georgia archaeology. James Knight has written more on this interesting episode (Knight 2002).

The second issue of archaeological substance I want to discuss relates to the dating of the so-called *Mossy Oak* period (Fairbanks 1956:41). In his 1954 dissertation, Fairbanks merely calls this "Mossy Oak," with no specific appellation as to period, focus, pottery complex, aspect, etc. He states that Mossy Oak, recognized by the pottery type Mossy Oak Simple Stamped, "probably followed Deptford and precedes Swift Creek in Central Georgia" (Fairbanks 1956:41). Mossy Oak simple stamped pottery is very common in central Georgia, with hundreds, and likely thousands of such sites located there. One of the first noted by Arthur Kelly in the 1930s was the Vining site in Putnam County near Eatonton some 40 miles north of Macon. Indeed, this site supplied the initial name to this pottery type. It was renamed Mossy Oak by Jennings and Fairbanks in 1939, based upon similar material from the Mossy Oak site down river from the Macon Plateau site, where it had been found buried under Lamar ceramics (Jennings and Fairbanks 1939:3). Archaeologists in Georgia assumed until the late 1980s that this was, following Fairbanks, an Early to Middle Woodland ceramic, but it is not. We now know that it is a Late Woodland manifestation, and it dates after the Swift Creek period, not before it (Elliott and Wynn 1991; Meyers et al. 1997; Worth 1995). Because of the naming confusion, Georgia archaeologists have now dropped the use of the Mossy Oak moniker in favor of the original Vining term. Readers again beware.

An important third issue is that of the projectile points. When Fairbanks wrote the *Funeral Mound* report, the classic study of Joffre Coe that revolutionized our understanding of the chronological sequence of projectile points in the southeastern United States had not yet been written (Coe 1964). It is obvious to any present researcher that the projectile points Fairbanks discusses on pages 44–45 and illustrates in Plate 27 as associated with the Macon Plateau Mississippian occupation actually date thousands of years earlier. Plate 26 shows several uniface scrappers that likely even date to the Paleo-Indian occupation of Macon Plateau.

This is not the correct place to present an updated chronological analysis of these lithic tools; however, it appears that virtually the entire 7,000-year Archaic sequence is represented by projectile points found in the fill of Mound C. This can only imply that the builders of the mound gathered earth from a nearby Archaic midden for its construction. In 1961, excavations in the Ocmulgee Bottoms prior to the construction of Interstate Highway 16 replicated the chronological sequence of projectile points recognized by Coe almost exactly (Nelson et al. 1974). Although the *Funeral Mound* report is not, therefore, the proper place to learn about prehistoric lithic usage in Georgia, at least one very important question remains. What actually was the nature of the Macon Plateau lithic assemblage? Given the rarity of Macon Plateau period sites in central Georgia and the extreme component mixing at the Macon Plateau site itself, we probably cannot answer this question satisfactorily without new excavations.

Another issue I wish to discuss is Fairbanks's belief that the builders of the Macon Plateau site, and by implication the Funeral Mound were immigrants to Georgia from outside the state, perhaps from the northwest. Over the years, after the 1950s, some researchers began questioning this observation, implying that eventually an evolutionary sequence would be recognized that would show in situ development of the Macon Plateau archaeological culture in central Georgia (Schroedl 1994; Smith 1984). The issue of documenting through archaeological means the human process of migration is and will continue to be a difficult and frustrating task.

In 1986, after examining the growing body of central Georgia archaeological data in the Georgia Archaeological Site File, I expressed the opinion that Fairbanks's assessment was still valid (Williams 1994). Today, with over 38,000 sites recorded in Georgia, twice as many as were recorded in 1986, I still judge Fairbanks's view to be correct. In fact, not a single new Macon Plateau period site has been located in central Georgia in the last 16 years! The issue of the origins of Macon Plateau is, in my opinion, a settled one.

One final issue I wish to discuss is the function of Mound C and its relationship to the rest of the Macon Plateau site. David Hally and I have discussed the Ocmulgee site layout in some detail in our 1986 paper, and I refer readers to this paper (Hally and Williams 1994). In short, we believe that the mounds at Macon were not randomly placed over the landscape but were located as part of a fully conceived site plan. In this hypothetical plan, Mound C occupies the southwestern corner of a generally pentagonally shaped mound arrangement.

In terms of Mound C's function, Kelly and others have made much of the many burials found in its undestroyed remnant. It was declared to be "The Funeral Mound!" It is true that no other excavated mound at Macon produced nearly as many burials as Mound C; however, Mound A was hardly excavated at all, the small remnant of Mound B was not extensively excavated, and most of the Mound D had been plowed away before the 1930s. Many of the burials in Mound C were placed there and in the surrounding village area by historic Creek people hundreds of years after the major use of Mound C had been completed. The Creeks had moved into the area of Macon Plateau after the establishment of the Trading Post there some time after 1687. In any event, it is clear from the drawings and data presented by Fairbanks that Mound C had houses on its several summits, even if we do not have their floor plans available. These houses were probably rectangularly shaped structures. It is well known throughout the Mississippian world that burials are commonly placed through the floors of houses, both in villages as well as in mounds. I combine these simple ideas together to suggest here (perhaps heretically) that we should not think of Mound C as exclusively, or even primarily a place for burial of the honored dead. It may simply have been a "normal" Mississippian plat-

form mound with "normal" burials through the floors of the structures located on its summit. If we must continue to call it "The Funeral Mound" because of the importance of tradition, however, I would suggest we do so in an uncapitalized manner.

In closing, I wish to commend The University of Alabama Press for keeping this important site report alive. My fondest hope would be that somewhere out there another twelve-year-old kid, by reading this report, will be filled with the same sense of wonder and mystery about lost Indian chiefs that I was and will discover that there is no better career than the one I have shared with Charles Fairbanks—the archaeology of the southeastern United States.

REFERENCES CITED

Anderson, David G.
1994 *The Savannah River Chiefdoms: Political Change in the Late Prehistoric Southeast.* University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.

Bense, Judith A.
1994 *Archaeology of the Southeastern United States: Paleoindian to World War I.* Academic Press, New York.

Coe Joffre L.
1964 *The Formative Cultures of the Carolina Piedmont.* Transactions of the American Philosophical Society Vol. 54, Pt. 2. Philadelphia.

Elliott, Daniel T., and Jack T. Wynn
1991 The Vining Revival: A Late Simple Stamped Phase in Central Georgia. *Early Georgia* 19(1):1–18.

Fairbanks, Charles H.
1942 The Kolomoki Mound Group, Early County, Georgia. *American Antiquity* 11:258–260.
1946 The Macon Earth Lodge. *American Antiquity* 12:94–108.
1954 The Excavation of Mound C, Ocmulgee National Monument, Macon, Georgia. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
1955 Review of *Excavations at Kolomoki, Season III and IV, Mound D,* by William Sears. *American Antiquity* 20(3):289–290.
1956 *Archaeology of the Funeral Mound, Ocmulgee National Monument, Georgia.* Archaeological Research Series No. 3, USDI National Park Service, Washington, D.C.

Hally, David J., and Mark Williams
1994 Macon Plateau Site Community Pattern. In *Ocmulgee Archaeology, 1936–1986,* edited by D. Hally, pp. 84–95. University of Georgia Press, Athens.

Jennings, Jesse D.
1957 Review of *Archaeology of the Funeral Mound, Ocmulgee National Monument,* by Charles H. Fairbanks. *American Antiquity* 23(1):93–94.

Jennings, Jesse D., and Charles H. Fairbanks
1939 Pottery Type Descriptions. *Southeast Archaeological Conference Newsletter* 1(2).

Knight, Vernon James, Jr.
2002 The Curious History of Woodland Cultural Chronology in the Lower Chattahoochee Valley. Paper Presented at the Spring Meeting of the Society for Georgia Archaeology, Fort Gaines.

Lyon, Edwin A.
1996 *A New Deal for Southeastern Archaeology.* University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.

McKern, William C.
1939 The Midwestern Taxonomic Method as an Aid to Archaeological Culture Study. *American Antiquity* 4:301–313.

Meyers, Maureen S., Jack T. Wynn, Ramie Gougeon, and Elizabeth C. Shirk
1997 *Summary Report of Four Vining Phase Excavations in Central Georgia.* Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forests, United States Forest Service, Gainesville, Georgia.

Nelson, Ben A., David Swindel III, and Mark Williams
1974 *Analysis of the Ocmulgee Bottoms Materials at the Southeast Archeological Center.* Department of Anthropology, Florida State University, Tallahassee.

Peregrine, Peter N.
1996 *Archaeology of the Mississippian Culture: A Research Guide.* Garland Publishing, New York.

Pope, Gustavus D., Jr.
1956 *Ocmulgee National Monument, Georgia.* National Park Service Historical Handbook Series No. 24. Washington, D.C.

Schroedl, Gerald F.
1994 A Comparison of the Origins of Macon Plateau and Hiwassee Island Cultures. In *Ocmulgee Archaeology, 1936–1986,* edited by D. Hally, pp. 138–143. University of Georgia Press, Athens.

Sears, William H.
1956 *Excavations at Kolomoki: Final Report.* University of Georgia Press, Athens.
1992 Mea Culpa. *Southeastern Archaeology* 11(1):66–71.

Smith, Bruce D.
1984 Mississippian Expansion: Tracing the Historical Development of an Explanatory Model. *Southeastern Archaeology* 3:13–22.
1990 *The Mississippian Emergence.* Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.

Weisman, Brent R.
1989 *Like Beads on a String: A Culture History of the Seminole Indians in Northern Peninsular Florida.* University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.

Willey, Gordon R., and Philip Phillips
1955 Method and Theory in American Archaeology II: Historical-Developmental Interpretation. *American Anthropologist* 57:723–819.

1958 *Method and Theory in American Archaeology.* University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Williams, Mark

1994 The Origins of the Macon Plateau Site. In *Ocmulgee Archaeology, 1936–1986,* edited by D. Hally, pp. 130–143. University of Georgia Press, Athens.

Williams, Stephen

1958 Review of *Excavation at Kolomoki, Final Report,* by William H. Sears. *American Antiquity* 23:321–323.

Wilson, Robert

1982 Interview with Charles H. Fairbanks. Samuel Proctor Oral History Program, Turlington Hall, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.

Worth, John

1995 Upland Lamar, Vining, and Cartersville: An Interim Report from Racoon Ridge. *Early Georgia* 24(1):34–83.

Preface to the 1954 Dissertation

The following is Charles Fairbanks's 1954 dissertation preface, which was omitted from the 1956 published version of his dissertation. Therefore very few people have seen this preface before now. I include it here because I believe it provides additional useful information on the project, because it provides overdue public acknowledgments, and because I simply believe it should be reintegrated with the rest of his famous report.

The archeological excavations at Ocmulgee National Monument were undertaken during the widespread archeological investigations that were part of the public relief program during the thirties. The existence of a large series of mounds at Macon had been known since the earliest white settlement. Local citizens applied to the relief agency for an excavation project at the same time that the Smithsonian Institution had decided to sponsor a project at Macon. Dr. Arthur R. Kelly was in charge of the excavation for the Smithsonian Institution. Later the Macon Historical Association assumed partial sponsorship along with the Smithsonian Institution.

These archeological excavations were designed primarily as relief work projects. They never had sufficient trained supervisory personnel and rarely continued after the excavation to enable the archeologist to complete his reports. At Macon Dr. Kelly often had as many as twelve hundred workers, largely white collar individuals not accustomed to heavy manual labor. Supervisory assistance was generally limited to one individual, James A. Ford first, then Gordon R. Willey. In spite of the many disadvantages in such a system the work did produce material of real value.

The excavation of the earthlodge and the rich material uncovered in other locations on the plateau interested local citizens in the problem of preservation and display of the remains. Under the leadership of the Macon Junior Chamber of Commerce the land was purchased and donated to the United States, and in 1936 became a National Monument. A museum was planned and Dr. Kelly conceived the idea of making Ocmulgee National Monument a regional museum for the Southeast where collections could be maintained for the whole area and students could investigate a wide range of archeological problems. In 1938 J. D. Jennings established a laboratory for the cataloguing, analysis, and interpretation of the excavated material. The preparation of the reports, building of the museum, and stabilization of field exhibits was halted by the outbreak of World War II. In the post-war years the museum has been completed, exhibits installed, and a program of report writing initiated. This achievement was due in the main to the wisdom and untiring efforts of Senator Richard B. Russell, Superintendent Millard D. Guy, and many interested citizens.

The original draft of this report was begun in 1940 at the suggestion of Dr. A. R. Kelly who approved the assignment of the writer to this undertaking. During the war years publication was impossible. After the war it was apparent that complete revision of the report was necessary and it was completely re-written. The present plan of research envisions a series of reports on all the areas excavated at Ocmulgee.

The preparation of an archeological report such as this requires the cooperation of a large number of individuals including the field workers and all the friends of the author. I cannot thank all of them by name but must single out some of those whose contribution was more apparent or continuous. Dr. Jesse D. Jennings, formerly superintendent of Ocmulgee National Monument, is primarily responsible for the establishment of the laboratory where the analysis took place, and for the plan of preparing reports for the various units. Dr. Arthur R. Kelly was in charge of the field excavations with James A. Ford and Gordon R. Willey as assistants at various times. Ronald F. Lee and Herbert E. Kahler, while chiefs of the History Division of the National Park Service, and J. C. Harrington, Regional Archeologist, have realized the need for research facilities and the urgent nature of the reports. It is due to the sympathy of these men that it was possible for me to be assigned to the work of completing the report. The establishment of Ocmulgee National Monument was largely due to three men: General Walter A. Harris, Linton M. Solomon, and the late Dr. Charles C. Harrold. These three have followed the work for years with constant interest and encouragement. Without them the work would probably not have begun and would have progressed much more slowly. Dr. James B. Griffin has given constant guidance and Dr. William H. Sears has offered many stimulating and disturbing criticisms during the long period when the ideas were being crystalized in final form. To all the workers in the various WPA and CCC projects appreciation is expressed for work well done.

Introduction to the Second Printing

Charles H. Fairbanks
Distinguished Service Professor,
Department of Anthropology, University of Florida
September 1980

By 1980 the original 1956 National Park Service publication of the Funeral Mound report was long out of print, and the stock had been exhausted for many years. At that time the Ocmulgee National Monument Association arranged for a new limited reprinting of the report, this time with a green leatherette cover, rather than the yellow art deco cover of the original. Charles Fairbanks was contacted in Florida and agreed to write a new introduction for that edition. I believe it is an important enough document to include in this edition and thus present it here.

Twenty-four years between the first and second printings make it necessary to evaluate this study in light of additional archeological research at Ocmulgee National Monument and other relevant areas in the southeastern United States. We need to know what speculations or ideas presented in 1956 must be changed in view of the state of the art in 1980. It may also be possible to assess the impact of the work since first publication.

The original *Funeral Mound* report was not specific about the date of occupation and the use of the site. Only the general chronological table gives indication of the time frame, A.D. 900–1100, of the Macon Plateau Phase. While radiocarbon dating had been developed in 1950, little charcoal or other organic samples were available from the Macon Plateau. Many samples of charcoal collected during the excavations of the 1930's had been carefully preserved by impregnating them with a mixture of gasoline and parafin wax, then felt to be the best treatment. This mixture was inert carbon. It made the samples of little use for radiocarbon dating.

Not until 1959 did excavations at Brown's Mount produce charcoal from the hearth of a circular earthlodge that gave a radiocarbon date of 970 ? 150 years, B.P. This translated to A.D. 980, just about what we had concluded earlier. The standard deviation of 150 years means there is a 2 out of 3 probability that the true date falls between A.D. 830 and 1130. For practical purposes, the A.D. 980 is used as falling within the Macon Plateau Phase. This means that the Funeral Mound represents an early phase of the Mississippian pattern, equivalent in time to the Fairmont Phase at the great Cahokia Site at East St. Louis. It remains an interesting aspect of the Macon Plateau Phase at Ocmulgee that a full-blown Mississippian settlement was established there at such an early time and at such a major distance from the Cahokia center.

In 1956, we at Ocmulgee felt sure that the Macon Plateau Phase represented some sort of an invasion or movement of people carrying the Mississippian cultural pattern to Ocmulgee. This explanation still makes sense as the fortified Macon Plateau settlement shows little derivation from settlement patterns of the earlier Swift Creek Phase in central Georgia. The Macon Plateau site and the neighboring Brown's Mount site seem to be fortified outposts of people seeking room for fully agricultural settlement in the hostile territory of another people in central Georgia.

The combination of river, flood plain swamps, and adjacent lower Piedmont uplands offered the newcomers a variety of wild plant and animal resources to supplement their domesticates of corn, beans, and squash crops. They needed these wild resources to provide them with protein since they appear to have had no domestic animals except the dog.

Excavations in the Ocmulgee flood plain during the building of highway Interstate 16 have shown that the river flats were used for gardens and farm homesteads. Knowing this now we can visualize a stretch of farmsteads and gardens along the river flood plain with the fortified mound group above them on the first terrace, the Macon Plateau. The whole settlement pattern is now seen as much more complex than was suspected during the early years of excavation and analysis. The more complex settlement pattern clearly indicates a more sophisticated way of life for the inhabitants.

Recently, some archeologists have strongly suggested that the Early Mississippian Phase developed gradually out of earlier complexes. They point to similarities between tools and other artifacts as evidence of this parentage. To me, the Macon Plateau Phase represents a pure Mississippian movement into central Georgia. There is a minimum of cultural ties to the earlier Swift Creek Phase in central Georgia. The same can be said for relationships with any other far southeastern cultural complex. The Macon Plateau people seem to have existed in virtually complete isolation from the surrounding populations as there seems to have been no exchange, trade, or mixing of cultures during the Macon Plateau occupation of Central Georgia.

How long did the Macon Plateau Phase maintain isolation? I now suspect a very brief occupation, perhaps only 3 or 4 generations long.

As we compare the Macon Plateau settlement system with that of early European settlements in the New World, we see a very different situation, one in which Spaniards, Britains, or Frenchmen rapidly adopted many varied traits from the indigenous populations. Why these different patterns should have developed is an entirely proper question, given the present interests of archeologists. Likely, one reason was because the Macon Plateau already possessed an adaptation to the New World physical and cultural environment. In addition, the Macon Plateau people may have arrived with sufficient population so that they did not at once need to exploit the resident peoples. One problem that still needs to be investigated is how the eventual mixing of Macon Plateau cultural features with the indigenous cultural complex did finally come about.

If the *Funeral Mound* report was written today with the current interests of archeologists, it would be somewhat different. In the 1950's we urgently needed solid descriptions of southeastern Indian cultures. That may well be the major contribution of this work. Today we would look more closely at the cultural processes that controlled the life of the people at this and other sites. Ecological relationships would also receive greater attention.

Unfortunately, the Funeral Mound area and the Macon Plateau did not yield much in food bones to give us a foundation to reconstruct their daily diets. We can only speculate that they must have exploited the river, the swamp, and the upland resources of the region. That they established their fortified town at the fall-line of the Ocmulgee River indicates they recognized the abundant products available.

While it is clear that they raised extensive crops of corn, beans, and squash, it is less clear how they supplemented their diets with wild foods. At this site, they could, within a few miles, exploit a broad spectrum of plant and animal resources.

Fish were abundant in the river and oxbow lakes in the swamp. Shell-fish seem not to have been used extensively, perhaps because they don't contribute that much to the diet. Nuts, fruit, and berries were almost certainly used extensively as were land mammals of both the riverine swamps and the upland area. While the major reason for their settling on the Macon Plateau was the annually renewed silt loam of the flood plain, the combination of many convenient resources may also have contributed to their choice of a settlement location.

It was this annual increment of nutrients from river floods that formed a subsidy for the agricultural system and contributed substantially to the wild food resources of the untilled areas of the floodplain. Their success at the Macon Plateau lay in the people's intensive farming and utilization of wild resources. These helped them achieve an adequate and reasonably balanced diet. It is worth noting that the large earthworks, mounds, and earthlodges were not erected in the floodplain but on the adjacent less fertile edge of the uplands. The ability of the Early Mississippian peoples to manage this dual economy goes far in explaining their success.

Their burial and other ritual actions enabled them to coordinate the great complexity of such a system. The Funeral Mound of the Macon Plateau Phase was the first such system to be described for any Early Mississippian settlement. Other related early phases had not revealed such an elaborate burial system as was found at Macon. Here the Indians built a series of flat-topped earthen mounds, at one of which elaborate funeral ceremonies were carried out. This burial ritual involved holding the body of the deceased in a temple structure on the mound until the dead was transferred from the status of living to that of ancestors. Thus a continuity of the dead, the living, and probably the yet to live, was maintained. The Funeral Mound was the portal through which one passed from the living to ancestral status.

Burials at the mound strongly suggest that the Macon Plateau Phase represented a society with varied status positions. Burials on the old land surface below Mound I level indicate that some persons received more elaborate funerals than others. We can assume these persons were individuals of higher status than the mass of individuals. As there seem to have been no other area on the Macon Plateau where burials were made during this period, we can conclude that all the burials at the Funeral Mound were of permanent residents of the village. These were likely the people who coordinated the complex social and economic systems, superintended the community-wide actions, and possibly those who maintained the highest status. A funeral at this mound was not for everyone, and the degree of elaboration of that funeral indicated the degree of status one held. Archeologists today generally regard burial rituals as the major means we have of interpreting the social hierarchy of the past. One can imagine that, then as now, the status of the person was directly proportional to the number of mourners, participants, and observers at one's funeral.

For the Macon Plateau people, it seems likely that the amount and value of objects buried with a person was also directly related to status. That the Funeral Mound contained burials of men, women, and children argues that status was partly determined at birth. These were not the remains only of high achievers who forced themselves into positions of authority. There must have been a hereditary leadership group. Leadership positions, and their related status indicators, do not seem grandly developed at Macon Plateau if funeral evidences are reliable.

At later sites such as the large Mississippian centers of Etowah or Moundville, there is evidence of much more structured status identification in the burials. Increased emphasis on status seems to be associated with the elaborate symbols of the Southern Cult. Since the Macon Plateau Phase has some simple antecedents of the Southern Cult, we can attempt to understand the development of this aspect.

At Ocmulgee, the Southern Cult evidences include a few examples of the "Forked Eye" design, the bilobate spud or ritual ax

blade, the cougar or puma as a ritually treated being, and conch shell drinking cups. This last item is seemingly part of the widespread southern Indian Black Drink ritual.

In historic times, travelers described the taking of the sacred cassena tea, the Black Drink, from a shell cup. At the Funeral Mound, at least one conch shell cup or dipper was present in one of the super-ordinated sub-Mound burials. Perhaps the relationship of the Macon Plateau Phase to the Late Mississippian manifestations can offer some explanation of the rise and spread of the Southern Cult.

Following the isolated phenomenon of the Macon Plateau Phase, perhaps from A.D. 1200 to 1500, there was a tremendous increase in both the number and size of Mississippian sites throughout the southeastern United States. This was a period of highly successful adaptation to the soils and environment of the region. Population increase seems both rapid and steady. It was, in my view, a period in which the early Macon Plateau culture absorbed, mixed with, and integrated other, older Indian elements in the region.

This population increase must have created stresses due to competition for favorite sites. It must also have created ideological stresses due to the mixing of cultural traditions. It is precisely this period of stress, due to rapid cultural change, that produced the flamboyant Southern Cult.

It is characteristic of religious revivals that they incorporate some elements from the old belief patterns, some from the new, and add some unique ones. The Southern Cult, then, built on the older Early Mississippian religious system, elaborated some elements and added many new ones. I see the stress situation that triggered this revitalization movement as springing from the amalgamation of Mississippian cultural patterns with those of indigenous peoples drawn into the wide-spread Mississippian system. Contributing factors were the pressure of increasing population and the demands for fertile agricultural lands of the river floodplains. The complex Mississippian societies, with some forms of class or status-structured organizations, depended on burials for emphasizing status positions. With the development of the Southern Cult, its symbolism was frequently displayed in differential burial situations.

We would now see the Funeral Mound in a larger frame and would seek to go beyond description to attempt to define the causes of culturally determined behavior at the Macon Plateau and among the descendants of those people in the following phases.

Any introduction to the *Funeral Mound* report must acknowledge the help of many people. First are General Walter A. Harris, Dr. Charles C. Harrold, and Linton M. Solomon whose interest in the Macon Plateau and all aspects of Georgia history served as foundation and continuing support for the archeological work there. I cannot express too deeply my debts to these men for their unfailing interest, courtesy, and support. Dr. Arthur R. Kelly was responsible for the direction of the early public works archeological supervision. I relied heavily on his insights and interpretations for my own understanding of the complex situation at the Funeral Mound. Jesse D. Jennings urged me to come to Ocmulgee National Monument and provided the administrative support for my analysis. As the first version of this paper was presented to the Anthropology Faculty of the University of Michigan as a doctoral dissertation, I owe much to those members of my committee who guided my graduate work. James B. Griffin was a constant goad and guide to my understanding of archeology. Albert C. Spaulding brought me to understand the need for rigor and accuracy its my interpretations. Finally, I owe my students during the last 25 years a debt for asking questions that have made me continually re-evaluate my ideas. Without the unfailing sympathy and support of my wife, Evelyn, none of this work would have been possible or worthwhile.

ARCHEOLOGY OF THE
FUNERAL MOUND

OCMULGEE National Monument, Georgia

By Charles H. Fairbanks with introduction by Frank M. Setzler

THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM, of which Ocmulgee National Monument is a unit, is dedicated to conserving the scenic, scientific, and historic heritage of the United States for the benefit and enjoyment of its people.

Foreword

Ocmulgee National Monument stands as a memorial to a way of life practiced in the Southeast over a span of 10,000 years, beginning with the Paleo-Indian hunters and ending with the modern Creeks of the 19th century. Here modern exhibits in the monument museum will enable you to view the panorama of aboriginal development, and here you can enter the restoration of an actual earth lodge and stand where forgotten ceremonies of a great tribe were held. Within the monument area you may see prehistoric temple mounds and the historic trading post.

The story of Ocmulgee, however, has not yet all been told. Much information remains to be extracted from the voluminous records and notes made during the program of excavations carried out from 1933 to 1938. The present report on the Funeral Mound is the result of many years of patient research by archeologists both inside and outside the National Park Service. It is the first of a series of major reports on Ocmulgee National Monument.

Conrad L. Wirth

Director.

Contents

	Page
Introduction	1
The Setting	3
The Country	3
Ecology	3
The Background	6
Historical accounts	6
Chronology of the Macon Plateau	8
The Creeks	16
Present appearance of the mounds	16
Excavations at the Funeral Mound	20
Methodology	20
Mound stages and associated remains	20
The sub-mound area	20
Mound construction	24
The Village Site	34
19th-century features	35
Analysis	37
Physical stratigraphy	37
Cultural stratigraphy	37
Pre-Funeral Mound occupations	38
Funeral Mound occupation	39
Artifacts and other cultural elements	40
Stalling's Island Period	41
Dunlap Period	41
Deptford Period	41
Mossy Oak Period	41
Swift Creek Period	41
Macon Plateau Period	42
Lamar Period	48
Ocmulgee Fields Period	48
Affiliations of Macon Plateau Focus	49
Summary	55
Summary of life on the Macon Plateau	56
Bibliography	77
Appendices	79
Index	91

Illustrations

Plate	Page
1. Frontispiece: Burial 57 grave goods displayed	vi
2. Early hunters of the Paleo-Indian era	9
3. Shellfish Eaters of the Archaic era	10
4. Early Farmers of the Southeast	12
5. Conquest of the Macon Plateau by Master Farmers	14
6. Pottery of the Master Farmers	15
7. Model of a Macon Plateau temple mound	16
8. East end, north profile of Funeral Mound	17
9. West end, north profile of Funeral Mound	19
10. Ocmulgee site during Macon Plateau times	57
11. Detail, diorama of earth lodge ceremonial	58
12. Hypothetical structure on Macon Plateau mound	59
13. Detail, diorama of "New Fire" ceremony	60
14. Upper photograph—Burial 68 in sub-Mound I log tomb	62
Lower photograph—Bundle Burial 60 in Mound VI	62
15. Upper photograph—Burial 48, rearticulated	62
Middle photograph—Burial 1, historical, intrusive	62
Lower photograph—Burial 69 in Pit 54	62
16. Upper photograph—Bibb Plain jar with Burial 38–3	63
Lower photograph—Bibb Plain jar, polished, with Burial 40	63
17. Upper photograph—Halstead Plain effigy bottle, with Burial 76	64
Lower photograph—Bibb Plain bottle, with Burial 46	64
Right photograph—Halstead Plain effigy bottle, with Burial 59	64
18. Upper photograph—Halstead Plain effigy bottle found in village area	65
Lower photograph—Bibb Plain sherds from general collections showing loop handles	65
19. Upper photograph—Sherds of early types from general collections	66
Lower photograph—Macon Plateau pottery types from the general collections	66
20. Historic materials from the Creek occupation of the Funeral Mound area	67
21. Macon Plateau artifacts, ground stone and pottery pipe from Funeral Mound	68
22. Bone and shell artifacts from the Funeral Mound	69
23. Upper photograph—Copper sun discs and copper-covered puma jaws, original specimens	70
Lower photograph—Reproductions of disc and jaw artifacts, showing probable original condition	70
24. Walnut Roughened sherds from Historic Creek period	71
25. Ocmulgee Fields Incised and Kasita Red Filmed sherds	72
26. Chipped stone artifacts from the Funeral Mound	73
27. Chipped stone artifacts from the Funeral Mound	74
28. Upper photograph—Bibb Plain jar from unnumbered pit in south face of Funeral Mound	75
Lower photograph—Bibb Plain jar with Burial 46	75

Figure	
1. Map showing situation of Macon Plateau	4
2. Map of Ocmulgee National Monument archeological areas	7
3. Composite profile drawing of North Face of Funeral Mound	18–19
4. Plat of Funeral Mound pits and burials	22
5. Theoretical reconstruction of ditch on Mound V	30
6. Graphs: Sherd distributions at two test areas	36

Tables

	Page
I. Southeastern cultures in relation to Macon Plateau.	11
II. Classification of sherd material from submound level.	21
III. Summary of Funeral Mound pits.	87
IV. Summary of burials.	89–90
V. Old Road Survey sherd distribution data.	90
VI. Willey's Test Pits sherd distribution data.	90

PLATE 1. Representation of the individual of Burial 57, found in the Fifth Stage of the Funeral Mound, showing the original stone spud and reproductions of the shell gorget, copper "sun-symbols," copper-covered puma jaws and spud handle. This figure is part of the exhibit at Ocmulgee National Monument museum.

Introduction

Twenty years ago the initial excavations at what is now Ocmulgee National Monument were commenced under the authority of the Smithsonian Institution in cooperation with the Civil Works Administration. The accompanying paper by Charles H. Fairbanks represents the first of several projected reports by the National Park Service describing the archeological explorations at, and the materials recovered from, Ocmulgee National Monument. To appreciate fully the archeological developments which have taken place in central Georgia during the past 20 years, one must take into account the circumstances which transformed a former cotton patch into one of the outstanding monuments east of the Mississippi River.

In August 1933, I was privileged to excavate an archeological site at Marksville, La. Here, for the first time, laborers were provided by the State Emergency Relief Administration. Instead of the usual 10 to 15 workers to which most archeologists were accustomed, we were allotted over 100 men. With such a large crew, and James A. Ford as my assistant, we were able to excavate and restore, in 4 short months, an unusually large number of prehistoric earthworks at this site.

This experiment convinced us that with a sufficient number of trained assistants and supervisors, it would be feasible for archeologists to use large crews of relief labor. From the standpoint of the relief agencies, archeological explorations were made to order, for they provided immediate work for numerous unemployed people; they used more than 90 percent of the allotted funds for labor, since the necessary tools and other materials cost very little; and they produced results of a scientific and educational nature.

During the fall of 1933 every effort was being made by the Federal and State governments to counteract unemployment and the related suffering and disorganization. One of the assistant directors in the newly created Federal Civil Works Administration asked me to give some consideration to the use of relief labor, particularly in the South, for archeological explorations. M. W. Stirling, W. D. Strong, and I submitted such a program for archeological excavations, restorations, and research on mounds and sites occupied by prehistoric and early historic American Indians.

This program was approved on December 7, 1933, and enabled the Smithsonian Institution to conduct 7 archeological projects in Florida, and 1 each in Tennessee, North Carolina, California, and Georgia.

All of these projects were launched within 2 weeks and provided employment for 1,500 laborers. Except for the ones in North Carolina and Georgia, all were under the direction of archeologists in the Bureau of American Ethnology and were to continue from December 15, 1933, to February 15, 1934. Subsequently, however, the closing date in most cases was extended to April 1934.

The particular C. W. A. project which here is of interest is the one for Macon, Ga., which originally called for 150 unskilled and 50 skilled laborers and 5 supervisors. The Smithsonian Institution selected Arthur R. Kelly as archeologist and director of the project, and James A. Ford as assistant archeologist. The latter's previous experience in directing relief labor with me at the site in Marksville, La., was of aid in carrying forward a program of such magnitude which heretofore was unheard of except in the large Egyptian pyramid excavations in the Near East.

Few can appreciate the problems of administration and public relations which confronted the archeologist. He had to serve as engineer, bookkeeper, personnel officer, liaison, and director, as well as an archeologist. Under such conditions it is due largely to the enthusiasm and exacting standards of scholarship exemplified by Dr. Kelly and his assistants that we can now publish such detailed reports as this one 20 years afterward.

As previously mentioned, the Federal Civil Works Administration projects under the direction of the Smithsonian Institution closed in April 1934. The artifacts from California, Tennessee, North Carolina, and Florida were shipped to Washington, the material analyzed, and reports written. After April 1934 the project at Ocmulgee continued under the sponsorship of the Society for Georgia Archeology and the Macon Chamber of Commerce; explorations continued under the direction of Dr. Kelly with labor supplied by the Georgia Emergency Relief Administration. With the constant cooperation and enthusiasm of Dr. C. C. Harrold, General Walter A. Harris, and Linton M. Solomon, operations were carried on under the Works Progress Administration. Through the help of United States Representative Carl Vinson and Senator Richard B. Russell, the Ocmulgee National Monument was authorized by Congress on June 14, 1934. The next step was the Presidential proclamation in December 1936, establishing this site as a national monument.

Through the excavation of the mounds, the village sites, and the council house or ceremonial earth lodge, an occupation of 10,000 years was revealed. Later, the establishment of the historic trading post further extended this period of occupation of the Macon Plateau.

The Civilian Conservation Corps began building roads and levees in the newly created monument, and finally the Public Works Administration provided funds for the National Park Service to build a museum to house the large collections recovered during the excavations. In the fall of 1951 exhibits were installed in the museum so that the thousands of visitors might see and appreciate the prehistoric cultural developments that took place within the area.

Despite many administrative problems, specimens were labeled and preserved, detailed notes and drawings were made and filed, photographs were taken before the evidence was destroyed, and quarterly reports were prepared. Archeological techniques were improved to meet the new conditions. On the basis of these records and the artifacts recovered, Fairbanks has been able to prepare this report which depicts the various periods and cultural horizons of the Macon Plateau.

This in brief is the historial background to the many phases of the development leading up to the present Ocmulgee National Monument. Credit is due to Arthur R. Kelly for the initial direction of archeological exploration and for carrying forward the program of excavations from December 1933 to October 1938. Our great gratitude should be expressed to the late Dr. Charles C. Harrold, Gen. Walter A. Harris, and Linton M. Solomon, and the Society for Georgia Archeology, for their continuous cooperation and interest in the creation of the Ocmulgee National Monument and Museum. Much credit is due to Charles H. Fairbanks, James A. Ford, Jesse D. Jennings, and Gordon R. Willey for assisting Dr. Kelly in the excavations at Ocmulgee; to John C. Ewers, Charles H. Fairbanks, and Jesse D. Jennings for developing the Ocmulgee Museum plans and exhibits; and to John M. Corbett, John L. Cotter, James B. Griffin, and William H. Sears, who helped Fairbanks with professional criticism and appraisal of this report during its preparation. Finally, due credit must be given to the various officers, administrators, and workers from the relief organization, Public Works Administration, and National Park Service staff who have devoted themselves wholeheartedly to numerous aspects of this project.

Thanks to all these men, the material and data at Ocmulgee have been preserved. This report, and others to follow, will make the archeological data available both to the professional archeologist and to the interested layman.

FRANK M. SETZLER,
Head Curator, Department of Anthropology,
Smithsonian Institution, Washington 25, D. C.

The Setting

THE COUNTRY

Ocmulgee National Monument is located at the eastern edge of the city of Macon, Bibb County, Ga., on the left bank of the Ocmulgee River (see figs. 1 and 2). It lies in land lots 60, 61, 62, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, and 79. An area administered by the National Park Service, it was established by Presidential proclamation in 1936. Macon lies at the fall line of the Ocmulgee River and the monument proper is a thrusting tongue of the "red hills" extending out into the river bottoms which in turn form a tongue of the Coastal Plain. These "red hills" are the remnants of a former upland plateau capped by a brilliant red sand or sandy loams which are the residual product of the weathering of Eocene rocks. The red soils are mainly of the upper Eocene Barnwell formation underlain by Tuscaloosa sands and clays of the Upper Cretaceous. The underlying crystalline rocks are pre-Cretaceous in age. The area once had up to 3 feet of topsoil, but this has largely been eroded away by more than a century of row cropping. The general area is well supplied with a variety of natural resources including: hard and soft kaolin, fuller's earth, limestone, bauxite, some granite, and abundant quantities of timber.

The monument area, and the area also of aboriginal occupation, is the southern tip of one of the "red hills." It is a sloping, rounded plateau tilted slightly south toward the river flood plain. Several small, intermittent streams cross it from north to south and empty into Walnut Creek which cuts close to the southeastern and southern edges of the plateau and then meanders across the flood plain to empty into the Ocmulgee River (see fig. 2). The plateau offered wide areas which were partly flat and surrounded by fairly steep slopes. These flat areas were those used by the Indians for habitations and mounds. The steep banks probably helped in the defense of the town. Along the banks, springs formerly provided adequate fresh water. The Lower Creek Trading Path entered the northeast corner of the plateau and cut diagonally southwestward to cross the river at the mouth of Walnut Creek (Meyer, 1928, p. 747, Plate 15, Trail 60). Even today the ridges or plateaus in the region offer better living sites and communication than the bottom lands choked with vegetation. The tip of the plateau gave the Indians a commodious living area, easy access to the flora and fauna of both hill and bottom lands. Trails along the ridges and the bottom lands led to their farms. The river perhaps afforded a highway for boat travel as well as a source of fish and shellfish.

ECOLOGY

Macon is supposed to enjoy a rather pleasant climate which is a blend of the continental and maritime types, although summers are always long and frequently hot. The normal annual temperature is 64.4° F. with a growing season of 247 days (from March 14 to November 13). Annual rainfall is 44.84 inches with both summer and winter rains. The wettest month is July, the driest October. While there are 61 days with above 90° temperatures, the climate is usually not oppressively hot. Only 29 days on the average have temperatures below 32° and snow is extremely rare. In brief, life in the open would not be too uncomfortable and growth of all kinds is vigorous.

Before European row cropping was introduced, the native flora probably did not differ, except in quantity, from that found at present. The hills are dominated by oaks, sweetgum, and tuliptrees. The oaks, chiefly *Quercus coccinea* and *Q. rubra,* were probably economically useful for their acorns. Pecans and hickories (*Carya sp.*) were certainly useful, as the chestnut (*Castanea dentata*) was in Indian times. Loblolly pine (*Pinus teada*) and shortleaf pine (*Pinus echinata*) are at present abundant but may have partly replaced the climax hardwood forest of aboriginal times. Persimmon (*Diospyros virginiana*), wild plums (*Prunus sp.*), pawpaw (*Asimina triloba*), and haws (*Crataegus, sp.*) all furnished food and were certainly abundant. The lanceleaf greenbrier (*Smilax lanceolata*) is widespread and was apparently an important food source for the Indians. Giant cane (*Arundinaria gigantea*), is now scarce but was formerly very abundant. The chief changes have been the reduction of woodlands and the increase of pines and haws in cut-over or burned land. The chestnut is probably the only species that has completely disappeared since European settlement. The floral pattern seems very favorable for human exploitation. Especially at the fall line, there was a very wide variety of plants available for use as foods and for manufactures.

The fauna of the fall line region was also varied and abundant. The most important game animal was the Florida whitetail deer (*Odocoileus virginianus osceola*) which supplied meat, hides, sinew, bone, and antlers. The Georgia specimens seem to be slightly smaller than the more northern representatives in conformity with Bergmann's rule. The black bear (*Euarctos americanus americanus* or *E. americanus floridanus*) is still occasionally found as are the otter (*Lutra canadensis canadensis* or *L. canadensis vaga*) and the Carolina beaver (*Castor canadensis carolinensis*). Racoon (*Procyon lotor varius* or *P. lotor elucus*) and the opposum (*Didelphis virginiana virginiana*) are abundant and probably contributed to the Indian diet. The eastern cottontail (*Sylvilagus floridanus mallurus*) is common but its bones are rarely found in Indian sites and it may not have contributed much to the food supply. Skunks, gray foxes, wildcats, and squirrels were probably common but again do not seem to have figured in the Indian's diet. The puma (*Felis concolor*) is now rare or

FIGURE 1. Situation of Macon Plateau in relation to drainage and state boundaries.

extinct, but was ceremonially important to the builders of the mound. By the beginning of the 18th century, bison (*Bison bison bison*) were present in Georgia in some numbers, but it is uncertain when they came into the area and bison bones have not been reported from Indian sites in this area.

Over 100 species of birds have been observed in the monument but the majority of them were certainly of little use to the early inhabitants. The eastern turkey (*Meleagris gallopavo silvestris*) was probably the most sought after species with the meat in demand for food and the feathers for cloaks. It is possible that the eastern bobwhite (*Colinus virginianus virginianus*), the passenger pigeon (*Ectopistes migratorius*), and the eastern mourning dove (*Zenaidura macroura carolinensis*) as well as ducks, when migrating, formed elements of the diet. The southern bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalis leucocephalis*), the turkey vulture (*Cathartes aura septentrionalis*), and the black vulture (*Coragyps atratus atratus*) were probably sources for feathers for the ubiquitous southeastern fans of ceremonial use. Bartram describes the cropped vulture which, in the edition of 1791, is called the "painted vulture" (*Vultur sacra*) (Bartram, 1943, p. 165). Harper has shown that this was probably the king vulture (*Sarcoramphus papa*) now confined to Mexico and South America (Harper, 1936). Bartram says that the Creeks used the tail feathers of this vulture for the royal standard that was carried into battle and displayed at all important public occasions (Bartram, 1791, pp. 151–152). This may be the only species of importance to the Indians not at present found in the region.

The variety of fish in the rivers and streams probably added much to the diet of the early inhabitants. Among those present and undoubtedly used were: channel catfish (*Ictalurus furcatus*), the yellow catfish (*Ameiurus natalis*), the large-mouth bass (*Micropterus floridanus*), and possibly the gar (*Lepisosteus sp.*). The various species of brim or blue-gills (*Lepomis sp.*), while abundant, were probably too small to form important elements of the diet. The rivers also yielded several species of fresh-water mussels that were used extensively in the earlier periods for food and the later stages for both food and ornaments. These shellfish have largely disappeared from the rivers due to muddying of the waters and other forms of pollution.

An extensive list of snakes and turtles together with several species of lizards are regular inhabitants of the area. Among the snakes the canebrake rattlesnake (*Crotalus horridus articaudatus*) and the southern copperhead (*Agkistroden mokasen mokasen*) are the only poisonous species common in the central Georgia area. The largest turtles that might have some food value, are the soft-shelled turtle (*Trionyx ferox*) and the snapping turtle (*Chelydra serpentina*). The small turtles, lizards, and frogs were probably of little economic use to the Indians. The shells of small turtles, however, were used for rattles in both the historic and prehistoric periods.

There have thus been many species of the local flora and fauna that were used by the Indians. Except for the king vulture, passenger pigeon and chestnut these species are still found in the area. The numbers of most species have decreased markedly with European settlements, with the greatest change in the game animals. However, the overall pattern remains essentially the same. In central Georgia, especially at the fall line with its juxtaposition of Piedmont and Coastal Plain biotas, a hunting-collecting economy has a broad base for selection of diet. The soils, rainfall, and temperatures are ideal for agriculture which yielded excellent results until rowcropping destroyed the 2 to 3 feet of aboriginal top soil. It is not surprising that remains of Indian villages are extensive in the area.

The Background

HISTORICAL ACCOUNTS

The first recorded mention of the mounds at Ocmulgee is in an account by one of Gen. James E. Oglethorpe's rangers of the expedition by the general to the Lower Creeks in 1739. The ranger says, "we camped at Ocmulgas River where there are three Mounts raised by the Indians over three of their Great Kings who were killed in the Wars" (Mereness, ed., 1916, p. 200). This was in the first part of August 1739 and surely refers to Ocmulgee Old Fields as the party had left Augusta and was headed for the Lower Creek towns around the present site of Columbus. The Lower Creek Trading Path, as previously mentioned, passed through Ocmulgee Old Fields and crossed the river at the mouth of Walnut Creek. The three mounds can be presumed to be those designated A, B, and C by C. C. Jones as those are the largest and are closest to the path. Why the ranger described them as burial mounds is not clear unless that was the general Creek explanation in the early years of the 18th century.

The next recorded mention of Ocmulgee Old Fields is by James Adair in discussing the southern Indian's belief in ghosts and spirits. He says, "Indians and traders claimed to have heard ghostly singing and dancing especially at *Okmulge,* the old waste town, belonging to the Muskohge, 150 miles S. W. of Augusta in Georgia, which the South Carolinians destroyed about the year 1715" (Adair, 1775, p. 35). This, of course, refers to the Old Fields at Ocmulgee that were the remains of the Creek settlement around the Carolinian trading post. It does, however, suggest more extensive remains than those of the trading post and reveals the feeling of awe in which these remains were regarded by Indian and frontiersman. Adair adds that he himself never heard ghostly singing at Ocmulgee.

The first very extensive mention of the Ocmulgee Old Fields is by the botanist William Bartram who traveled widely in the South between 1773 and 1777. His first visit may have been in 1773 when he says:

> About seventy or eighty miles above the confluence of the Oakmulge (sic) and Ocone (sic), the trading path, from Augusta to the Creek nation, crosses these fine rivers, which are there forty miles apart. On the east banks of the Oakmulge (sic), this trading road runs nearly two miles through ancient Indian fields, which are called the Oakmulge fields. They are the rich low lands of the river. On the heights of these low grounds are yet visible monuments, or traces, of an ancient town, such as artificial mounts or terraces, squares and banks encircling considerable areas. Their old fields and planting lands extend up and down the river, fifteen or twenty miles from this site.
>
> If we can give credit to the account the Creeks give of themselves, this place is remarkable for being the first town or settlement, when they sat down (as they term it) or established themselves, after their migration from the west, beyond the Mississippi, their original native country. (Bartram, 1791, pp. 52–53.)

Several other references of a literary nature are found, but nothing important is added until Charles C. Jones, Jr. described the area in some detail and gave the mounds the names which were still used in the period of excavation. As Jones is the first to describe the remains in any detail and, since his book is not readily available, it is quoted at length.

> Of the mounds on the left bank of the Ocmulgee River, opposite the city of Macon, the largest and most noteworthy (A, Plate IV),[1] lying farthest down the river, is located upon the summit of a natural hill, and occupies a commanding position. The earth of which it is composed was gathered in the valley and conveyed to the top of the hill so as, in the end, to increase its elevation by some forty five or fifty feet. The summit diameters of this tumulus, measured north and south and east and west, are respectively one hundred and eighty and two hundred feet. On the west is an artificial plateau, still about eight feet high, seventy-two feet long and ninety-three feet wide. On the north and east are three spurs or elevated approaches, over which, as paths, the laborers, during the construction of the mound, carried their burdens of sand and clay in cane baskets, and, by means of which, when the tumulus was completed, ascent to its summit was rendered more facile. It is not improbable that this was a temple-mound, used by priests and devotees in their established worship of the sun.
>
> One hundred feet north of this tumulus is a second mound (B) about ten feet high, eliptical in shape, with a summit-diameter, measured in the direction of the major axis, of one hundred and twenty-eight feet. Northwest of this mound and distant between three and four hundred yards, is the third of the group (C), its outlines marred by the elements, and its northern slope carried away by the excavation for the new track of the Central Railway. It is still about forty feet high and is conical in form—its mean summit diameter being about eighty-two feet. On its top is the decayed stump of a tree, more than five feet thick.
>
> About four hundred yards in a northeasterly direction is the last tumulus of this series (D). In general characteristics it closely resembles the mound last mentioned. These mounds are all flat, and may be described as truncated cones, with the exception of the temple-mound, which assimilates the form of an octagonal, truncated pyramid. The temple-mound was erected for religious purposes; the others heaped up, probably in honor of the dead. In their vicinity the fields are filled with sherds, shells of the pearl-bearing unio, and fragments of articles of ancient domestic economy. Upon the acclivity east of the central mound are the manifest remains of an aboriginal settlement. Here in excavating for the new track of the Central Railway, the workmen a short time since unearthed, a few feet below the surface, several skeletons, in connection with which were found beads of shell and porcelain, a part of a discoidal stone, several arrow and spear points, two stone celts, a clay pipe, an earthen pot, and other matters of a primitive character fashioned for use or ornament.
>
> This excavation for the line of the railway necessitated the removal of a considerable portion of the northern side of the central mound. In the conduct of this work, the laborers, while cutting through the slope of the mound, and at a depth of perhaps three feet below the superior surface, exhumed several skulls, regular in outline and possessing the ordinary characteristics of American crania. Associated with these skeletons were stone implements—the handiwork of the red race—and Venetian beads and copper hawk-bells acquired through commercial intercourse with early traders and voyagers. The fact was patent that at least some of these inhumations had occurred subsequent to the period of primal contact between the European and the Indian.

[1] For correlation with modern nomenclature, see p. 16.

FIGURE 2. Map of Ocmulgee National Monument showing archeological areas.

Passing below these interments—which were evidently secondary in their character—and arriving at the bottom of the mound, a skull was obtained which differed essentially from those we have described as belonging to the later inhumation. It was vastly older than those of the secondary interments, and had been artificially distorted to such an extent that the cerebellum was quite obliterated, while the front portion of the skull had not only been flattened but irregularly compressed, so as to cause an undue elevation and divergence to the left.

For the purposes of comparison we have (in Plate IV–A) figured two skulls, the first (1) being that of a modern Indian buried upon the side of the mound only a few feet below the surface; the other, the cranium of the primitive man in whose honor the tumulus was constructed. On this latter skull we have both a front and a side view (figs. 2 and 3, Plate IV–A).

Among the relics found in the vicinity of this old, artificially-compressed skull, was a total absence of European ornaments. Here we have an interesting demonstration of the fact that these ancient tumuli were in turn used by tribes who perhaps had no knowledge the one of the other. The flattened and distorted skull belongs to the mound-building people to whose industry the erection of these tumuli is to be referred. It was in perpetuation and in honor of such primal sepulture that this mound was heaped up. In the course of time these sepulchral and temple structures, abandoned by their owners, passed into the hands of other and later red races, who buried their dead upon the superior surface and along the slopes of these ancient tumuli, having at the time, perchance no personal acquaintance with, and frequently not even a distinct tradition of, the peoples to whose exertions these evidences of early constructive skill were attributable.

The Creeks did not claim these tumuli were erected by them. They declared that they were here when their ancestors first possessed themselves of the region. Who these flat-head mound-builders were, is a matter of conjecture. It may be that they were a colony of the Natchez, journeying hither from their old habitat on the banks of the Mississippi. Certain it is, that these tumuli antedate the traditions of the Creeks who were native here at the period of the English colonization. (Jones, 1873, pp. 158–62, Plates IV & IV–A.)

Jones' description is remarkably accurate except that later excavation indicated Mound D was not a sepulchral mound as was Mound C, or the Central Mound, as he refers to it. Actually, his Mound C is at the western edge of the village area and is not central. The ramps of Mound A are much less prominent than he indicates in his Plate IV. The two railway cuts at Mounds C and B have destroyed much more of these two mounds than is indicated in his sketch. The mounds evidently served as barrow pits for years. There was also a large amount of collecting of the artifacts by local people, especially shell beads, that were exposed in the faces of the two cuts. Jones' description of the skull deformation is interesting although it cannot be directly checked from recently excavated skulls. It appears, however, in some of the burial photographs.

CHRONOLOGY OF THE MACON PLATEAU

It may be appropriate here to discuss briefly the chronological sequence found at Macon in order that the reader may better understand the material to be presented. The chronological sequence is, at present, far from complete but the outlines are well defined and there is hope that future analysis of excavated materials will fill in the gaps. These cultural assemblages are figured in Table I.

The earliest levels are ascribed to the Paleo-Indian, and are assumed to have an antiquity roughly equivalent to that of the Paleo-Indian in the Southwest and High Plains (see plate 2). A quite typical Clovis fluted point was found on the Mound D plateau by Kelly in a weathered clay zone. It was accompanied by end scrapers, circular scrapers, and a quantity of flint scrap, all heavily patinated (Kelly, 1938, pp. 2–8, figs. 3–5). There is no direct evidence as yet for determining the age of fluted blades in central Georgia. However, every indication is that there is a fluted blade complex in the Southeast and that the remains will prove to be of the same order of antiquity as those to the west.

Following the Paleo-Indian, there is in the Southeast a widespread manifestation called the Archaic (see table I and plate 3). These people were nonagricultural, often becoming sedentary through the exploitation of shellfish beds. The classic Archaic sites in Georgia are the Stalling's Island (Claflin, 1931) and Bilbo (Waring, Ms.) middens on the Savannah River at Augusta and Savannah respectively. In these sites there is evidently a nonceramic level in which projectile points are large, long, and fairly heavy, possibly percussion chipped and usually of materials other than flint. Other traits include: drills of several types, atlatl weights, antler atlatl hooks, domestic dog, dog burial, flexed human burials in the shell midden, some shell ornaments such as disc and tubular beads, both long and short bone pins, often with expanded heads and an elaborate geometric incising, bell pestles, "nut stones," grooved stone axes usually of the three quarter grooved type, sandstone and steatite vessels, bone fishhooks, antler points, and both net and line sinkers of steatite. The line sinkers are simply small soapstone pebbles with a roughly incised groove around the middle. The type that is often called a net sinker is a flat pebble of soapstone with a single bored hole, usually near one edge. A number of them show evidence of burning, but some are very nicely finished. It may be suggested that they are really a sort of elaborated stone for stone boiling. The bow and arrow, as well as pottery, are lacking in the earliest levels.

The latter part of the Archaic period is marked by the beginnings of pottery making, without any real break in the cultural sequence or physical type of the population. The Archaic peoples, living on their shell middens, gradually began to make pottery tempered with Spanish moss (*Tillandsia usnoides*). Present evidence does not indicate whether this was a trait learned from the north or south. The pottery is at first plain, but then a series of surface treatments are applied. These include linear-punctates (stab and drag); punctates, sometimes zoned; a variety of simple stamping; fabric impression; and incising. This period is often broken into two major subperiods on the basis of the presence or absence of pottery. This division, however, seems to be stretching a point since the cultural development is obviously continuous with the gradual addition of new traits.

The Archaic is not well represented in central Georgia. This may be because the river bottoms are deeply buried under a heavy blanket of silt. The Archaic sites seem always to lie near water, and perhaps special conditions of silting in central Georgia have masked this period. Projectile points of the Archaic type occur in a few sites, and the distinctive fiber-tempered pottery is also found on a number of sites. The complex was certainly present but may not have occurred as a strong manifestation. Present evidence, largely negative, such as the paucity of remains, suggests that the Archaic was not well developed in central Georgia. Surveys by Sears indicate that it is much better known in southwest Georgia (Sears, personal communication). So it simply may have been overlooked in central Georgia.

PLATE 2. A panel exhibit from Ocmulgee National Monument museum showing data of the Paleo-Indian era.

The next three periods fall within what is being called in the eastern United States, the Early Woodland (see table I). It is characterized by granular-tempered, stamped, or impressed pottery. In general it is represented by small sites, usually with a variety of pottery types in varying amounts. Three complexes can be distinguished. As yet these are not clearly defined nor their chronological relationships clearly stated. The preponderance of evidence, based on cross dating, indicates the following sequence.

Possibly the earliest is the Dunlap period characterized by a fabric-impressed type pottery. This pottery type is represented in central Georgia by Dunlap Fabric Impressed and by the Kellog type of cord-wrapped stick impressed sherds of north Georgia which are very similar to what is called Dunlap Fabric Impressed (Caldwell, 1950, pp. 17–19, figs. 14–15). The pottery is decorated, or impressed, with a plain-plaited, fabric-wrapped paddle often called a cord-wrapped stick. It shows relationships to the earliest pottery of the Northeast and elsewhere is early. At some sites in Georgia it may be as early as some of the Stalling's Island sites of the Archaic. The scanty evidence available indicates that this was a hunting-collecting economy with, at most, only a few cultivated plants of local character.

On the Georgia Coast the Deptford period occupies a chronological position immediately above Stalling's Island. In northern Georgia the related Forsyth period occurs above the Kellog period (see table I). Both Deptford and Forsyth are characterized by check stamped pottery with granular temper. In fact, check stamped pottery forms a rather well-defined horizon at this time level. Deptford has been best described by Caldwell from a site near Savannah (Caldwell, 1952, pp. 315–316, fig. 170). Although not mentioned in the above description, Deptford Bold Check Stamped is the predominant pottery type (Caldwell and Waring, 1939 b). Other forms are Deptford Linear Check Stamped, Deptford Simple Stamped, and Deptford Complicated Stamped (Caldwell and Waring, 1939 a) which is highly similar to Swift Creek Complicated Stamped. Minor types include Deptford Plain, Deptford Zone Punctated, and Deptford Cord Marked (Caldwell, 1952, p. 315). The simple stamped and complicated stamped types are evidently late in the period.

Projectile points are both stemmed and triangular. Both classes

are heavy and possibly indicate the use of darts rather than the bow and arrow. Ground stone artifacts seem to include a variety of flat gorgets, hemispherical stones, plummets, and possibly celts. Pipes are of a projecting stemmed type suggestive of Hopewellian specimens. The whole complex is not well known at present. It would seem to belong to the Burial Mound I period except that no burial mounds are definitely known from this complex at the present time.

Widespread in Georgia is the Mossy Oak period which is well known in the central part of the state from a pure site of the same name. This site had a pure Mossy Oak pottery level below Lamar and was separated from it by a sterile sand stratum. The pottery is exclusively and heavily sand tempered, simple stamped or plain, and it sometimes has conoidal bases or tetrapodal feet. Some tubular and conical stone pipes are known, as well as rectangular and ovate, two-hole bar gorgets, and heavy stemmed projectile points. The sites seem to be mainly small, and mounds are not known with any degree of certainty. However, Kelly believes the rock eagle effigy mounds near Eatonton may belong to this complex as may the small rock mounds with depressed centers which extend from the Eatonton area almost to Macon (Kelly, personal communication). The whole complex appears to be the remains of a partly sedentary, mainly hunting people. The similarity of Mossy Oak Simple Stamped pottery to the ubiquitous cord-roughened material of the northeastern United States suggests that there is a common element in these cultures and that they may be related. There is some sand-tempered cord-roughened pottery in central Georgia that well may belong to this period, but it has not yet been isolated and defined as part of a complex. Elsewhere in the Southeast the general time period during which the Mossy Oak complex occurred has been called Burial Mound I, a period characterized by simple burial mounds and impressed or stamped pottery (Ford and Willey, 1941).

In the following period, Swift Creek, we enter the time phase of Middle Woodland and what may be termed the "Early Farm-

PLATE 3. A panel exhibit from Ocmulgee National Monument museum showing data on the Shellfish Eaters.

TABLE I.—*Southeastern Cultures in relation to Macon Plateau*

Estimated Dates	Horizons	MACON PLATEAU						Related Periods	Related Cultures	Remarks
		Periods	Cultural Complexes	Pottery Complexes	Pottery Types	Mound Type	Economic Base			
1685–1716	Historic	Ocmulgee Fields	Ocmulgee Fields	Ocmulgee Fields	Ocmulgee Plain Ocmulgee Fields Incised Walnut Roughened Kasita Red Filmed	None	Agriculture and deer skin trade	Spanish-Indian in Florida		
1350–1685	Mississippian:	Hiatus						Irene *in Georgia* Plaquemine *in Mississippi and Louisiana*		
	Late	Lamar	Lamar	Lamar	Lamar Plain Lamar Complicated Stamped Lamar Bold Incised Mercier Check Stamped	Paired pyramidal	Agriculture			Proto-historic Lower Creek in central Georgia; northern Lamar is Cherokee; Southern Cult declines.
1100–1350	Mature	Hiatus—Macon Plateau abandoned						Savannah *in North and Central Georgia* Etowah-Kolomoki *in Georgia* (Temple Mound II) Coles Creek *in Mississippi and Louisiana*		Southern Cult reaches climax.
900–1100	Early	Macon Plateau	Macon Plateau	Macon Plateau	Bibb Plain McDougal Plain Halstead Plain Hawkins Fabric Marked Brown's Mount Plain	Platform-Temple mounds	Full agriculture	Temple Mound I Troyville *in Louisiana*	Small-log Townhouse and Hiwassee Island *in Tennessee:* Woodstock *in Georgia*	Southern Cult beginning, partially reflected at Macon Plateau.
		Probable invasion of Macon Plateau by Muskhogeans								
500–900	Woodland: (Regional) Middle	Napier Swift Creek		Napier Swift Creek	Napier Complicated Stamped Swift Creek Complicated Stamped Swift Creek Plain		Limited agriculture?	Marksville *in Louisiana* Miller II *in Mississippi* Hopewell *in Ohio* (Burial Mound II)	Woodstock, Swift Creek and Napier *in Georgia*	Burial mounds probably known but not reported from central Georgia.
300–500	(Transitional) Early	Mossy Oak		Mossy Oak	Mossy Oak Simple Stamped Unnamed Plain			Mossy Oak *in Georgia* Miller I *in Mississippi* (Burial Mound I)	Eatonton *in Georgia*	
100–300		Deptford		Deptford	Deptford Complicated Stamped Deptford Bold Check Stamped Deptford Linear Check Stamped Deptford Simple Check Stamped			(Burial Mound I) Adena *in Kentucky* Forsyth *in N. Georgia*	Candy Creek *in Tennessee* Cartersville *in Georgia*	Adena probably has greater time span.
100 BC–100 AD		Dunlap		Dunlap	Dunlap Fabric Marked			Kellog *in Northern Georgia*	Watts Bar *in Tennessee*	In some cases Dunlap may be as early as Stalling's Island.
500–100	Archaic: Late	Stalling's Island		Stalling's Island	Stallings Plain Stallings Punctate				Stalling's Island *in coastal Georgia* Orange *in Florida*	Shell mounds on coastal Georgia and in northern Alabama and Kentucky.
5,000–500	Early and Middle	Hiatus—Macon Plateau unoccupied								Plain pottery at 1850 B. C. on coast of Georgia.
pre-5,000	Paleo-Indian	Possibly present at Macon Plateau					Hunting			Based on Clovis fluted point at Ocmulgee.

PLATE 4. A panel exhibit from Ocmulgee National Monument museum showing data on the period of the Early Farmers.

ers" (Plate 4). In the Southeast this period is roughly the equivalent of Burial Mound II (Ford and Willey, 1941), a period during which more elaborate burials and pottery were made (see table I). This is also the period in which we find the Southeastern tradition of stamped pottery well established, a tradition which lasted into historic times. The division of this stamped material into complexes is not yet complete and the full cultural sequences are not yet thoroughly stated. It is clear, however, that in central Georgia, we are dealing with two pottery complexes in this time period: Swift Creek and Napier. The Napier material is characterized by very sandy, thin, dark pottery, with a rectilinear complicated stamp decoration that makes use of extensive hachuring of straight lines to fill rectangular or, very rarely, curved areas. Rim folds are deep and there is a suggestion that Napier material falls in the middle part of the period. This pottery is known from one pure site and from a number of pits where it occurs in combination with both Mossy Oak and Swift Creek type sherds. From this circumstance, it is suggested that the Napier complex is a minor occupation in central Georgia and that it is present during the Swift Creek period.

The Swift Creek pottery complex is the dominant one at this time level in central Georgia and the one which apparently gave rise to later complexes such as the Savannah, Kolomoki, and Lamar, which will be discussed presently. Swift Creek pottery has been divided by Kelly into early, middle, and late phases, mainly on a stylistic basis (Kelly, 1938, pp. 25–31). More recently, it has been suggested that only Swift Creek I and Swift Creek II (Kelly's Early and Middle Swift Creek) be retained and that what was called Late Swift Creek be redefined in terms of better collections. At any rate, Swift Creek I pottery is well stamped with complicated, mainly curvilinear designs, but the designs are relatively shallow, open, and they have more narrow lands (ridges). Rims are simple, direct, without extrusions or folds on the lips and both with or without notches. Swift Creek II pottery, formerly Middle Swift Creek, is characterized by bold stamping in which lands and grooves are approximately equal, designs large and complicated. Rims are more elaborate with

folds on the lips. The Kolomoki period now includes part of what was formerly termed Late Swift Creek (Sears, 1951, pp. 9 & ff.), but the rest is not yet fully described. Kolomoki Complicated Stamped falls in the beginning of Mississippian time levels and is clearly an outgrowth of the Swift Creek I and II types. It has some added Mississippian elements such as round bases, straight necks, and red paint. Stamping is often confined to a band around the shoulder area or neck of jars and is somewhat less complicated than the Swift Creek II stamping. Rim folds are more elaborate and varied.

In central Georgia, Swift Creek I and II are associated with a type of accretional mound that was not a burial mound nor is it described by Kelly as a temple mound (Kelly, 1938, pp. 25–31). It may well be an early type of temple mound in which bands of fill and humus alternate. Swift Creek may contain burial mounds in central Georgia but none has yet been reported. Many of the sites are small camps, and on the Macon Plateau, Swift Creek sherds occurred in refuse pits under the Macon Plateau occupation. In these pits Swift Creek pottery was often mixed with Napier and Mossy Oak pottery, although sometimes it occurred alone. On small, shallow village sites it is also mixed with sherds of the Stalling's Island, Mossy Oak, and Napier pottery. The occurrence of all these types together in surface collections, of course, does not mean that the complexes were contemporary. I believe, however, Mossy Oak is only slightly earlier than Swift Creek and that Swift Creek and Napier are partly contemporary. This is further indicated by the excavations at Kolomoki where Napier Complicated Stamped sherds occurred in Weeden Island pits, along with Swift Creek II sherds (Sears, 1951, p. 29).

The Swift Creek stamping tradition and cultural growth is interrupted on the Macon Plateau by the Macon Plateau focus. This is one of the foci of the Norris Basin aspect (Webb, 1938) others being the Norris Basin focus and the Hiwassee Island focus (Lewis and Kneberg, 1946). The Macon Plateau people suddenly appear without any antecedents in central Georgia archeology and bear all the earmarks of an invasion (see plate 5). Only two sites, Macon Plateau and Brown's Mount, are known from Georgia. Their possible ethnic affiliation will be discussed in the final pages of this report. It is sufficient here, before a detailed presentation of the material, to point out that the Macon Plateau complex is a good example of the Early Mississippian horizon. It has temple mounds, earth lodges as auxiliary ceremonial buildings, plain grit or shell-tempered pottery of the round base Mississippian type, shell ornaments, and a variety of special traits that both link it with the Norris Basin sites and Hiwassee Island sites of eastern Tennesee. It is the earliest representative of Mississippian cultures in central Georgia and evidently Ocmulgee marks the spot where some of the earliest bearers of this complex established a fortified town. It also contains a few elements of the Southern Cult (forked eye, bilobed spud, conch cup) and other elements that may be ancestral to the Cult.

During the Macon Plateau period at the Macon Plateau, the Swift Creek and Napier, as well as the later complicated stamped pottery complexes, are absent. It was a period of domination by the Macon Plateau people. The Woodstock period, the very beginning of the Etowah period, and perhaps the very earliest Kolomoki periods are approximately contemporary, with the latter two extending into later times. Present indications are that Swift Creek is contemporary with Hopewell in Ohio but that Macon Plateau everywhere seems to have an entirely post-Hopewell time span. The dates A. D. 900–1100 seem to fit Macon Plateau well with other similar periods, although no radiocarbon dates are yet available. In spite of the fact that Macon Plateau people drove the Swift Creek people out of central Georgia, their domination of other areas was not complete and the evolution of complicated stamped pottery went on, apparently to the north, east, and south. Central Georgia (perhaps just the Macon Plateau to Brown's Mount area), seems to be the only district which the Macon Plateau people dominated completely. With the influx of the Macon Plateau people, full agriculture came to Central Georgia, and this period may be referred to as that of the "Master Farmers" (see plate 6).

The Etowah period of northern Georgia and the Kolomoki period of southwest Georgia both combine Mississippian elements with traits of the old Southeastern stamping tradition. They both fall just after the general time bracket of Macon Plateau with stylistic grounds as the basis for believing them somewhat later. The Etowah period is derived from the Woodstock with Mississippian elements added; the Kolomoki stems from Swift Creek II plus similar Mississippian elements. The Savannah period of north Georgia and coastal Georgia falls after the Macon Plateau, Etowah, and Kolomoki periods (Sears, 1950; Fairbanks, 1950.) (see table I). Of course, in many instances there is evidence that the Etowah, Kolomoki, and Savannah complexes had traditions extending back into the previous period. Savannah, however, on present evidence is wholly later. It represents an evolution out of Swift Creek but the exact stages are not yet defined. There is also a dominant element of check stamping and cord marking in Savannah that points to coastal and perhaps northeastern affiliations. Etowah, Kolomoki, and Savannah are all absent from the Macon chronology and these periods represent a gap in the occupation of the area. This gap occurs at the end of the Macon Plateau occupation and may represent a hiatus due to such social attitudes as awe of previous occupants, and such political elements as conquest of the Macon Plateau by other peoples. As far as present information goes, the Macon area was uninhabitated during the Etowah and Savannah times.

Following the Savannah period when central Georgia was apparently uninhabited, it was again occupied by a group using complicated stamped pottery. This group was responsible for the extensive Lamar remains, fortified and open towns scattered both widely and thickly in central Georgia. In fact, the Lamar culture in general can be said to blanket Georgia and portions of neighboring states from about A. D. 1350 until at least A. D. 1650. Lamar is a hybrid material culture embodying elements of the ancient southeastern complicated stamping tradition and such late Mississippian traits as incising and cazuela bowls. That it actually represents a fusion of peoples remains to be proved. It is characterized, aside from the typical pottery, by small sites, paired mounds, and open courts, vestiges of the Southern Cult, and the frequency of the sites. Agriculture, first reaching its full expression in Macon Plateau times, had now resulted in such an increase of population that most available farmland was occupied at least during some part of this period.

As the first explorations by Spanish and English fall within the years of the Lamar occupation, we are certain that this complex represents the remains of the historic Lower Creek, at least in central Georgia. No Lamar site has been positively identified at the present time with a 16th or 17th century Creek town. However, the exclusive archeological complex at the time and in the area inhabited by the Creek from A. D. 1540 until A. D. 1700 is the Lamar focus. Thus time and areal distribution indicate surely that we are dealing with the archeological remains of the various Lower Creek towns. The northern Lamar material is just as surely Cherokee. Pottery or artifacts of the Lamar period are extremely scarce on the Macon Plateau, but a large site is located 3 miles south in the river swamps. Other sites, of various sizes, are found in the immediate vicinity.

There can be no doubt, on stylistic grounds, that the Lamar complex is directly ancestral to Ocmulgee Fields complex. This complex represents the historic Lower Creek town of that name located on the Macon Plateau from 1690 until the close of the Yammssee War in 1717. The documentation is spotty, but references indicate that a Carolina trader, following the Lower Creek Trading Path, set up a trading post at Ocmulgee Old Fields in 1690 (Kelly, 1939, pp. 328–33.). Indians flocked there to benefit from English trade, but their exact town identification is lacking in the documents (Crane, 1928, pp. 36 and 79.). It is probable that they were Hitchiti. As the name Ocmulgee Old Fields has so long been attached to the site, it is highly probable that this was the town. Other sites are Shinholsters on the Oconee, believed to be Old Oconee Town, and Lawson Field below Columbus, believed to be the Kashita town of the post-1717 period. A number of other Ocmulgee Fields types of towns are known throughout Georgia. All show an approximate identity of traits which are clearly derived from Lamar plus the advent of European trade, especially English. Pottery is sloppily decorated and stamping has been abandoned for brushing and stippling, surface treatments that have continued until very recently

PLATE 5. A panel exhibit from Ocmulgee National Monument museum showing data on the conquest of the Macon Plateau by the Master Farmers.

PLATE 6. A panel exhibit from Ocmulgee National Monument museum showing data on the pottery of the Master Farmers.

among the Creeks of Oklahoma (Quimby and Spoehr, 1950, pp. 249–51; see also Schmitt, 1950, pp. 2–8). Mounds were no longer built. The whole appearance of the material remains is that of a people rapidly moving toward a barter economy under the influence of English trade and eventually turning to a log-cabin-farming economy in the closing years of the 18th century.

The Creeks retained their claim to Ocmulgee Old Fields for 100 years but did not actually occupy it after 1717. From 1806 to 1819 Indians came to Fort Hawkins just north of Ocmulgee Old Fields for treaty payments and to trade, but they left no discoverable remains on the Macon Plateau. The plantation, Civil War, and post-Civil War periods all left remains on the Plateau, mainly in the form of destruction of aboriginal remains.

In the series shown in Table I, the Folsom and Archaic materials do not seem to be related, and population replacement is postulated. Mossy Oak, Napier, and Swift Creek ceramics all show basic similarities and the discreet elements appearing in pottery surface treatments appear again or are modified in later times. It is possible that a single continuing population is involved with local differences and probably minor additions. But there does seem to be something of a continuity from Mossy Oak times through Napier. The Macon Plateau people, however, are a new element and introduce Mississippian traits as well as full agriculture. Lamar represents a return to the Southeastern stamping tradition and possibly a mingling of Macon Plateau peoples with the older inhabitants. Linguistically, Lamar was Muskogean. Lamar and Ocmulgee Fields represent the same people, the Lower Creeks, in their prehistoric and historic manifestations. In central Georgia (with the exception of the Macon Plateau itself), we are thus presented with about 1700 years of fairly certain cultural evolution on a single basic pattern, an agriculture-hunting economy with paddle stamping of pottery as one of the most easily recognized material traits. Full agriculture, temple mounds (see plate 7), and much later iron tools and muskets were added through the agency of conquest or invasion. Other traits as well may have been added through the arrival of new peoples but there is an essential development within the area. Georgia is possibly as close to a center of the area of proliferation of complicated paddle stamping as it is possible to designate. It is precisely this trait—paddle stamping of pottery surfaces—that is the essential common denominator of the central Georgia cultures from the Mossy Oak period through the Lamar period.

PLATE 7. Detail from an exhibit at Ocmulgee National Monument showing model of a Macon Plateau-type temple mound.

Our chief concern in this report is with the Macon Plateau focus and with one of its components—the Funeral Mound. Thus our attention will be directed not on the evolution of Southeastern stamped pottery and the cultures represented by it, but at the major interruption of that sequence. In relation to the whole span of human occupation of central Georgia our interest will be concentrated on a relatively short, but important, moment.

THE CREEKS

Both Bartram and Jones credit the Creeks with the late, historic occupation of Ocmulgee Old Fields. They are undoubtedly right as the Creeks regarded Ocmulgee Old Fields as one of their ancient towns and retained title to it long after they had relinquished their claims to all other lands east of the Ocmulgee. Among the Lower Creek towns was one that used the name Ocmulgee or Okmulgee from the middle of the 18th century until the move to Oklahoma where it survives in the form of *Okmulgee*. The Mitchell map of 1755 shows the Hitchiti, in the form of *Echetee*, on the Ocmulgee River at the location of modern Macon. Swanton believes from this evidence that the Ocmulgee town is a daughter town of Hitchiti (Swanton, 1922, p. 178). It evidently belongs to the Hitchiti group and this explanation sounds quite reasonable. Hawkins (Hawkins, 1848, p. 173) and Gatschet (Gatschet, 1884, p. 78) refer to the later Ocmulgee town as having come from the Ocmulgee Old Fields. The only other Creek town placed on the upper Ocmulgee River during this period was Coweta which was located near Indian Springs in present Butts County. The historic occupation must, then, be ascribed to the Hitchiti. Whether the Ocmulgee town split off from the mother Hitchiti town before or after leaving Ocmulgee Old Fields is not clear. The earlier occupation cannot be equated readily with any historic Creek towns, but the legends quoted in Hawkins and Gatschet indicate that the Creeks themselves believed Ocmulgee Old Fields was an old town of the nation.

PRESENT APPEARANCE OF THE MOUNDS

During the excavation under Dr. Kelly the mounds were referred to by the names given them by C. C. Jones. Later trinomial identifications were assigned in which the first element referred to the site (Macon Plateau), the second element was a county abbreviation (Bibb County), and the third element was the unit. When the museum exhibits were prepared in 1950 a series of descriptive names were applied to facilitate identification by visitors. The following tabulation coordinates all these designations.

C. C. Jones	Numerical	Present descriptive
Mound A	1 Bi 2	Great Temple Mound.
Mound B	1 Bi 2	Lesser Temple Mound.
Mound C	1 Bi 1	Funeral Mound.
Mound D	1 Bi 3	Cornfield Mound.
	1 Bi 4	Southeast Mound and Trading Post.
	1 Bi 5	McDougal Mound.
	1 Bi 6	Dunlap Mound.

The Great Temple Mound is the largest of the group and lies farthest to the southwest. The basal dimensions are 300 feet northwest-southeast and 270 feet northeast-southwest. At present it rises to a height of 40 feet from the area directly north but this, in turn, has been built up to a height of about 9 feet so that the total height is around 50 feet. It lies on the extreme southwestern tip of a spur of the Macon Plateau. Mound fill covers the slopes of the spur on the south and west sides, giving a fairly even slope from the top to the flood plain below. The top platform is 160 feet northeast-southwest and 165 feet northwest-southeast. On the northern face a faint indication of the three ramps described by Jones can be seen but they are much less distinct now than in 1873. The Lesser Temple Mound 130

feet to the northeast is now only a triangular remnant about 100 feet on each side. It rises about 10 feet to a flat top about 75 feet on each side. Most of the mound was cut away by the Macon, Dublin & Savannah Railroad in 1843 but considerable slumping has taken place since. These mounds are grouped together in the Ocmulgee National Monument catalogue system.

The Funeral Mound is 1,100 feet northwest of the Great Temple Mound. At the beginning of work it was 230 feet east-west and 100 feet north-south. The central part was 25 feet high with very little flat space on the top. The sides were all eroded and pitted with the northeast face the most nearly vertical. This face is the one along the Central of Georgia Railway cut and had evidently been used as a barrow pit.

The Cornfield Mound is 1,800 feet northeast of the Great Temple Mound. In 1933, it was roughly round, 150 feet in diameter, and about 8 feet high. The area had been intensively cultivated and the whole mound was rounded without abrupt sides or flat top. Immediately to the south is the restored earth-lodge (Fairbanks, 1946, pp. 94–108). Directly east of the Cornfield Mound the plateau slopes gently down to a small creek or spring run. At the present time this creek has water only in wet periods but it is probable that it had a fairly constant flow under forest conditions. On the western slope of this creek, 1,000 feet south of the Cornfield Mound is the small Southeast Mound. This was not described by Jones and is quite insignificant. At present it is oval, about 20 feet by 15 feet, domed, and 3 feet high. The whole area lying south of the Central of Georgia Railway cut and north of the Macon, Dublin & Savannah Railroad cut has been treated as a unit. Besides the Southeast Mound it contains the remains of the trading post as well as numerous midden deposits belonging to several periods. The line from the Cornfield Mound to the Southeast Mound forms the eastern boundary of the Macon Plateau village as the line from the Great Temple Mound to the Funeral Mound forms the western boundary. The town extended somewhat north of the line from the Funeral Mound to the Cornfield Mound. Along the line from the Great Temple Mound to the Southeast Mound the plateau breaks sharply away on an irregular line to the river swamps. This line is again the limit of the town.

Two mounds, McDougal and Dunlap, lie outside the town area but seem to belong culturally to the rest of the complex. McDougal Mound, the farthest out, is 2,200 feet north of the Cornfield Mound. It is about 100 feet north-south and 40 feet east-west. It had been used as a barrow pit for road fill and was

PLATE 8. East end, north profile of Funeral Mound. This photograph shows clearly the sand wash strata outside the various mound slopes. Partly cleared Burials 65 and 67 in foreground.

FIGURE 3.

badly eroded. Its present height is about 15 feet above the red clay hill on which it stands. At present, it is dome-shaped without summit platform. Dunlap Mound is 1,800 feet northeast of the Cornfield Mound on the crest of a low ridge. At present, it is circular, 55 feet in diameter and 2 feet high. It is at present dome-shaped, though it may have been a low truncated pyramidal mound before a century of intensive farming virtually eliminated it. The excavation notes speak of McDougal Mound B as lying near the McDougal Mound, but this was apparently an erosional remnant rather than a purposefully constructed feature. McDougal and Dunlap Mounds were not mentioned by C. C. Jones in his description of the Macon Group.

→

PLATE 9. West end, north profile of Funeral Mound. At the time of this set-back, excavation of the mound structure was as high as the fourth stage. The mottled band at the lower part is the fill of the primary mound. At the right and left sides of the primary mound the first domes of loading can be seen.

FIGURE 3—Continued.

Excavations at the Funeral Mound

METHODOLOGY

The first excavations in the Funeral Mound were made by vertical profile cuts on an east-west axis from both the north and south sides. The mound was first staked off in horizontal 5-foot squares. The north sections of the mound had been greatly cut away, incident to the construction of the Central of Georgia Railway right-of-way, and large amounts of slump dirt covered the standing sections. The center or higher parts had been cut further south than the sides, leaving a crescent shaped remnant, the highest point of which was slightly more than 25 feet above the surrounding general ground level. Profile sketches indicate that this elevation was less than the original height of the mound, although it was impossible to establish accurately how much dirt had been removed from the top during railroad excavation and by erosion. On the north side, the first trenches did not extend up to the top since this had already been cut away. What little remained of the upper sections, after railroad operations, had been pitted by local collectors and school children, attracted by the disk shell beads often exposed in the face of the cut by heavy rains. The south trenches, started well outside the periphery of the mound, show mound structure and also indicate the character of the village surrounding the mound. These south trenches were later extended into the village area to the east. Additional test pits were sunk in this village area to the east in an effort to determine village stratigraphy.

During the summer of 1936, while students of the Laboratory of Anthropology, Santa Fe, were engaged in studying the excavations at Macon, the south trenches were reopened and two additional profiles were cut. Later, Gordon R. Willey, then Civilian Conservation Corps senior foreman (archeologist) at Ocmulgee National Monument, excavated a series of fifteen 5- by 10-foot test pits in the village area to the west and southwest of the mound. These give the best picture of the ceramic stratigraphy of the site. Incident to the construction of a road to the Funeral Mound, the whole area to be covered by the road and parking area was thoroughly trenched and test pitted. A long trench was run from the trading post area west to the mound area to correlate the soil features in between the two units. All these excavations give a fairly complete picture of the conditions at the mound. About 20 feet of the mound remains intact. It is certain that more burials exist in this remaining part but they surely do not alter the conclusions drawn from the rest of the excavation.

In making this study of Mound C, notes of the field supervisors were used. The correlation of these notes and profiles, together with the cataloguing and analysis of the materials has been my own work. Horizontal maps are largely lacking and construction of plats showing the placing of pits and other features has been possible only by laborious extraction from the field notes. In the case of post molds, no coherent pattern could be achieved by this method as most post molds mentioned in the notes were not recorded in any other way. The location of pits and burials, however, worked out much better, and most were finally located with a fair degree of accuracy.

Because the bulk of mound fill was almost sterile, consisting of pure clays and sands, little archeological material was collected in the mound aside from materials in graves. The adjacent village areas yielded a slightly larger bulk of material. Most of the material was placed in general collection boxes and can be located by trench but not by level. Thus the general collections give an overall picture of the Macon Plateau complex but lack stratigraphic detail. Gordon Willey's stratigraphic material is an outstanding exception and furnished excellent material by levels. For these reasons no attempt was made to determine pottery and artifact types on the basis of the Mound C collections alone. Instead, types were determined on the basis of collections from the whole Macon Plateau horizon rather than from a restricted section. Thus any differences between the types at Mound C and the Macon Plateau as a whole will have significance for determining the position of this unit. Since all the whole pots from Mound C are derived as burial furniture from graves, a slight typological difference is found between these materials and those from the rest of the Macon Plateau. This variation does not seem to be enough to establish a special "funerary ware."

Likewise, the historic Creek indications around Mound C represent only a portion of the total historic occupation. Again, types were determined on the basis of the complete historic evidence and not just on the artifacts recovered from Mound C.

It is regrettable that the field notes did not contain a horizontal record of structures on the flat summits of the several mound stages. It is certain from notes that post molds did appear on these flat summits. Unfortunately, the post molds mentioned do not appear on the plats and are usually mentioned in passing without their horizontal locations being given. Thus, while the arrangement of the posts is uncertain, it can be said that structures did exist on the flat tops of the several stages. No discussion of these structures is possible. The fragment of the mound excavated would probably not have yielded complete structural information in any case. In this context, we can only say that Mound C contained structures in a mound otherwise largely devoted to burials.

THE MOUND STAGES AND ASSOCIATED REMAINS

The Submound Area

The subsoil under Mound C was a dark brown sandy loam, the upper 5 to 8 centimeters of which were a black stained humus. This evidently had been a village area as indicated by pits, post holes and some few scattered sherds. The fact that post holes are

mentioned suggests some sort of premound structures. The fact that no horizontal record of them exists makes any speculation useless. The notes suggest that there were more post holes to the east than under the center of the mound. This may mean that the structure had no cultural connection with the mound. It is certain that, in part the mound still remaining, there was no elaborate structure. The humus band was thin and little material was recovered from it (see fig. 3; plates 8 and 9.)

Pottery

Thousands of sherds were collected from the Mound C excavations but only 38 can be identified as belonging to the submound level. Most of the sherds were identified only as "Mound C, North Face," "Mound C, Miscellaneous" and similar designations. Thus the scarcity of sherds is not an indication of the actual frequency of cultural material in the submound humus. The types of sherds found in this small sample are classified in Table II. The significance of this sherd collection will be discussed in the section dealing with the stratigraphy.

TABLE II.—*Classification of Sherd Material From Submound Level*[1]

Bibb Plain	9	
Total Macon Plateau Complex		9
Mossy Oak Simple Stamped	3	
Total Mossy Oak Complex		3
Deptford Bold Check Stamped	8	
Total Deptford Complex		8
Dunlap Fabric Marked	5	
Total Dunlap Complex		5
Stallings Plain	7	
Stallings Punctate	6	
Total Stalling's Island Complex		13
Total sherds		38

[1] This classification is based on the following references: Stalling's Island pottery types—Griffin, 1943, pp. 155–168, Caldwell and Waring, 1939, p. 10. Deptford Bold Check Stamped—Sears and Griffin, 1950. Dunlap Fabric Marked—Jennings and Fairbanks, 1939, p. 35. Mossy Oak Simple Stamped—Jennings and Fairbanks, 1940, p. 2.

Lithic Artifacts

As with the sherds, very little material in this category is catalogued from the submound level. Only 35 pieces of stone can be identified as belonging to the zone below the primary mound. Of these, 18 are small flint flakes, all with some patination. There are also three flakes of quartz, one light yellow and two pink. Both the flint and quartz flakes seem to be the usual scrap from the manufacture of tools. There was also a flat piece of fine-grained sandstone and a piece of calcined limestone. The sandstone showed no signs of work or use, but both are foreign to the clay subsoil and presumably are village detritus. There were five flint flakes that showed some evidences of secondary chipping and appeared to be the bases of ovate blades. They are so fragmentary that nothing can be said of their original shape.

Seven points are sufficiently complete for shape identification. A broken triangular point was 29 millimeters long with an estimated original length of 50 millimeters. It was 21 millimeters wide and 10 millimeters thick with straight sides and a very slightly concave base. It was also patinated and from the size does not fall in the usual group of Late Mississippian projectile points. It is a type that is provisionally assigned to the Macon Plateau complex. A side-notched quartz point was 53 millimeters long, 23 millimeters wide, and 9 millimeters thick. The sides were straight and beveled from opposite sides producing the so-called "spinner point." Actually, such a bevel would not spin an arrow or dart and seems to be rather a technique of chipping the blade margins from opposite sides, possibly to facilitate use as a skinning or woodworking knife. A straight stemmed projectile point with square shoulders was 38 millimeters long, 31 millimeters wide, and 8 millimeters thick. The base was square and the flint thinly patinated. An expanding stem point with opposite bevel of the edges was 43 millimeters long, 26 millimeters wide, and 8 millimeters thick. The base of the stem was square and again the flint was thinly patinated. There were two narrow stemmed projectile points with straight sides. One was made of gray flint, 46 millimeters long, 32 millimeters wide, and 10 millimeters thick. The other was broken and measured 52 millimeters long (estimated original length 80 millimeters), 30 millimeters wide, and 9 millimeters thick. It was made of a tan flint subsequently slightly patinated.

A broken drill was 37 millimeters long, 13 millimeters wide, and 6 millimeters thick. It had a straight base and was slightly patinated. No estimate of its original length can be made but it appears to have been the usual straight, unmodified drill.

All these artifacts are the general run of Georgia types. Their significance will be discussed in the section on stratigraphy.

Pits and Burials

There were eight pits, numbers 9, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 61, and 86, under the primary mound. Two of these contained no burials but only one was probably a refuse pit. The pits will be discussed in numerical order together with the burials they contained. All the information on the pits is presented in summary form in Table III, burials in Table IV, Appendix E. Figure 4 is a plat recording the location of pits and burials.

Pit 9 lay about 30 feet west of the eastern edge of the primary mound. It was basin-shaped, 7 feet in length east-west with a maximum depth of 2.9 feet. It originated in the submound humus and it could not be determined whether it was cut from the upper or lower part of that band. There was an intrusive post hole in the pit that extended 0.5 feet lower than the pit itself. This post hole appeared to originate in the submound humus. The pit contained no recognizable bones but showed a phosphorus content, which was presumed to indicate a very badly decayed burial. The field notes indicate the pit contained slivers of flint and a few potsherds. These, however, cannot be located in the catalogued collections, evidently having been catalogued in the field as miscellaneous collections, so no statement can be made regarding the types.

Pit 53, which was 65 feet from the eastern edge of the primary mound, contained Burial 48, consisting of two individuals, a male and a female. The pit was bowl-shaped with sloping sides and uneven floor, 8.8 feet east-west, 5 feet north-south, and 3 feet

FIGURE 4. Plat of Funeral Mound pits and burials.

deep. There were no banks of spoil dirt at the sides of the pit. The pit definitely cut through the submound humus and did not commence at that level. The remains of decayed wood and bark indicated some covering over and around the bones, but it was not the type of log tomb arrangement found with Burials 49 and 68. The bones of the female lay to the south in an extended position, head west, the body apparently in normal articulation except that the heads of both femurs were at the point of the second lumbar vertebra. The femora extended down across the pelvis. The tibiae, feet, and even the patallae seemed to be in normal anatomical position. In short, the legs seem to have been disarticulated from the torso as a unit and placed over the pelvis. The arms were at the sides, the vertebrae contorted, indicating the burial of a body in advanced stages of decay, or else a rearticulation of cleaned bones. In view of the fact that ribs, clavicles, hands, and feet seemed to be in normal anatomical positions, it is probable that a badly decomposed body was placed in the grave rather than that cleaned bones were reassembled. If the body was in an advanced state of decay the legs might easily have become disjointed from the pelvis during placement in the grave.

The male was lying just to the north of the female, a bundle 34 inches long and 12.5 inches wide. The long bones lay on the bottom with ribs, mandible, sacrum, and other small bones on top. The skull lay at the west end of the bundle. The bundle showed no evidence of rearticulation, but it does seem to be a less compact bundle than is usual.

Both bodies showed some slight evidence of charring, as if a small fire, insufficient to cause incineration, had been started in the grave. The burials were accompanied by large quantities of shell beads, apparently cut from the wing of a *Busycon* or some other large marine shell. These lay in lines and bands as if they had been sewn to a cloak or woven into some netlike fabric. The majority (17,582), mainly confined to the torso of the extended female, were flat discs, 10 millimeters in diameter and 5 millimeters thick. The remainder (387), were slightly flattened, barrel-shaped, 16 millimeters long, 5 millimeters thick, and 8 millimeters wide (see plate 15, upper photograph).

The center of Pit 54 was 40 feet from the east edge of the primary mound and just south of Pit 9. It was precedent to Pit 57 just to the west. The submound humus was not broken

over the pit. This pit contained Burial 69, the most complex of the group, being composed of 7 individuals, at least 3 of whom were adults, 1, a child, and the others were unidentifiable. The pit was bowl-shaped, 11 feet east-west, 4 feet north-south, and 6.6 feet deep. It had a wooden or bark cover, but no log molds around the sides were found. There was considerable faulting of the primary mound fill into the pit. The significance of this faulting in the dating of the various stages will be discussed in the section on stratigraphy. The three adults lay in an extended position closely piled together with their heads toward the west. Around and over these bones were scattered remains of the other four, completely disarticulated.

It is not clear whether the whole mass was wrapped in one bundle, but it seems certain that all were interred together. The three extended adults appeared to have been buried as badly decomposed bodies, for the skulls were out of position and the bones closely compacted. The legs and feet, however, seem to be in normal position. On top of the pile of bones was a large conch dipper. Scattered over the entire grave area were numerous small olivella shells with the apex cut away to form beads (total computed at 26,000). These, because of their widely scattered position, may well have been sewn on the burial wrappings. Near one adult skull was a circular disc of conch shell, 11.3 millimeters in diameter with notched edges. There are no perforations but the edge is broken in one place and could have contained one or two holes at that point.

Below the same skull were three long bone pins, 11 centimeters, 15.5 centimeters, and 15.5 centimeters long, respectively. All were round in cross section, 5 millimeters in diameter, and have 2, 4, and 6 shallow grooves around the blunt end. The pins are badly decayed but had evidently once been highly polished and finely made. Within the bundle of bones were two biconcave discoidals of light clay stone, polished on the edges but with the concave faces slightly rough. Both are 7 centimeters in diameter; one is 3.2 centimeters thick, the other, 2.8 centimeters thick. The notes describe a small flat greenstone celt, 9 centimeters long as being found with the discoidals. This is now missing from the catalogued collections and, therefore, cannot be further described. The bones are also described as being stained with red paint but the material is not available for analysis. The bones were very slightly burned, not enough to be classified as a cremation, but it does indicate the use of fire either in the bone cleaning process or the burial rites.

Eighteen feet in from the eastern edge of the primary mound was Pit 55 in which was Burial 50. The pit was long, oval, bowl-shaped, 8 feet east-west, and 4 feet north-south. It had sloping sides and was 2.7 feet deep. There was no evidence of a log tomb but the remains of a bark or wood cover were again observed. Burial 50 within the pit consisted of two adults fully extended on the back with heads to the west. The bones were very poorly preserved and it is difficult to decide whether this is a flesh burial or another burial of rearticulated bones. From the photograph they appear to have been buried in the flesh. There were no grave goods. The fill of the pit contained three sherds: 1 Dunlap Fabric Marked and 2 sherds of a plain grit-tempered ware with flaring rim and square lip. This does not appear to be Bibb Plain but a Woodland type. As the sherds were in the pit fill and were not grave goods, they do not exactly date the pit. Also in the pit fill were 30 small flakes of patinated flint. These are similar to the usual type of flint detritus found in the submound village and on the plateau in general.

Pit 56 lay 50 feet in from the eastern edge of the primary mound between Pits 53 and 57. The pit was a long oval, 8 feet by 5 feet and 3.8 feet deep. It was aligned slightly north of east and south of west. On the floor of the pit a log tomb had been constructed. This was composed of upright logs, 4 and 5 inches in diameter, extending along both sides of the burial in a rectangle 6.5 feet long and 3.5 feet wide. The logs extended to a height of 2.5 feet above the floor of the pit. The overlying fill of the primary mound had slumped and faulted into Pit 56 after the mound had been built. This faulting evidently originated in the collapse of the log tomb. However, no horizontal roof or floor of the tomb was observed.

Burial 49, consisting of an adult female and two juveniles, lay inside the log tomb. The female lay to the north in a fully extended prone position. The vertebrae were somewhat contorted and the dorsal surface of the tibiae and foot bones were slightly charred as if a fire had been built on the body after it was placed in the pit. The two juveniles lay just to the south of the female and were another case of bodies in a state halfway between flesh and bundle burial. The bones were in an extended position with ribs, mandible, and clavicles placed at the ends. The tibiae were somewhat displaced. The foot and hand bones were in anatomical order. In general, the two adolescents were piled on top of each other but there was some mixing of the two skeletons. These seem to represent bodies flung in the grave in an advanced stage of decay or else very sketchily cleaned. There were no grave goods.

Pit 57 lay 40 feet from the eastern edge of the primary mound between Pits 54 and 56. It was intrusive in the western edge of Pit 54. Over it the earth was very markedly faulted into the pit. It was a large, basin-shaped pit, 11 feet east-west and 5 feet north-south and 5.7 feet deep. The sides sloped gently down to a flat base. On this floor was a log tomb 5.7 feet long and 3.7 feet wide. It was built of vertical posts 4 and 5 inches in diameter and extended 4 feet above the base of the pit. There were 12 posts on the north and 11 on the south with none at the ends. There was also some evidence of horizontal logs at the sides. The top had evidently been of logs and the floor was composed of nine logs. The tomb was aligned slightly north of east and south of west.

The tomb contained Burial 68 consisting of the bones of one individual. This was a clear case of rearticulation with some slight evidence of charring. The tibiae and one fibula were in nearly correct relation to the femorae which were not articulated with the pelvis but extended up to the first lumbar vertebra. The other fibula lay alongside its femur, obviously not in anatomical position. The whole burial was compact and suggests that the body was wrapped in some sort of robe. The notes mention that the bones were stained red as if painted. This material was presumably hematite, but none of it remains for analysis. Outside the southeast corner of the log tomb, on the floor of the pit, were found the bones of a foot, apparently belonging to this burial.

Seven large disc shell beads 20 millimeters in diameter and 5 millimeters thick were found near the north wall inside the tomb. The fill of the pit contained 2 sherds of Dunlap Fabric Marked and 1 sherd of Stallings Punctate. These again are probably accidental inclusions and not grave goods. This pit seems to have been the central tomb of the submound group.

Pit 61 was 70 feet in from the eastern edge of the primary mound and immediately west of Pit 53. It was round in plan and conical in profile, 3 feet in diameter and 2.9 feet deep. It contained nothing but dark soil and is presumed to be a refuse pit.

Pit 86 lay 6 feet south of Pit 53. It was a nearly round basin-shaped pit 5.9 feet east-west and 4.2 feet north-south. In it was Burial 71, the extremely decayed bones of one individual buried in an extended position. The bones were in such bad shape that nothing more can be said of its position. The faulting of the primary mound fill into Pit 86 was very marked but there was questionable evidence of a log tomb. There were no grave goods.

In summary of the burials under the primary mound, it can be said that the pits were large, and faulting of the mound fill into the pits was common. In 2 cases, log tombs were definitely present and in 3 more there was evidence of bark or wooden covers. Four graves had multiple burials of 2 to 7 individuals. In most cases there was evidence that the burials were of cleaned bones or bodies in an advanced stage of decay. Half the burials were accompanied by grave goods, usually beads or other ornaments. Of these, two were accompanied by a very large number of beads. Cremation in the true sense was not practiced, but fires were evidently built on the burials in the graves. Pits 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, and 86 seem to form a nucleus of burials under the center portions of the primary mound. Pits 9 and 61 are slightly aberrant or yielded scanty information.

From the six central pits we get a picture of a large (averaging 9.3 feet by 4.6 feet) basin-shaped pit with an average depth of 4.3 feet. In this was built an open-ended log tomb or a bark cover was placed over the burial. From 1 to 7 persons of different ages and sex were placed in the grave in an advanced stage of decay. Beads were probably sewn to the burial wrappings and rarely were other ornaments added. Often a small fire was built on top of the bones. When the grave had been covered the primary mound was built over the burials. The fill of the mound soon slumped into the grave. Whether the mound and burials belong to the same group will be discussed in the section on stratigraphy. It is sufficient here to say that the available evidence suggests that the burials were made by the same group that subsequently erected the primary mound. The central individual burial, surrounded by graves containing multiple burials, strongly suggests retainer burial.

Mound Construction

The Funeral Mound was originally composed of seven construction stages (see fig. 3; plates 8 and 9), each consisting of fill over the preceding stage with an additional finishing clay plate over the summit and sides of the mound. The first five of these mounds were preserved to some extent from base to summit in the small portion excavated, later additions being indicated only by fills and clay plates at the sides. Each stage will be discussed, beginning with the first mound, together with any attendant features such as pits. Due to the extensive excavation for the Central of Georgia Railway right-of-way and the fact that the only profiles recorded were all along the east-west lines, it is extremely difficult to identify the mound stages in the south trenches with those found in the north trenches. The south trenches generally seem to have cut only the slopes of the various mounds and none of the flat summit platforms. It has been impossible to identify the various elements in the south profiles by means of comparable soil strata, as the south profiles are not described in the field notes in the same colors and textures as the north profiles.

Mound I

There seems to have been no cleaning of the submound area before the erection of the mound began. The upper surface of the submound humus is on the same level under Mound I as outside Mound I and there is no evidence of grading. Construction of the mound began with the placing of a thin layer of red loam 2 to 6 inches deep over the major portion of the area to be covered. This loam varies greatly in depth and may, in fact, be considered simply as the first earth added rather than a prepared base. The mound fill above this band was started in two places: one near the center over Pits 56 and 57, and the other near the west, approximately below the top of a stepped ramp. These two nuclear domes showed markedly lenticular loads of various colored earths. Above, between, and to the sides of the two nuclear piles the basket loads became progressively thinner and longer. They gave the appearance of scattered basketloads rather than carefully piled loads. At the west end the sequence of loadings was clearly seen to have progressed in an annular fashion, each series being dumped in an orderly manner against the pile already placed. Various clays, often sandy, produced a varicolored profile.

Mound I was quadrangular in ground plan, measuring at least 130 feet east-west. Only a small portion (about 15 feet north-south) of this mound was excavated, so it is not certain that this represents the major diameter, although it is believed to be very nearly the maximum distance and the rectangular shape is clearly shown. Mound I was not found in the south side trenches 20 feet south, and thus had a north-south extension of less than 35 feet in the small part of the mound which remained. At about 7 feet above the original ground surface the fill was carefully leveled, as shown by the broken pattern of lenses. A plate of slate-blue clay was applied to a thickness of 1.5 feet on the horizontal summit. Near the center of the summit platform and below the plate a circular pit-like feature was noted. This consisted of a pit 5 feet across at the top and 1 foot in diameter at a depth of 1.5 feet, from which point it extended down to mound base without further constriction. It was filled with mottled red clay. As its top was below the unbroken clay plate covering the mound, it existed before the plate was added.

It is suggested that a large post was imbedded in the mound as construction progressed. Such a post could have served either as a center marker, height gage, or as an aid in ascending the mound during construction. I am inclined to believe, however, that it served some ritual function as the mound was not built from one center and the sides do not seem steep enough to require the use of handlines. A somewhat similar post hole was found

in the primary mound at the Crooks Site (Ford and Willey, 1940, p. 27) and in the Marksville Mound 4 (Fowke, 1928, p. 420). Both of these were domed burial mounds and not flat-topped platform structures like Mound C, and comparisons are risky. William H. Sears has found large post holes in the flat-topped secondary mound of Mound D at the Kolomoki site in southwest Georgia (Sears, 1952, pp. 1–7). This mound was composed of a number of stages, the second of which was a rectangular and flat-topped mound. It contained numerous burials and, on the east side, a large pottery deposit in the Weeden Island fashion. Evidently, a large, deep post hole in the primary, or at any rate an early, mound stage is a feature more to be associated with burial mounds than with temple mounds. Additional large posts, in the part excavated by the railroad, may have supported a scaffold which would agree well with the evidence of bone cleaning in the graves; i. e., a Natchez type scaffold over the partly completed primary mound.

The clay plate capping Mound I was composed of long thin laminae of nearly pure clay. It extended down the west slope to the bottom. On the west side it had an average thickness of 1 foot. On the east slope, however, it was sometimes lacking and, where present, was only 1 or 2 inches thick. This is taken as an indication that the west slope was more important than the east. The east slope, at an angle of 30° to 40°, was steeper than the west slope which maintained an angle of 20° to 25° throughout the part excavated. The top of the clay plate was quite smooth and flat, except at the eastern end, where a slightly lower area was filled with water-deposited sand. The horizontal top of the primary mound varied from 80 to 85 feet in length in the 15-foot section excavated.

On the west side, a stepped ramp, 8 feet wide, extended from the base to the summit. From the notes and profiles it seems apparent that this ramp was built directly on the slope and did not extend out from the side. It was slightly concave across its face with the corners projecting somewhat from the mound face. It was constructed by placing basketloads of brilliant red clay in horizontal rows on the blue-gray clay plate. The loads are 15 to 18 inches in diameter and 1 to 2 inches thick, spaced 21 inches apart. Steps and ramps had undergone a good deal of wear, all the contours being somewhat rounded. While the spaces between the red clay steps may have served as seats for horizontal logs, the presence of thin accumulations of water-deposited sand argues that the clay itself was the step. The surface of the ramp and the clay summit plate was covered with a thin layer of dark deposit. It is described as a greasy substance and apparently was not a true humus. Dr. Kelly believed it was an organic deposit derived from the occupation of the mound surface. The top of the mound was evidently the platform for some sort of structure as post holes are mentioned which originated on the upper margin of the clay plate. No horizontal record of these exists and no statements can be made about the shape or position of this feature. However, it does seem certain that some sort of structure was erected on top of the primary mound. The ramp on the west side presumably marks the middle of that side.

The horizontal top of the primary mound and the slopes were covered with a thin layer of laminated sand, never more than 2 inches, and usually about one-half inch deep. The same thin band of sandy wash extends a short distance from the foot of Mound I and covers the submound humus. This water-deposited sand, on the flat top of the mound, was also found on the horizontal surfaces of all successive stages with the exception of Mound IV. The presence of water-laid sand does not seem, at first, very logical, for these summit platforms were horizontal and elevated above the level of the surrounding terrain. Under these conditions the sand strata cannot represent wash from a higher elevation.

It may be postulated that there was a higher bench for each stage to the north in the part destroyed by the Central of Georgia Railway. If this were so, the sand could be washed from that section. However, there is no evidence that such a condition existed. It has also been suggested that the laminated sand represents wash from earth-covered structures. All of the tectonic elements of the mound, with the exception of the various sand strata, show a regular lensing and do not show any evidence of being the remains of a collapsed earth-covered structure. Even if earth lodges existed in the destroyed portion to the north, the problem of retention of water on the flat summits, necessary for the deposition of the amount of sand observed, remains a problem.

The sand strata all show a laminated structure indicating deposition at various times. The presence of clay curbs for the later stages would hold water but these curbs were apparently not present on Mound I. The most logical explanation is that the Indians brought successive thin blankets of sand to cover the top of the mound. Each of these sand blankets was only a fraction of an inch thick. During the heavy summer rains these blankets were partly washed down the mound slopes, contributing to the heavy sand deposits at the base. They were also partly sorted in place to yield the laminated sands on the summits. As the successive plates were all quite pure clay the addition of sand would do much to improve the footing and may have had other uses. The clay cap does not seem to be sandy enough for the water-laid sand to have been derived from it. Local deposits of laminated sand will accumulate on a flat, clay surface, of course, if there is enough sand in the clay to wash out. The clay caps of Mound C, however, do not seem to be sufficiently sandy and I believe sand was added to the summits.

There were no pits dug in the upper surface or slopes of Mound I as far as the part excavated is concerned. Some pits, beyond the limits of this stage, and underlying the sandy wash from the mound may well enough belong to the period of construction and use of the primary mound. There is no way of determining this fact, however. Only three sherds—all Bibb Plain, 1 mixed shell and grit temper and 2 shell temper—were all that was found in the fill of the primary mound. They serve to indicate the earliest date at which the mound could have been built and also show that the barrow pits were not in village areas, else more sherds would have been found.

Mound II

The second stage of mound construction was not placed symmetrically over the first stage, but extended a greater distance to the west. The base of the eastern slope, from 5 to 9 feet beyond the base of Mound I, rose at an angle of 40°. The western edge was about 25 feet beyond the corresponding point on the primary mound with a more gentle slope of about 30°. Thus the top of

Mound II was increased markedly toward the west, implying that an additional area was desirable in that direction. This western emphasis would correspond with the alignment of Mound I on which the ramp was found at the west side.

The fill of Mound II was composed of long thin laminae of various clays which did not show thick oval lenses except on the slopes. Built to a height of from 3.1 feet to 4 feet above the top of the primary mound, it was capped with a band of light gray clay laid in long thin laminae. This 9 to 16 inch band was nearly level on top at an average height of 13.3 feet above the original ground level (the base of Mound I). This plate was neither as homogeneous as the blue-gray plate covering the primary mound nor did it extend as far down the slope of the mound. On the east slope it was frequently missing. While the west slope seems to have been covered, the profiles were somewhat broken by pits so that only remnants remain. No evidence of a ramp or steps was recorded, but the western slope had a shallow terrace about midway which may represent some ramp remains. Sherds from the fill were only 4 in number—2 Deptford Check Stamped, 1 Swift Creek Complicated Stamped, and 1 Halstead Plain. Evidently the area from which the fill was gathered at this stage had been previously occupied to a slight extent and was currently in use.

Field notes indicate that pits and post holes were put down from the middle of the clay plate. No evidence of the post holes is shown in the profiles or the plats. Such an origin for post holes would indicate that an earth lodge was placed on the summit of the mound or that the clay plate was added after the structure was built. As all profile photographs show that the lensing is uniform from top to bottom of the plate, the assignment of post holes to the middle of the plate is probably erroneous. It may be that the band of light colored, water sorted sand which covered the top of Mound II was mistakenly described as the upper part of the clay plate. If this were the case the post holes would appear in their logical position, i. e., at the top of the plate. The water-sorted material extended over the top of this mound to a depth of from 1 to 4 inches and down the slopes where it became the first talus stratum of any importance. The greater thickness of this water-sorted layer on top of Mound II may indicate that it was in use for a longer period if we assume that the sand elements were added at regular intervals. However, the increased size of Mound II and other imponderables make this a risky assumption. Mound II extended into the south side profiles where it was represented by a downward sloping segment. No horizontal map of the extent of the mound segments was made but reconstruction of profile evidence shows a tendency for the south foot of the second stage to be curved. This would produce an oval mound rather than a rectangular one. All the later stages of Mound C seem to have had this oval shape. They also seem to have had summit platforms, and thus are not true pyramidal mounds. This shape agrees with that described by Jones in 1873 (Jones, C. C., 1873, p. 159).

Nine pits can be identified with the period of construction and use of Mound II. Of these, 6 (Pits 34, 38, 49, 63, 80, and 92) fall within the period before the completion of Mound II, while 3 (Pits 35, 51, and 91) were dug after the clay plate was added and thus belong to the period of completion and use of the secondary mound. All the pits are long ovals except Pit 34, and were generally oriented on a northeast-southwest axis. The majority of them seem to have contained burials. The pits with their burials will be described in order.

Pit 34 was found on the east end of the north face. It was 2.4 feet in diameter and 3 feet deep. It had been dug through a very thin layer of sandy wash, probably derived from Mound I, and was covered by a sandy wash derived from Mound II. Thus its position is slightly ambiguous but it can probably be assigned to the period between the completion of Mound I and the completion of Mound II. No burial is listed for this pit and, from its indicated size, it may well be a refuse pit.

Pit 35 at the west end of the north face cuts the completed plate of Mound II and lies under the fill of Mound III. It thus belongs to the period of completion and use of Mound II. It was a long oval, 6.8 feet northeast-southwest and 3.5 feet wide. Its total depth was 4.8 feet. It contained Burial 43 which consisted of the badly decayed bones of a single individual buried in an extended position with head toward the southwest. Near the shoulder area was a small mass of pure clay. This was described in the field catalogue notes as a crude effigy but at the present time resembles nothing but a mass of clay. There were also some sherds of Bibb Plain variant, a very soft pottery with an extreme amount of shell temper.

Pit 38 at the west end of the north face cuts some sandy wash and seems to have been dug during the placing of the fill of Mound II. It was 7.6 feet long east-west and 3.2 feet deep. No width is available since it is not described in the notes and the only information is from the profiles. No burial is described for this pit but in all respects it is like the other burial pits of the various mound stages.

Pit 49 was dug through some fill of Mound II at the west end of the north side, and then covered with 5 inches more of fill and the plate of Mound II. Thus, it definitely belongs to the construction period. The profile shows a top diameter of 3.7 feet east-west and 2 feet bottom diameter in the same direction. The depth is 3.2 feet. There is no horizontal plat of the pit but photographs show an oval pit about 6 by 3 feet. Burial 52 in the pit was a bundle or pile of bones 3.9 feet long with the skull to the south. All the bones were badly decayed and there were no grave goods.

Pit 51 at the western end of the north face cut the very base of the water-deposited sandy wash and seems to cut some of the wash of Mound II. It is, moreover, under the fill and plate of Mound III, so it seems to belong to the period following completion of Mound II but before the construction of Mound III. It may be the latest pit of the second mound. It was intrusive to Pit 80 which will be described later. At its eastern edge a spoil bank of soil from the pit was lying on the water-deposited sand and covered by later sandy wash. Several cases like this were noticed in which pits at the sides of the mound had spoil banks adjacent which were covered by later water-deposited sand. The pit was a long oval 5.5 feet north-south and 2.5 feet east-west. It was 3.1 feet deep with quite vertical sides. These sides showed some vertical log molds or bark impressions. The size of the molds is not given. Burial 65 was found in the base of the pit.

It was an extended individual in very poor state of preservation without grave goods. The head was to the south.

Pit 63 at the west end of the north face was 6.9 feet long east-west and 3.8 feet deep. The north-south dimension was 6 feet. It was dug through water-deposited wash from the mound and is covered by unbroken clay of the Mound II plate. It thus belongs to the period of construction of Mound II. At the southeast corner of the pit was found an effigy bottle of Halstead Plain (Plate 17). The body of the bottle is 13.5 centimeters in diameter and 4.5 centimeters high with a neck 9 centimeters high and 6 centimeters in diameter. The total height is 13.5 centimeters. The basic color is a light mouse-gray with splotches of buff and black. The neck is straight and slightly tapering with the orifice at the side. Back of the mouth are two semicircular raised ridges apparently representing ears. It seems to be characteristic of the type Halstead Plain. Eight inches west of the bottle were the badly decayed remains of some teeth, all that remained of Burial 59. From the size of the pit and the position of the teeth, it is concluded that the burial was apparently extended with the head to the southeast, but, since all the bone had been destroyed, this cannot be certain.

Pit 80, at the east end of the north face, cut some water-deposited sand and the fill of Mound II. It was precedent to Pit 51 and seems to have been dug during the construction of Mound II but before the addition of the final clay plate. It was 1.8 feet deep and 6.5 feet long east-west. The north-south dimension is not given. It contained Burial 67, an extended individual with the head toward the west. The bones were badly decayed but there was enough remaining to indicate that the burial had been made in the flesh and not the badly decayed condition previously described for Mound I burials.

The digging of Pit 51 with Burial 65 had cut through the entire torso area and completely destroyed the bones of that part. Burial 65 lay 1.3 feet below the level of Burial 67. The area between the leg bones and immediately on each side of the legs was covered by a mass of shell beads. These were identified by Dr. Henry van der Schalie as *Olivella mutica say.* (van der Schalie, University of Michigan, Personal communication, June 13, 1939). They were shaped by grinding off the apex of the shell until an opening was made to the interior. The number and arrangement of the shells suggested that they were sewn closely on a garment. At the present time there are 400 cubic centimeters of these small shells in the catalogued collections, but the photograph shows many more around the legs of the burial.

Pit 91 was dug on the eastern edge of the summit platform through the clay plate. It is overlain by the water-sorted sand and is believed to have been dug shortly after the completion of this mound stage. It was 6.5 feet long east-west and 3 feet deep. The north-south dimension is not given. It contained Burial 77. No description of the burial is available. Field notes mention "shell beads of the type found throughout Mound C" and a white fibrous material compared to "decayed asbestos." Neither is in the catalogued collections. Pit 91 was the first case encountered in the mound of a burial pit dug from the top platform of a mound stage.

Pit 92 was also dug from the top platform of Mound II, but it was dug before the plate was added and is thus earlier than Pit 91. It was 7 feet east-west and 1.8 feet deep. The north-south dimension is not given. It was also at the eastern edge of the Mound II summit platform. It contained Burial 75, an extended burial with head west. The bones were compressed into a narrow space and measured 4.8 feet long. This is another case of the burial of a badly decayed body with some displacement of the bones. In these respects it closely resembles some of the burials below the primary mound.

In summary: Burials were made at all stages of construction of the second mound. The majority were evidently extended with 5 almost surely in this position and 1 perhaps so. There was also 1 burial of cleaned bones or a decayed body, and 1 bundle burial. Grave goods were found in 4 of 9 pits. As 2 pits—34 and 38—contained no visible remains and may well be refuse pits, the proportion of burials containing grave goods rises to 4 in 7. Grave goods consisted of 2 shell beads—1 identified as olivella—a pottery bottle, a mass of clay, and some shreds. The "decayed asbestos" may also be an intentional inclusion but remains something of a mystery. Logs sometimes decay to leave a white fibrous substance which may well have been the material here. In respect to the burial of badly decayed bodies with some rearrangement of the bones, the bundle burial, and the preponderance of extended burials, the Mound II interments resemble those of sub-Mound I. However, they are less elaborate in size of pit and in number of individuals found in each pit. The only real innovation is the inclusion of the Halstead Plain bottle, which presumably contained a liquid. It will be recalled that one of the sub-Mound I Burials (Burial 69) contained a conch shell container. In general the Mound II burials seem only less elaborate forms of the pattern established in sub-Mound I.

Mound III

The third stage was composed of a light-gray clay band some 2 feet thick over the water-sorted sand on top of Mound II. There was no marked lens pattern in the clay on the horizontal summit but at the sides a fill 2 to 3 feet thick showed oval lenses. The gray clay plate did not reach far down the east slope but did extend over most of the west slope. Both the east slope, at an angle of 40°, and the west slope, at an angle of 30° to 35°, conformed closely to the slopes of the corresponding faces of Mound II. In the Mound III stage there was no increase of summit platform toward the west. On the south side of the mound the face plate seems to be composed of various clays and to be quite discontinuous. Just at the surface of the clay plate, on the horizontal top, post holes were mentioned indicating a structure on the flat top. No plat is available and again nothing can be said about the structure or its shape.

A layer of water-sorted sand 1 to 1.1 feet thick overlay the summit of Mound III and extended down beyond the base in varying thickness where it merged with the earlier talus. In this connection it should be noted that the wash from the various mounds, beyond the edges of the respective slopes, cannot always be assigned definitely to a particular mound. The profiles existing do not show the origins of the stratified wash beyond the periphery of each mound stage. Thus in listing the burials and pits there will be a residue of pits that can definitely be called

inclusive for the mound as a whole but cannot be accurately assigned to any particular stage. The thickness of the wash on, and surrounding, Mound II and III indicates that the increased summit area gave rise to more wash. It also may indicate longer periods of occupation for these stages. However, it is futile to attempt an estimate of the relative length of the occupations on the basis of the depth of these sand strata.

A new feature was identified from the south profiles and from the profiles of footing ditches put in at the highest point on the mound for the construction of a shelter over the mound. This feature had been observed in a very tenuous form for Mound II but was definitely found for the first time on Mound III. It consisted of a small ridge of clay added to the extreme edge of the summit platform on top of the clay plate. It projected upward and slightly outward from 0.2 to 1 foot. It has all the appearances, and doubtless was intended for, a curb to prevent erosion of the sand from the summit of the mound. It was impossible to trace this for any distance due to the plan of excavation and the proposed preservation of a portion of the mound as a field exhibit. It does seem certain that there must have been breaks in the curbs, or they were not applied as soon as the stages were complete, because water-sorted sandy wash is present at the bases of all stages. The curbs indicate that it was desirable to keep the sand on top of the mound and that grass cover did not develop on the top, or, for that matter, on the slopes. In fact, the Indians seem to have had a major soil erosion problem on the mounds.

Seven pits were dug in the third mound or can reasonably be dated during the period of Mound III. Additional pits in the sand wash at the sides may well belong to this stage but cannot be definitely placed because of ambiguities of profile descriptions. The pits will be discussed in order.

Pit 16 at the west end of the north side was dug from the top of the fill of Mound III. No dimensions are given in the plats or notes, and the size on the profile is only 1.7 feet east-west and 1.7 feet deep. It is certain that the pit was larger in north-south dimension but the figures are lacking. According to the notes, Pit 16 contained a bundle burial—Burial 25. Photos and sketches show Burial 25 to be a very badly decayed extended burial. It may be that this is another case of the burial of a badly rotted body with some bunching of the bones. There were no grave goods.

Pit 19 was cut into the western slope of Mound III on the north face and it penetrates both the fill and plate. It was thus slightly later than Pit 16, and precedent to Pits 21, 22, and 28. It was 8.6 feet east-west and 3.2 feet deep with the north-south dimension not given. The photograph of the burial suggests an approximate north-south dimension of 3.5 feet. The pit contained Burials 20 and 21. Burial 20 was an extended skeleton in a very poor state of preservation with the head presumably west although this is not stated specifically. Burial 21 was a bundle burial also in very poor condition. There were no grave goods with either burial.

Pit 27 at the east end of the north face was at the foot of the slope of Mound II and cut the extreme edge of the third plate and the water-deposited sandy wash beyond the mound. It lay under the plate of Mound IV. Thus it seems to date from the period of completion of Mound III and before the construction of Mound IV. It was a long oval, 5 feet north-south, 3.9 feet east-west and 3 feet deep. It contained Burial 40 which was so badly preserved that the mode of burial is questionable. Several traces of calcined long bones show for a distance of 3.5 feet but whether it was an extended or bundle burial is impossible to say. With the burial was a small Bibb Plain jar (see plate 16), 13.5 centimeters in diameter and 7.5 centimeters high with two grooved loop handles. The color is an even chocolate brown and shows a fair degree of polish. It is similar to most of the Bibb Plain jars with handles but is smaller than those from the village refuse and has a better polish.

Pit 70 was at the east end of the south face and its placement in this sequence is less definite than some of the others. It lies beneath unbroken sand wash derived from the early stages of the mound and under the undisturbed clay plate of Mound IV. The sandy wash over this pit had faulted into it with the subsidence of the pit fill. Thus it seems evident that the pit was dug immediately before the wash was deposited and certainly before the clay plate of Mound IV was put down. This gives its terminal date as just before Mound IV or approximately at the time of Mound III completion. The dating can, however, never be fully satisfactory. The pit was 2.2 feet north-south, 3.5 feet east-west, and 2 feet deep. It was precedent to Pit 41. It contained Burial 64, which consisted of the bundled remains of a child of 6 or 7 years on the basis of the formation of permanent and deciduous teeth. There were no grave goods.

Pit 74 was located near the middle of the south face and again is somewhat ambiguous as to placement in the sequence. Since it lay under 1.4 feet of undisturbed water-deposited sands which in turn were under the unbroken plate of Mound IV, it must have been dug before Mound IV was begun. Thus Mound III is the latest construction stage in which it could have been built, but it could just as well have been built earlier. The sands were not faulted into the pit and it is probably earlier than Pit 70. It was precedent to Pits 73 and 59. Its east-west length from the profile was only 3.2 feet and it was 1.7 feet deep. No north-south dimension is given. It almost certainly contained some sort of burial, or even burials, but how many and what kind is not given in the notes.

Pit 81 at the east end of the north face was almost certainly a refuse pit. It was 1.8 feet in diameter and 3.3 feet deep. It lay under some undisturbed sandy wash and the fill of Mound III. Thus it has a terminal date of the third stage but may have been earlier. The profiles show spoil banks to the east and west of the pit between layers of water-deposited sand. This suggests that the sandy wash accumulated so fast that normal humus development did not obliterate the spoil dirt before it was sealed in by more wash. It contained no recognizable remains of a burial.

Pit 83 at the east end of the north face also lay under some of the sandy wash. It is outside of the limits of Mound II and under the fill of Mound III. Thus its terminal date is Mound III with the earliest date it could have been dug unknown. It also may have been a refuse pit as no trace of a burial is reported. It was 3.7 feet in east-west diameter and 1 foot deep. No north-south diameter was given.

To summarize the pits and burials of Mound III: Two pits were

caches, or refuse pits, and contained no bones. One pit presumably contained bones which are now missing. Of 5 burials in the remaining pits, 1 was extended and 4 were bundle burials, 2 of the latter being so poorly preserved that there is some question as to just what sort they were. The only item of grave goods was a Bibb Plain jar with one probable burial. Pits 70, 74, 81, and 83 are dated as Mound III or earlier on the basis of their relation to the sandy wash and elements of Mounds II and IV. This is a rather unsatisfactory collection of pits and burials for Mound III. But one thing is apparent—during Mound III times bundle burials were more popular and grave goods less popular than in sub-Mound I and Mound II graves.

Mound IV

The fourth construction stage consisted of a thick clay plate with only minor lensed fill elements. A dark-red clay band 2.5 feet thick was laid directly over the water-sorted sand on top of Mound III. At the east a thin facing plate ascended at an angle of 45° with some lensed fill underlying it. On the western slope the red plate conformed to the more gentle slope of that side, being very nearly 30°. From small profiles obtained on the south side, incidental to the construction of the shelter over the mound, it was apparent that the south slope of Mound IV was quite abrupt and that a curb, mentioned for the tops of Mounds II and III, had been added. Evidence of structural remains on the summit of the fourth stage is not reported, but presumably this stage was similar to the others. Mound IV differs from the earliest stages in that no water-sorted sand strata were present on the crown, but they were typically developed on the slopes and surrounding the periphery. This was the last stage represented by any extensive remains of the horizontal summit platform. In spite of the lack of any extensive or deep fills, Mound IV seems a valid mound stage and not simply a replating of Mound III.

Twelve pits are assigned to Mound IV. As in the case of Mound III some of them can definitely be associated with the construction or completion of the fourth stage, while others are more ambiguous. Of these latter, it can only be said that they were dug before the beginning of Mound V. The description of the pits and burials follows:

Pit 4 at the east end of the north face was 5.9 feet east-west and 3.1 feet deep. The north-south dimension was not given. It cuts the sandy wash from Mound III and is under the wash from Mound IV. It contained Burial 12, a rather loosely piled bundle of two individuals with the maxilla on top. There were no grave goods.

Pit 5, just to the east of Pit 4, on the north face also cut the wash from Mound III and was covered by the wash from Mound IV. It was 3.3 feet east-west and 3.5 feet deep. No burial was found and it appears to be another refuse pit.

Pit 20 at the west end of the north profile was included in the fill of Mound IV but does not seem to come quite to the top of this fill. Thus it dates from the construction period of the fourth stage. It was only 2 feet in diameter and 0.8 of a foot deep. A small scrap of long bone was found near the top of the pit and assigned the number Burial 22, but the pit seems definitely a refuse, rather than a burial, pit. Pit 20 was intrusive to Pit 19.

Pit 28 at the western end of the north face also was small—2.1 feet in diameter and 1.5 feet deep—and inclusive in the fill of Mound IV. It is intrusive to Pit 19. It contained only the tooth shells of a burial, so it is impossible to say whether Burial 37 represents a bundle burial or a skull burial. The small size of the pit suggests that it contained only the skull. There was no burial furniture.

Pit 32 at the east end of the north face is under water-deposited sand and can only be placed with reference to the latest date at which it could have been dug. It is outside Mound V and under sand wash derived from Mound IV. Thus it must date from before the fourth stage with some likelihood that it is considerably earlier. It was 3.3 feet east-west, 3.6 feet north-south, 2.3 feet deep, and contained seven large slightly patinated flint blades. Two of them have square bases; the others are ovate blades from 74 to 119 millimeters in length and 40 to 58 millimeters in width. They show only primary chipping and may well be blanks.

Pit 37 was found at the east end of the north face under water-deposited sandy wash from Mound IV. It lay outside the foot of Mound V, and the Mound IV date must be taken as only the latest date at which it could have been dug. The sandy wash had faulted into the top of the pit upon contraction of the pit fill. This faulting suggests that the pit was not much earlier than the deposition of wash from Mound IV. It was 3 feet in diameter and 3.1 feet deep. The burial number 70 was assigned to this pit but actually nothing was found except pit fill. In view of the complete lack of evidence of bones and the small size of the pit, it was probably a refuse pit.

Pit 41 at the east end of the south face lay under water-deposited sand and the red-clay plate of Mound IV. Thus it was dug sometime before the completion of Mound IV. It had a north-south dimension of 5 feet and a depth of 3.5 feet. The east-west length was not given. It was intrusive to Pit 70. Burial 29 in the pit consisted of only a few teeth in the southern end of the pit. The field notes say no grave goods were found but 11 disc shell beads are mentioned in the field catalogue as belonging to this pit. From the size of the pit an extended burial is suggested, but this is not certain.

Pit 45 at the east end of the south face was also under the sandy wash and fill of Mound IV and thus has a terminal date of the fourth mound stage with its earliest possible date unknown. It was 7.2 feet east-west, 2.5 feet north-south, and 3.5 feet deep. It definitely contained a burial, probably extended, but rains caused a bad fall in this section before the burial was cleared and no information is available now.

Pit 69 at the east end of the south face is described as being under faulted, but unbroken, water-deposited sand. The profile shows it cutting the water-deposited sand and lying under undisturbed clay forming the plate of Mound IV. Thus it is tentatively assigned to Mound IV. It was intrusive to Pit 85. It was 5.5 feet long in a northeast-southwest direction, 2 feet wide, and 2.7 feet deep. Burial 38 in it was the very poorly preserved skeleton of an adult in an extended position with head to the southwest. There were no grave goods with the bones, but 10 inches above them were found a conch shell cup, a muller and a Bibb Plain sherd.

Pit 75 in the central section of the south face lay under the red

clay of Mound IV and was dug into wash deposits that were under, and earlier, than the fourth stage. Thus is rather definitely belongs to the Mound IV period. It was intrusive to Pit 48. The east-west dimension was 3.3 feet, and it was 4 feet deep. The north-south dimension is not given. Burial 62 in Pit 75 consisted of only three pieces of long bone very poorly preserved and arranged in a southeast-northwest direction. The size of the bones suggests that it may have been the burial of an adolescent. At the southwest end of the pit was a pile of five rocks near what was probably the skull of the burial. Two are roughly rectangular and may have been mullers. The others are simply rough rocks showing no signs of work or use. I doubt if these objects can be considered grave goods.

Pit 84 at the east end of the south face lay under the plate of Mound IV and the earlier sandy wash. Thus its dating is somewhat ambiguous, but Mound IV is the latest date that can be assigned to it with certainty. It was approximately 2 feet in diameter and 1.9 feet deep. It was intrusive to Pit 85. It contained no recognizable bones and only 10 pieces of rough rock were found at the base. The purpose of the pit is unknown, but it is best regarded as a refuse pit and the rocks as accidental inclusions.

Pit 85 at the east end of the south face lay under the fill of Mound V and was covered by sandy wash. Thus its date is again ambiguous. It was dug before the sandy wash previous to the construction of Mound V accumulated and thus the latest date is the period of Mound IV. It was precedent to Pits 84 and 69. The profiles show an east-west diameter of 2 feet, but this must be less than the true dimension. It was 3.9 feet deep. Burial 66 in Pit 85 consisted of the skull and one piece of long bone 2.5 feet distant. As no flexed burials have been described for the inclusive burials at the Funeral Mound this suggests an extended burial. With such badly preserved bones any definite statement is impossible. There were no grave goods.

The collection of pits and burials from Mound IV does not yield much in the way of information. Many of them are only tentatively dated as of Mound IV times. The rest are poorly preserved. Bundle, extended, and perhaps skull burials are present in this stage. The only observable change from earlier times seems to be the decrease in number of burials with grave goods. The majority definitely had no grave goods and only one case of disc shell beads is at all sure. Refuse pits were present as in the earlier stages.

Mound V

The fifth mound stage was represented only by an ascending clay plate on the east side and by short sections of the summit explored during the excavation of footing ditches for the shelter erected over the mound. The south profiles show more extensive portions of the southern plate of Mound V. In spite of the scanty profile evidence, a number of very interesting facts have been learned concerning this stage. The builders, turning their attention from the west where it was centered during Mounds I, II, III, and probably IV, built a rather large extension to the south. This is shown by the lensed fill from 5.5 to 5.8 feet thick on the south side with little or no fill on the east and west sides. However, the brightly colored red and yellow lensed clay plate

FIGURE 5.

on the east side was as much as 4.8 feet thick. This eastern plate lay at an angle of 35° while the south slope varied from 39° to 40°. Very little of the west slope remained. Considerable sandy wash was present at the foot of the mound face on the east side, and continued around to the south side where it contained a large amount of charcoal.

Just at the edge of the red clay summit plate (0.5 to 0.7 of a foot thick) on the east and south sides, a trench 1.3 feet wide had been dug from the top of the plate to a vertical depth of from 2.5 to 3.2 feet. This trench on the east side slants down toward the east, i. e., towards the mound platform at the top, at an angle of 39° from the horizontal. It cut down through the red clay plate of Mound IV and into the sand strata on top of Mound III. On the south side, the same trench extended down into the sandy lensed fill present there, after having turned at an angle and headed in a westerly direction. The direction of inclination was also changed, now being slanted down to the north, i. e., with the top away from the mound platform. The angle varied from 11° to 40° from the vertical, but generally about 30°. The size of the trench, 1.3 feet wide, is such that a post 5 inches in diameter could be set vertically to a depth of 3.2 feet from the top of the clay plate, even in the part of the trench with the lowest angle of insertion. The trench, filled with dark loam, in two cases contained charcoal and decayed wood although no post holes were observed. In several places along the trench the summit plate of red clay was seen to extend down the inner edge of the trench, while along the outer edge a small additional band of clay had been added (see fig. 5).

These two features seem to be intentional bracing of the trench to withstand pressure of posts inserted in it and bent inward toward the summit platform. The five points at which the trench was profiled would indicate that it ran north and south for a distance of a least 20 feet along the eastern edge of Mound V and then turned at a right angle for 32 feet along the southern edge of the summit platform. It is assumed that this trench, together with the scattered charcoal on the platform and slopes, indicates the presence of a rather large structure, or possibly a palisade on the summit platform.

It is possible that the slant of the ditch outward was for the purpose of giving a better purchase on the underlying soils for the posts. It is certain that the trench contained poles as evidenced by the charcoal and rotted wood. They probably were not greatly tilted outward as the width of the trench is sufficient so that posts could have been set in a nearly vertical position. Had the trench been dug vertically on the south edge where comparatively loose or unstable sandy fill underlay the thin (0.25 of a foot average) clay plate, the tendency for any outward strain at the base would have been to tear out the exterior wall of the trench. This is an ever-present danger in houses of arched-roof construction in which the primary strain will be felt on the inner edge of the trench at the top. This is shown diagrammatically in Figure 5. The secondary strains at the bases of the posts will tend to be exerted in a direction away from the arch. Webb has discussed this problem in relation to the Small-log Town-house remains of the Norris Basin (Webb, 1938, pp. 21, 40, 46, and figs. 6 and 23).

The fact that the east trench slants inward may be explained by the evidence that there the clay plate on the face of the mound was quite thick and relatively tough. In addition, the trench on the east side extends into pure red clay of Mound IV, which would serve as a strong, tough matrix. From the small sections of the trench profiles and the fact that the structure was not cleared horizontally, no adequate idea of its form can be obtained. But the observed facts could indicate a rectangular building with arched-roof construction of the small-log type. The structure in that case would probably be one of several on the top of the fifth stage. The possibility that the trench could have been part of a defensive work or palisade has been considered, but does not seem to have much to recommend it.

The clay plate was covered, in the horizontal summit areas, with sand layers. From the small profiles observed they seem to be lensed rather than water sorted. These may be either fill for Mound VI or sand layers placed on the summit and not water sorted. As this is the only case where sand on the summit was not water sorted, it does not weaken the argument that the sand was deposited as a ritual, or sanitary, act and not as the roof for earth lodges.

Fifteen pits were found which belong in the Mound V period or which can be dated as not later than Mound V. The 6 which can surely be dated as of this period will be discussed first, then the 9 that are Mound V or earlier.

Pit 21 at the west end of the north face cut the fill of Mound V and was dug during the construction of that mound. It was precedent to Pit 22, and was only 2.1 feet in diameter and 1.9 feet deep. It contained no recognizable bones and is certainly a refuse pit.

Pit 22, also at the west end of the north side, was located in the fill of Mound V but it was slightly later than Pit 21 as it was intrusive to the latter. It was quite small, being 1.6 feet in diameter and 1.7 feet deep. It contained Burial 15, a bundle with no grave goods.

Pit 23 at the west end of the north face was slightly later than Pits 21 and 22 but not in direct contact with them. It seems to have been dug from a slightly higher point in the fill of Mound V. It was 2.3 feet in diameter and 2.1 feet deep and contained Burial 19. This burial consisted only of a few scraps of badly decayed bone and can be presumed to have been a bundle burial. There were no grave goods.

Pit 29 was found in the center of the Funeral Mound in the upper portions that have not yet been completely excavated. It was dug into the clay plate of Mound V. Only one dimension is given, 6.8 feet east-west. It contained Burial 24 consisting of two individuals, both in very poor condition. One body was extended on the north side of the pit with the head west. The other was a bundle burial just to the south of the first one. There were no grave goods.

Pit 31 at the east end of the north side extended down into the water-deposited sand from stages precedent to Mound V and was covered by the unbroken clay plate of Mound V. Thus it almost certainly belongs to the fifth stage. No dimensions are given and it does not appear on the profiles. According to the field notes, it contained Burial 35 which was extended with the head southwest. There were no grave goods.

Pit 66 at the east end on the south side was one of the most startling in the entire mound. It was dug into the clay plate of Mound V and the fill of the mound above had subsequently faulted down into the top of the pit under the pressure of dirt from Mound VI. It was precedent to Pit 67. The only dimension given is 8 feet north-south. Pit 66 contained Burial 57, which was represented by the fragment of one femur only. Burial 57 was accompanied by the most elaborate grave goods of any burial in the Funeral Mound. These consisted of 2 copper plates, 2 copper covered puma jaws, fragments of cane matting, and something described in the field notes as "decayed fur."

The copper plates are oval, 15 centimeters long and 7.5 centimeters wide, and were made from extremely thin sheet copper. Both carry a repoussé design consisting of a semi-circle with radiating rays, 26 and 28 in number respectively. Each has two small holes 7 millimeters apart near the broader edge. One is made of 2 sheets riveted together with 2 rows of small rivets. Both seem to have had originally a slight curve but are now somewhat fragmentary and it is difficult to decide if this curve was intentional or not.

The puma jaws were each cut with one branch short to form a pair, i. e., one has the right branch short, the other, the left. The longer branch reached to the base of the ascending ramus and is there broken off rather roughly. The short branch is cut neatly in the diastema back of the canine tooth. The cut end of the jaw and the whole body of the jaw up to the alveolar margin is sheathed in thin sheet copper.

The matting or basketry is apparently made of cane, in strips 2 millimeters wide. The weave is an over-3-under-3 diagonal twilling. No part of the "decayed fur" is presently extant. Adhering to the front of one plate is a small fragment of two-strand twisted cord. The whole collection is at present in the United States National Museum (Catalogue No. 385590). They are illustrated here on Plate 22. Eye-witnesses of the excavation of this burial report a round copper gorget also present. No trace of this is found among the objects in the National Museum and it is not mentioned in the notes.

During construction of museum exhibits it was decided to attempt a reproduction of this set of ornaments. Plaster casts of puma jaws were covered with thin copper without much

trouble. It was found in making the plates that if a sheet of thin copper were placed on a slightly yielding surface like a sheet of "cellotex" the design of radiating rays could be copied by scribing with a sharpened birch dowel. The dowel was used to scribe every other line, then the plate was turned over and the alternate lines drawn. The result, shown in Plate 22 appears very similar to the originals. The arrangement of the plates and jaws into a headdress is purely fanciful, but it seems probable that they did, in truth, form a headdress of some sort. I suspect the basketry may have been a container for the ornaments rather than a base for the headdress. The shape of the copper plates suggests a pecten shell to some extent but closer scrutiny convinces me it is a conventional sunrise. Cut animal jaws are found in Hopewell sites but I know of no copper-covered jaws and the plates seem to be unique. They certainly bear no resemblance to the copper plates of the Southern Cult with their eagle figures, the plumes, batons, and forked eyes that are so striking in many later sites. Neither do they resemble any ornaments worn by the figures shown on the copper plates or on the shell gorgets.

The second group of pits and burials are those which can be dated as being no later than the construction of the fifth mound stage. Some of them may be much earlier but lack of really good correlation between mound stages and the levels of mound wash on the south side of the mound make only the rougher dating possible.

Pit 36 at the east end of the south face lay under water-deposited sand and was covered by the plate of Mound V. It must be dated as not later than the fifth mound stage, but cannot surely be said to have been dug during that period. It was 5.1 feet long and 2.7 feet deep. The notes for this pit say it contained Burial 38 which was extended and accompanied by a conch cup. However, Burial 38 was surely in Pit 69 of Mound IV. Evidently the burial in Pit 36 was extended 1 foot beneath a conch cup, but it was not Burial 38.

Pit 39 at the east end of the south face was also under water-deposited sandy wash and overlain by the plate of Mound V. It also must date not later than Mound V. The linear dimensions are not certain, but it was 2.1 feet deep. It contained only the enamel shells of teeth and a fragment of bone so nothing is really known about the arrangement of the body making up Burial 32.

Pit 42, in the midsection of the south face, was placed similarly to the others, under sandy wash which was covered by the plate of Mound V. It was 5.5 feet east-west and 2.6 feet deep. The north-south dimension is not certain. Burial 42, which was contained in it, was very poorly preserved, but the arrangement of the scraps of bone indicated an extended burial with head toward the west.

Pit 44 in the middle of the south face also lay under the sandy wash and was covered by the plate of Mound V. It seems to have been only 2.5 feet in diameter and 3.7 feet deep. As the pit does not appear on any profile it is hard to check the diameter which, however, seems to be rather small for the burial it contained. Burial 44 consisted of a bundle of two individuals. There were 2 skulls, 1 mandible, and various scraps of long bones. The skulls were on top of the pile of bones with 2 single pieces of long bones 1 foot to the east. The long bones were too poorly preserved to give evidence whether 2 complete individuals are represented or simply 1 skeleton and an extra skull.

Pit 46 at the east end of the south profile was again under water-deposited sand and the plate of Mound V. It was 3.1 feet east-west and 2.4 feet deep. It definitely contained a burial but the profile slumped after heavy rains and nothing is known now about its arrangement.

Pit 48 in the middle section of the south profile again lay under the water-deposited sand capped by the plate of Mound V. It was 7 feet east-west, and 2.5 feet deep. The north-south dimension is not given. It was precedent to Pit 75. Burial 63 in Pit 48 was described in the field notes as a bundle burial. The measured drawings, however, show that the few teeth were 2.9 feet from the remains of the tibia. The arrangement of the bones definitely suggests a flexed burial with the head toward the north.

Pit 50 in the middle of the south face, again under water-deposited sand and the plate of Mound V, is not dimensioned in the notes except that the depth of 2.9 feet is given. It contained Burial 45 which is again described as a bundle, but further details are lacking.

Pit 62 at the west end of the south face is described in the notes as lying below "white lensed clay." The profile shows the top of the pit covered by undisturbed subsoil. The notes, on careful analysis, seem to indicate that the pit was covered by the lowest clay layer in that section which is the yellow and red plate of Mound V. So it seems fairly certain that this pit was dug before Mound V. It was precedent to Pit 76. The top east-west dimension is 6.6 feet, the base 6.5 feet, and it was 2.1 feet deep. Burial 51, in the base of the pit, consisted of only a few scraps of bone, not enough to determine the position of the skeleton.

Pit 65 at the east end of the south face again lies under the unbroken water-deposited wash which is in turn covered by the plate of Mound V. There are no field notes concerning it nor does it appear on the profile. The only information is from the catalogue of pits and burials which describe Burial 55 in Pit 65 as consisting of only three pieces of leg bones in very poor condition. Nothing can be said about the placement of the burial.

Of the 6 pits which surely belong to the fifth mound stage, 1 was certainly a cache (Pit 21) and 5 were burial pits (Pits 22, 23, 29, 31, and 66). One pit contained a double burial with the familiar pattern of 1 extended and 1 bundle burial. Counting the double burial, there were definitely 3 bundle burials and 2 extended burials with a strong possibility of a fourth bundle burial. Only one burial was accompanied by grave goods—Burial 57 with the copper-covered puma jaws and copper plates. Compared to the earlier levels we see a diminution of grave goods as the only outstanding change. There is also a greater proportion of single burials and consequent lessening of multiple burials.

The nine burials which only can be dated as not later than Mound V give the same sort of picture. There was one double burial but in this case it was not the extended-plus-bundle of earlier levels but a double bundle. There were 2 extended, 1 flexed, 2 bundles, and 4 burials too fragmentary to determine. Only one burial was accompanied by grave goods—Burial 38 in Pit 36 with a conch cup. The flexed burial is the main innova-

tion in the series and that is somewhat doubtful as it was very badly preserved.

Mound VI

The sixth stage was represented only by sloping bands at the eastern side of the north profiles and by small remnants of the gray clay summit plate at the top of the mound. Some of the lower segments of the south face may represent the southern periphery but it is difficult to identify in that area. The fill of Mound VI was a lensed, light colored sand and clay, 4.9 feet thick at its greatest depth on the east slope. It was covered by a plate of bright orange clay 0.6 to 1 foot thick. The fill and plate lay at an angle of from 35° to 40°, the fill being thicker at the top, the plate somewhat thicker at the base. No wash deposit was present except on the lower slopes and, to a considerable extent, beyond the periphery.

Near the base of the east slope two horizontal logs were found lying on the orange clay plate, in a north-south direction. These may be either posts from a summit structure which had been pushed down the slope when the summit was cleared for Mound VII, or they may be the remains of a log step on the face. Such log steps have been found at the Cox Mound in the Norris Basin of eastern Tennessee (Webb, 1938, p. 167, Plate III), and at the Peachtree Mound in western North Carolina (Setzler and Jennings, 1941, pp. 21–22, Fig. 5). It is more logical to believe these logs are detritus dumped down the mound face as no further evidence of a stepped ramp is present in this stage. The occasional presence of charcoal and other refuse on the slopes, especially of Mounds I and IV, indicate such procedures. It is difficult to say in what direction the emphasis of Mound VI lay. This stage is not present in the western end of the profiles and it may not have extended in that direction.

Only 2 pits can be associated with the sixth mound stage and 1 of them is doubtful. Pit 68 in the middle of the south face cut water-deposited wash from the mound and lies under the plate of Mound VI. Thus it was almost certainly dug just before the completion of Mound VI. It was 3.5 feet east-west, 2.5 feet north-south, and 4.1 feet deep. It is described as a long oval so the east-west dimension may actually have been in excess of 3.5 feet. Burial 60 in Pit 68 was the bundle of several individuals, 4 or 5 mandibles being present. The mandibles and teeth lay on top of a mass of bones 1.5 by 1.4 feet with the teeth slightly to the northwest of the center. There were no grave goods.

Pit 82 at the extreme east end of the north face cut the water-deposited sandy wash and seems to lie under the foot of Mound VII so it must have been dug before the seventh mound stage. Thus its dating is slightly questionable but it may belong to the sixth mound stage. It was 2.1 feet in diameter and 2.3 feet deep, and contained only sherds, dirt, charcoal, fragments of shell, and some pieces of unworked sandstone. It is clearly a refuse pit.

These two pits add little to our knowledge of the mound or to any possible stratigraphy within the mound. It is certain that bundle burials were still being made as late as the sixth mound stage. It is probable that some of the pits which could not be accurately dated also belong to the period of Mound VI but their position is so uncertain that they must be left out of our considerations.

Mound VII

Mound VII was represented by a sloping band of lensed clay, predominantly yellow in color, which was observed for a short distance in the east section of the north profile. It is also present as a yellow-to-tan band in the south profiles lying just under the humus. It is assumed that this stage represents a separate phase of mound construction just as the previous six stages did. However, so little is known about it that nothing very definite can be said. The top was cut away by erosion and a humus band developed in its place on top of the Funeral Mound. Only one pit—Pit 71—can be identified as probably belonging to the seventh mound stage. It was dug through the sandy wash and lies under the clay band of Mound VII in the middle of the south face. Burial 58 within it was in a very poor state of preservation but enough was left to indicate an extended burial of a small individual, possibly an adolescent, with head toward the west. There were no grave goods.

Other Inclusive Pits

When the field notes had been intensively analyzed, there remained a number of pits that could not be positively identified. They are divided into two classes: (1) Those lying under the water-deposited sandy wash from the mound stages, and (2) those which penetrated that wash but do not reach as high up as the humus cover of the mound.

There are eight pits in the first group that lie entirely below the water-deposited mound wash: Pits 59, 72, 97, 98, 99, 100, 105, and 106. All lie outside Mound I, so it cannot be said that they are truly sub-Mound I in time as they could have been dug any time before the wash covered that area. They range in size from 3.2 in diameter to long oval pits 7.8 feet long by 2.7 feet wide. Only one—Pit 106—is described as containing a burial, although it seems reasonable to suppose that the long oval ones at least were burial pits. Pit 106 on the south side contained Burial 80, an extended skeleton in very poor shape with the head southeast. There were no grave goods. These pits and the one burial seem to fall into the pattern of refuse pits and burial pits found in stages I to VII and evidently are to be regarded as having been dug during the occupation of the mound.

There are 12 in the second group of pits that cut some, at least, of the mound wash but do not reach to the humus: Pits 3, 73, 79, 89, 96, 101, 102, 103, 104, 107, 110, and 111. Again they range from small round pits 3.6 feet in diameter to long oval ones 7.5 feet long. Pit 3 with extended Burial 27 showed log impressions along the sides of the pit. Pit 96 contained Burial 86 which consisted of two individuals, one with head west, the other with its head east. Pit 101 contained Burial 87. Pit 103 contained Burial 88 extended with head toward the northeast (legs disturbed; may have been a flexed burial). As a group they seem to agree with the inclusive pits that can be identified with the various stages and add little to the list of burial traits. The flexed burial, however, is unusual.

Old Sod

The Funeral Mound was covered, in most parts, by a thick layer of humus which was divided into two zones. The lower zone was a humus which conformed with the original contours

of the mound and seems to have developed when the mound was first abandoned, and before any extensive erosion had altered its appearance. The upper, and younger, zone was unconformable with the older sod and seems to have developed during the historic period when the mound was more rounded than originally.

Five pits could be traced to the old sod but not up to the younger sod development. Pit 33 with Burial 36 was 2.9 feet in diameter and 2.2 feet deep. It is described as containing an extended burial. This is obviously in error if the pit was only 2.9 feet in diameter. It is evident that the major axis must have been much greater. Pit 43 with Burial 53 was 7.3 feet east-west, 4.1 feet north-south, and 2.7 feet deep. The burial was extended with head toward the east. Around the tibiae were shell disc beads similar to those found in the inclusive burials. Pit 47 evidently contained a burial but was destroyed by rains before the burial could be described. Pit 67, with Burial 56, was 5.5 feet north-south, 2.9 feet deep, and contained only a few scraps of long bones and the shells of teeth. It may have been a bundle burial. Pit 78 is another refuse pit like the inclusive ones already described. It was 2.6 feet deep and 2.2 feet east-west, and contained two Bibb Plain sherds. Thus, in these pits from the old sod there is no evidence for assigning them to anything else than the general mound-building period. However, for stratigraphic purposes they must remain separate.

New Sod

The upper, or later, humus development seems definitely to have arisen after the mound had suffered some erosion. It is often hard to separate the upper from the lower humus levels and wherever there has been a question the pit is assigned to the upper level. The pits arising from, or extending up to, this new sod may, of course, be intrusive to the completed Funeral Mound. Whether they are all later than the mound-building period, as distinct from the actual period of construction, is not at all clear. Pit 2 with Burial 46 was a long oval 3.1 feet deep, but the linear dimensions are not given. It was a flexed burial with evidence of cremation with a fair amount of grave goods; a bark or wooden cover was above the ashes. The grave goods consisted of: 18 shell disc beads 15 millimeters in diameter and 4 to 9 millimeters thick, 2 mussel-shell spoons, a projectile point, and 2 pottery vessels. The projectile point is missing from the collections. The first pot is a widemouthed straight-necked bottle, 165 millimeters in diameter and 159 millimeters high. The mouth is 75 millimeters in diameter and the neck is 45 millimeters tall. It is Bibb Plain, quite smooth but not polished (see plate 17). The other pot is also Bibb Plain—a small jar, 140 millimeters in diameter and 105 millimeters tall. It has a surged rim and two loop handles. From the collection of grave goods there can be no doubt that this is a Macon Plateau burial.

Pit 52 with Burial 47 was 9.1 feet long northeast-southwest, 3.9 feet wide and 5.1 feet deep. It contained an extended burial with the head southwest. There is nothing here to indicate to what level it belongs. Pit 60 was a refuse pit belonging to the historic level as it contained 1 red glass bead together with 9 Ocmulgee Field sherds, 1 sherd of Dunlap Fabric Marked, and several animal bones, evidently deer. The pit was 1.9 feet in diameter and 1.8 feet deep. Pit 64, 4.6 feet in diameter and 4.3 feet deep, contained nothing and is evidently a refuse pit. Pit 76 with Burial 54 was 4.1 feet in diameter and 2.7 feet deep. It contained a skull and 3 Bibb Plain and 1 Dunlap Fabric Marked sherds. The preservation of skeletal material is so poor at the Funeral Mound that it is questionable whether this is a skull burial or only the skull was preserved.

Pit 77 with Burial 72 was rather irregular in shape, 6.2 feet east-west, 4.2 feet north-south, and 4.4 feet deep. The few parts of an extended burial present were compacted and distorted as were the burials in the mound which were deposited as badly decayed corpses. The head was to the west and there was a post hole 0.6 of a foot in diameter near the pelvis. With Burial 72 was a large greenstone celt 25.5 centimeters long with the blade under the chin. The celt has a tapered poll and all sides are slightly curved. It appears to be the typical celt of the Macon Plateau Period (see plate 21A).

Unidentifiable Pits

A total of 27 pits from the mound area were in completely ambiguous situations and could not be identified with any of the physical strata. These are cases where notes and profiles do not give any information, or cases where the pit extended to the railroad cuts in the mound. They are included in the tabulation (table III) simply to give complete data where available. Actually they are of no use either for description or analysis as their provenience is completely chaotic.

THE VILLAGE SITE

The first trenches to the south of the mound were dug through the village site until the southern periphery of the mound was encountered 35 feet north of the first trench. These initial trenches also were extended eastward into the village site beyond the mound. Farther to the east, toward the small draw that separated the Funeral Mound area from the Middle Plateau and trading post area, the village site was laid out in a horizontal grid and 45 test pits, 10 by 20 feet, were sunk in that area. In the southwesterly portion of the site extensive trenches and pits were dug along the old road between Mound C and Mounds A and B. Later some stratigraphic test pits were excavated on the extreme western edge of the plateau west of the mound. These excavations comprise what is known as the Mound C village site. They actually form part of the larger Macon Plateau area which is south of the Central of Georgia Railway and west of the small creek on the western edge of the Middle Plateau. They are treated as a separate unit simply for convenience.

The test trenching discovered little in the way of features aside from a few small refuse pits and one rather extensive area of burned clay. This burned-clay area was the remnant of a house floor, but no post-mold pattern was discovered, and there was no fire basin. It had evidently been badly damaged by plowing.

The refuse pits were less than 2 feet across and from 1.3 to 2.5 feet deep. They differed in no way from those found in the mound. In one of the refuse pits there was a large bilobate spud of a highly polished green slate or siltstone, 51.8 centimeters long and circular in cross section. The bit is 8.3 centimeters wide, the shaft slightly tapered and the poll rounded. The stone is an extremely soft green slate that seems too fragile for any utilitarian

purpose. At a point 17 centimeters from the poll a series of shallow scratches encircled the shaft for a distance of 5 centimeters. They have all the appearance of hafting marks. No burial was found with this spud but it seems certain that it belongs with the Macon Plateau complex.

In testing the area just west of the Funeral Mound for the construction of the parking area a series of connected pits was uncovered. They were from 3 to 7 feet wide and 1 to 1.5 feet deep and extended for a distance of 30 feet. They were filled with brown soil and contained Bibb Plain and Hawkins Fabric Marked sherds, both good Macon Plateau types. They evidently represent the bases of the fortification trenches that were found surrounding the Macon Plateau at Mound D (the Cornfield Mound), the Middle Plateau, and Mound A (the Great Temple Mound). These will be described more completely in the report of the Mound D Plateau as it was there that they were typically developed. Here it is sufficient to say that the small remnants found west of the Funeral Mound suggest that the line of connected pits, or irregular trenches, seems pretty definitely to have encircled the entire village. Those at Mound D were described by Kelly as dugouts with a suggestion that they were pit houses (Kelly, 1938, pp. 12–22). All present evidence suggests that they were not pit houses but fortifications.

The occupational detritus of the village site varied in depth from a few inches below the plowline to a depth of 2 feet in a few cases. No natural stratigraphy was observed and it was necessary to segregate the materials by arbitrary levels only. The sherd collections from the survey along the old road site were taken in 6-inch levels and are presented in graphic form in Figure 6. It will be noted that the bottom level contained remarkably few sherds and that the bulk of the collections is represented in the upper three levels. The deposits are mixed, but the segregation of types gives a fair representation of their stratigraphic positions. The graphs represent the typical distribution for sherds from the entire area and are a reliable index of the situations on the plateau. In spite of the thickness of the arbitrary levels (0.5 foot) the collections do have value as the large number of sherds present gives the general picture as smaller collections might not do. The pottery complexes and types are sufficiently well known that their identification is positive.

On the western edge of the plateau a series of test pits were sunk by Gordon R. Willey in a search for more refined stratigraphy. Fifteen pits 5 by 10 feet were located in random positions where the deposits appeared to be less disturbed. The method of recording was to wash each sherd as it was excavated and to determine its type. The types were then plotted on graph paper in the proper pits and levels. The arbitrary levels were 3 inches thick. The sherd summaries are presented in graphic form for the entire series of pits in Figure 6. This is a much smaller sample than that from the old road survey but it was more precisely taken. It agrees very well with the larger sample.

Sixteen burials were found in the village site. Of these, 5 are historic Creek, being accompanied by glass beads in 4 instances, and by fragments of an iron knife in the fifth. The majority of the glass beads were of the small, blue and red Venetian type; others were red with a translucent green core (the Cornaline d'Alleppo or Hudson's Bay bead), several blue glass pendants and eight faceted white glass beads were also recovered. All the beads are of types commonly occurring with historic Creek burials in the vicinity of the trading post stockade on the Middle Plateau.

In addition to glass beads, two of the burials, both infants, were accompanied by shell cores of the marine conch or whelk (*Busycon perversum*) showing the process of manufacture into large tubular beads. Some of the cores were grooved preparatory to breaking off the bead. The occurrence of partly manufactured conch columella beads with burials had not previously been seen in this area. A somewhat similar feature was found in Hamilton component burials on Hiwassee Island, except that in this case they seem to be the completed ornament and were buried mostly with adults (Lewis and Kneberg, 1946, p. 140, plate 80A).

Three of the historic burials were partly flexed on the right side, two with the skull lying on the right side, the third with the skull face down. The burial which was accompanied by the iron knife (Burial 5), was fully flexed and, in addition, there were small quantities of red iron oxide in association with the bones. There seems to be no specific alignment of the burials, 1 being with the head east, 1 southeast, 1 north, and 1 west.

Of the remaining burials in the village site, 3 were partly flexed and unaccompanied by grave goods, 5 were extended, 1 consisted of a skull only, and 1 was a bundle burial. One was partly flexed on the right side and was accompanied by a profusion of grave goods indicating a Macon Plateau provenience. These grave goods consisted of a large two-hole circular shell gorget 12.8 centimeters in diameter; a small flat, slightly plano-convex adze (see plate 21 B), five lanceolate shell objects; numerous flint chips, a large projecting stem pottery pipe (see plate 21 E) and a pottery vessel with surged rim and two grooved loop handles with nodes (see plate 16; Appendix B, Specimen 39–39/1 Bi 1). The pottery vessel is 20 centimeters in diameter and 14 centimeters in height and is typical Bibb Plain. The pipe has characteristics of paste and temper like Bibb Plain. The lanceolate shell objects are not perforated, but are made of mussel shell and are completely unknown as to use or function. It is felt that the extended and bundle burials, and possibly more than one of the partly flexed burials, can be assigned to the Macon Plateau complex. Only those definitely associated with historic objects can safely be assigned to the historic Creek occupation.

19TH-CENTURY FEATURES

The whole area of the Funeral Mound and the adjacent village site was blanketed with a detritus of 19th-century crockery and iron tools. In most cases this material is readily separated on a typological basis from the historic Creek materials of the beginning of the 18th century. Starting on the southeast side of the mound and turning northward along the eastern edge an historic trench was discovered. It averaged 2 feet deep and 2 feet wide. The trench was filled with mixed earth containing large amounts of historic materials, especially glazed crockery and iron tools. It was traced to the edge of the railroad cut. It evidently is the remains of a Civil War fortification trench dug as part of the eastern defenses of Macon. No evidence of aboriginal use could be found in the trench. The various cuts of the Central of Georgia Railway have already been discussed.

FIGURE 6. Sherd distributions of Old Road Survey and Willey's Test Pit.

Analysis

PHYSICAL STRATIGRAPHY

The physical analysis of any large mound structure is an extremely complicated affair involving large expanses of profiles and many lenses of different soils. Individually, they lend themselves to little or no treatment. The actual analysis must, then, begin during the excavation when the structural elements which had cultural significance for the builders can be separated from the ordinary loads of dirt. Figure 3 is a consolidated profile through the mound as seen from the north face. As this north face was close to the center of the mound it represents an adequate cross section of the mound structures. The drawing of a composite profile is justified on the basis that the mound was excavated on the north side in a stepped fashion, both horizontally and vertically. Thus no one profile shows all the mound elements along any one vertical plane. The mound excavations were ended with this stepped condition still existing. The south side profiles were not carried far enough north to intersect any of the summit platforms and these profiles add little to the understanding of the mound phases.

The eleven structural elements comprising the Funeral Mound have been discussed previously in detail. Here it will be sufficient to list them briefly in the order in which they occur. The underlying element, and not really part of the mound construction, is the ubiquitous dark sandy loam which forms the subsoil of the Macon Plateau. It is usually darker in the areas once occupied by aboriginal peoples due to the downward leaching of humus stains. There is nothing to distinguish the subsoil under the Funeral Mound from that found under other mounds on the area.

The first cultural level is a nearly black sandy loam which underlies the mound and represents the land surface on which the mound was built. Its dark humus stain probably represents largely organic materials resulting from human occupation. The subprimary mound pits discussed previously belong to this level.

The primary mound was composed of four successive elements, all comprising a single cultural entity. First was the thin red loam stratum underlying all the primary mound. It represents a first preparation or stage of construction. Next was the mound fill, a tan clay and loam showing clearly the original basket loads. The mound fill had two centers which were not completed mounds but simply areas of beginning work. The primary mound was topped with a blue-gray clay plate and steps were added on the west. Finally, on top of the mound was evidently a building of some sort and sand was added from time to time which was later sorted by rains.

The secondary mound had a tan lensed fill and a gray cap. Sand was again present on the top horizontal surface.

The third mound was composed of some light-lensed fill and is mainly known from the gray clay top plate. Sand was again present on the top platform.

The fourth mound contrasted sharply with the earlier stages in having a bright-red top plate which extended some distance down the sides. There was a dark-lensed fill in spots and no sand on the summit platform.

The fill of Mound V was extended mostly to the south and composed of red and yellow clays. The plate was of thin orange clay.

The sixth stage was the last to be preserved on the top of the mound and thus the last for which a summit platform is known. The fill was a light-lensed fill with an orange plate on the sides and a gray clay plate on the summit.

The seventh mound stage was only found as ascending fills on the east side. The yellow-lensed fill is quite thick and this apparently represents a full stage of mound construction like the earlier stages. The summit platform has been lost through erosion. It is the last element that can be identified with the mound as built and used by the Indians.

On the east side especially, but present in spots in all parts of the mound, there was an old sod which was buried an average of 2 feet below the present surface. This represents the original contours of the mound when humus had developed on it. It was overlain by later erosional wash from the higher portions of the mound. This wash is postmound in time.

The present humus represents the recently stabilized surface of the mound with consequent humus development. It belongs to the period of growth and expansion of the present city of Macon.

CULTURAL STRATIGRAPHY

In the previous section the physical stratigraphy was discussed without reference to the people who lived and worked at the Funeral Mound. This section will present those physical elements in the framework of the peoples who lived here, and will be followed by a detailed analysis of the various cultural traits, and a summary.

At first it should be pointed out that we have at the site of the Funeral Mound a series of three occupations, premound, mound building, and postmound, each discreet and without apparent interactions. This will naturally affect the treatment of the material. The state of the mound when work was begun and the technique of excavation used did not yield collections that are susceptible to minute internal analysis for evidence of change within either of the three periods. It is, in fact, likely that the internal cultural changes within each period were of a minimal nature. The emphasis, then, must be on the establishment of the character of each of the three periods.

Pre-Funeral Mound Occupations

Previous to the construction of the Funeral Mound there was an occupation represented by the submound humus. The collections from this zone were scanty, only 38 sherds being definitely identified as belonging to the submound levels. It is likely that more material in miscellaneous collections belongs to this level but these sherds will have to serve as a sample. Actually, they probably represent a fair sample of the submound materials. At any rate, there is no evidence that they do not, and I must assume that they do. The scarcity, real or imagined, of material from the submound humus is suggestive of a relatively light or short occupation. This view is further strengthened by the fact that the submound humus was only 2 to 6 inches thick. In other areas of the Macon Plateau, early levels were sometimes considerably thicker and contained refuse pits easily identified by the pottery contained in them as belonging to the early occupations. This is not the case at the Funeral Mound. None of the pits can be surely identified as belonging to the early groups. It is definitely suggested that the premound occupation was very slight.

The 38 sherds belong to 5 pottery complexes: Stalling's Island–13, Deptford–8, Dunlap–5, Mossy Oak–3, and Macon Plateau–9. The Stalling's Island, Deptford, Dunlap, and Mossy Oak sherds all belong to early occupations of the Georgia area. Stalling's Island sherds are not known from any large sites in central Georgia, neither are Deptford. The Dunlap sherds are probably of the periods called Kellog and Cartersville in north Georgia (Caldwell, 1950, pp. 17–19). They also are not known from pure sites in central Georgia. Mossy Oak is known from pure sites in the Macon region and might have been expected to have occurred in larger quantities. However, the main occupation of the Mossy Oak complex on the Macon Plateau seems to have been several hundred yards east of the Funeral Mound where typical sherds are abundant in the lower levels. The evidence of these sherds indicates a light, probably intermittent, occupation of the area by early groups with these pottery traits before mound building was begun. A similar situation apparently holds for all the Macon Plateau (Fairbanks, 1946, pp. 97–99). The flint chips and artifacts from the submound humus do not add much to our information as they are of types that cannot, at present, be identified with any group. It can only be said that they are not historic Creek. Nor do they belong to the early groups who were temple mound builders. It is clear that these people did not build the Funeral Mound.

The Funeral Mound was erected by the Macon Plateau villagers, only 9 of whose sherds were found in the submound humus. These 9 sherds, however, are probably the most important handful of ceramics at the site because they definitely prove the arrival of the Macon Plateau people before the mound was started. Thus we have a picture of intermittent visits by the early groups, followed by the arrival of the Macon Plateau group. The mound construction must have started soon after their advent or we would expect to find more cultural detritus underlying the mound and identifiable with the latter group. While these factors demonstrate that the mound was built by Macon Plateau people, it does not settle the problem of the large submound burial pits. The question is: are they to be referred to one of the early groups or are they representative of the first Macon Plateau settlers?

Of the 8 pits under the primary mound, 2 seem to have had no burials (Pits 9 and 61) although Pit 9 may have had a burial at one time. Six pits (Pits 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, and 86) contained one or more burials. Thus it is evident that the majority of the pits were burial pits, while only one was definitely not a burial pit. Pit 9 originated in the submound humus. Thus it is certain to belong to the period of premound occupation. It cannot be assigned to either of the four premound occupations (Dunlap, Deptford, Mossy Oak, and Swift Creek) with any degree of certainty. As it contained little information of any kind, it is not very significant in any case. There is a reasonable probability that Pit 61 also was dug by one of the early groups but it did not contain any material by which to identify it with one of the premound occupations.

The remaining pits all seem to be later. Pit 53 was excavated through the submound humus and thus belongs to the period of occupation represented by this humus layer. Since we have shown, by the presence of Bibb Plain sherds, that this last premound occupation was early Macon Plateau, we can assign Pit 53 to that horizon. Pits 54, 56, and 86 all show faulting of the overlying fill of the primary mound into the pit. This faulting develops when the pit fill is compacted by the overburden and subsides into the pit. Most of the submound burial pits had log tombs as evidenced by log molds or decayed bark and wood. While the log tomb would remain for some time, it was not permanent. When it did collapse, it would leave a considerable void to be filled by the dirt above.

I believe from the evidence of faulting it is clear that the erection of the primary mound occurred not long after these burials were made. One would not expect log tombs buried at a shallow depth in the humid soil of central Georgia to remain for more than a very few years. Present experience on the Macon Plateau shows that timbers buried shallowly will be mere shells through decay and termite attacks within 10 years. Conditions could not have been much different in Indian times although pine logs were probably more resinous in that day. It is a common observation among southern lumbermen that pines growing in a mature forest develop more slowly and thus have more resin content.

Pit 55 did not show faulting and did contain 2 sherds of Dunlap Fabric Impressed and 2 of a Woodland-like grit-tempered plain ware. These sherds may be accidental inclusions and probably may have come from the filling of the pit.

Besides the physical evidence of the faulting as an argument for the late date of the submound pits, two other lines of evidence, or argument, are available. They are the location of the pits and the contents of the pits. The location of at least 6 pits, 5 of them large and containing elaborate burials, in the area directly under the primary mound argues a connection between the burials and the location of the mound. If the pits and mound were built by the same people there is a logical connection in their location. If we postulate that the burials belong to an earlier group we will have to explain why the Macon Plateau burial center was erected over the same spot. As there is no evidence of contact, or cultural continuity, between the earlier groups and the Macon Plateau group, this seems like too great a coincidence.

Finally there is the evidence of the artifacts contained in the graves. Pottery analysis remains the best method of providing

cultural identification in this area. While no whole pots were found with the burials, we were given some help by the following objects found therein: 1 conch-shell cup; many flat, disc-shell beads; a few barrel-shaped, flattened shell beads; many olivella beads; 1 circular shell gorget; 3 grooved bone pins; 2 discoidals, and 1 greenstone celt. The beads of the various types are not truly diagnostic but do suggest a Middle Mississippian group. The circular shell gorget and conch cup are more diagnostic and practically certain to belong to the Macon Plateau focus. The celt and the three bone pins have no diagnostic value, because the pins are unique in the area and because the celt is missing from the collections. But in the two stone discoidals we find a clear link with the mound-building period. These biconcave discoidals of stone are quite typical of the Macon Plateau focus and are found in other unquestionable associations. They are never found associated with the four earlier periods present in the submound humus. Thus the majority of artifacts placed in the graves as burial furniture seem to be possible Macon Plateau elements or, in the case of the discoidals, positive elements of that period. None of the objects are foreign to the early Mississippi foci.

In summary it can be said that all the evidence points toward Pits 9 and 61 being associated with one of the early complexes. Pits 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, and 86 seem, rather surely, to belong to the mound-building phase. The evidence for the late identification of these pits is: (1) The artifacts contained in them; (2) the faulting of mound fill into the pit; (3) their location in relation to the primary mound; and (4) the penetration of submound humus by one pit. It might be pointed out that the faulting would tend to destroy the evidence of whether the pits cut through the top of the submound humus. But the evidence is that the burials and their associated features belong with the mound, not with the premound occupation.

Funeral Mound Occupation

That Mound C was built by the Macon Plateau people is evident from the pottery and other artifacts that were recovered from the fill and, especially, the graves. The mound fill contained amounts of all the earlier pottery types and evidently was derived, in part, from areas formerly occupied as villages during the Stalling's Island, Dunlap, Deptford, Mossy Oak, and Swift Creek periods. The bulk of the collections from the mound fill are Macon Plateau pottery types. All material from the graves which were inclusive in the mound is Macon Plateau. Certain items, which will be discussed later; are unique for the Macon Plateau trait list and depend for their inclusion in that list upon their identification with the mound-building stage at the Funeral Mound. The fact that the clay plates covering the various mound stages were nearly pure clay of various colors reduces the number of sherds and artifacts found in the mound. Evidently barrow pits were not in heavily occupied areas.

The seven mound stages offer no evidence of being built by anyone but the same group. There is no break in type of construction or type of burial. The burials in the body of the mound and along its edges are less elaborate than those under the primary mound. It is believed that this does not reflect a change in the culture. It rather shows a reflection of the social importance of those individuals buried under the primary mound. The collections from the mound proper are not susceptible of analysis for change within the period of mound construction. If changes in ceramics, or other features, took place during the years the Funeral Mound was being built, the evidence for that change will have to come from other areas.

Collections taken in stratigraphic levels along the road area between the Funeral Mound and the Great Temple Mound consist of only four levels. Of these the lowest contains very little material. As might be expected the types for the Macon Plateau are heaviest in levels 1 and 2, those for the Ocmulgee Fields focus are heaviest in levels 3 and 4. All the sherds of the early types are predominant in the lowest levels but so few in number that the graph actually indicates little about their distribution. There is some evidence that Halstead Plain is slightly later in the Macon Plateau than the other types (Jennings and Fairbanks, 1940).

The stratigraphic survey conducted by Gordon R. Willey made a series of 15 cuts in the Mound C village area. The collections from these 15 cuts were individually small but when pooled they give respectable totals, except for level 5. As the lumped level 5 collections came to only three sherds, it can well be disregarded. Levels 3 and 4 predominate in Macon Plateau types, levels 1 and 2 in Ocmulgee Fields types. It is noticeable in this collection that Ocmulgee Fields Incised predominates in level 1 quite markedly.

These two collections were analyzed by different people and the graphs reflect slightly dissimilar interpretations of the sherds. The stratigraphic test pits were studied by Gordon R. Willey before 1938. The author analyzed the Old Road survey samples in 1940. Part of the disparity lies in the varied definitions of the pottery types, and part in the diverse sorting techniques used by each of us. The two classifications illustrate both the arbitrariness of sherd types and the extent to which typologists will disagree. There are, of course, some differences in the collections. These variations may have been caused by combining samples taken from sundry parts of the village site. The two analyses, however, have practically the same overall results.

One further comment might be made here, and will be returned to later. That is that all the evidence for the Macon Plateau as a whole indicates that we are not dealing with one cultural continuum but with at least three separate occupations. The first is a series of early periods which have been identified by their pottery complexes. These periods—Stalling's Island, Dunlap, Mossy Oak, Swift Creek, and Napier—might be regarded as separate occupations, all of minor importance. The second occupation is the major one by the Macon Plateau focus followed by a hiatus. Finally, there is the very slight Lamar occupation, perhaps grading into the Ocmulgee Fields focus.

Yet the sherd graphs show the early types from top to bottom and the late types from bottom to top. However, I do not mean to imply that there was anything like a continuous population with gradually changing pottery styles, each reaching its peak of popularity at different times. This was manifestly not the case. The upward grading of early types and the downward grading of late types is the result of both aboriginal and modern disturbances. What the graphs do show is the preponderance of occurrence of each type at the level at which it was most popular, i. e., during the time when its makers lived at the site. This is quite the opposite situation and assumption from that

used in large scale area surveys such as the Lower Mississippi Valley survey of Phillips, Ford, and Griffin (Phillips, Ford and Griffin, 1951, pp. 219–239 and ff.). In spite of the diverse populations involved and sundry types of settlements, the similar technique of graphing can be used. I hesitate to term it their serriation method because the next step of applying surface collection graphs to the basic profile has not been made.

The final phase of the mound was the development of the Old Sod in places on the slopes of the mound. It is likely that the greater portion of this sod was developed after abandonment of the Funeral Mound by its builders. It is definitely after the period of active construction and probably after the period of occupation. Following the Macon Plateau occupation there was a gap in the inhabitation of the area. This is probably represented by the Old Sod on the Funeral Mound.

The next occupation seems to have been the Lamar group. Their main village was 2½ miles southeast in the river swamps where they built a palisaded town (Jennings, 1939, pp. 45–55; also Fairbanks, 1940). The small amounts of Lamar Complicated Stamped, Lamar Bold Incised, and Lamar Plain found in the Funeral Mound excavation do not point to any heavy occupation. There were no pits, burials, or houses that could be assigned to the Lamar Period. The remains simply consist of a thin scattering of Lamar complex sherds. These may be the debris of casual camps on the area, or the result of historic Creek occupation. As Ocmulgee Fields is the direct descendant of Lamar and all the pottery types of Ocmulgee Fields grew out of Lamar, it is to be expected that some Lamar types continued into the historic period. In the case of the present Lamar collections this does not seem to be the case. There is evidence in the documents and in the excavated remains that the Creeks returned to Ocmulgee Old Fields about 1690 and were not resident here for several generations before that. If this is the case we would expect to find a full-fledged Ocmulgee Fields ceramic complex rather than a transitional Lamar-Ocmulgee Fields collection. It is probable that the Lamar sherds are the remains of a casual and temporary occupation of the plateau by the Lamar period peoples.

The Ocmulgee Fields remains are found in the new sod, or upper humus, that covered most of the mound and village site adjacent to it. They consist of some burials and quantities of pottery. No houses were found. About 1690 a band of Creeks moved back to the Ocmulgee (Ochesee Creek) from the Chattahoochee River (Kelly, 1939, pp. 328–33; also Crane, 1928, pp. 36, 38, 79; and Bolton, 1925, pp. 115–130). This event occurred either just before or just after the establishment of a trading post on the Macon Plateau by a Carolina trader. The main concentration of historic Creek remains is around the trading post stockade 1,000 feet east of the Funeral Mound. However, they also lived around the Funeral Mound and some historic burials had been placed in the slope of the mound and in the surrounding village. These burials were always intrusive through the upper humus. The stratigraphic cuts showed the Ocmulgee Fields ceramic types concentrated in the upper levels.

There is no evidence of the 19th-century Creek remains which might have been left during visits to Fort Hawkins to the north of the monument area. The 19th- and 20th-century American remains, such as intrusive post holes, have no bearing on the aboriginal occupations which are discussed here. As the purpose of this report is not to analyze American remains, they will be ignored.

ARTIFACTS AND OTHER CULTURAL ELEMENTS

In the two preceding sections the physical and the cultural stratigraphy have been discussed. This gives the picture of the physical remains as they existed at the time of the excavation of the Funeral Mound. The cultural section discussed the sequence of peoples who lived here in each of the periods represented by the physical remains. Still to be discussed are the artifacts and structural items that will tell how these people lived. In order to do that something must be said about the methods of analysis applied to the artifacts.

The most exhaustive analysis was applied to the pottery, consisting of 20,207 sherds: 1,223 from the stratigraphic pits; 8,649 from the Old Road excavations; and 10,335 from the mound and village site. The total number of sherds involved is much greater, however, as the types are based on the total collections for the Macon Plateau. These sherds were catalogued and most of them were typed from 1938 to 1943 by the author. The types were based on the total collections and served as standards for comparison in the classification of the Funeral Mound sherds. Thus the types are not restricted to the Funeral Mound alone but are based on the total occupation of the Macon Plateau.

The formulation of sherd types was the result of long experience in the field by A. R. Kelly and Gordon R. Willey, and in the laboratory by Jesse D. Jennings and the author. The types at which we were aiming were the consensus of how a particular pot was supposed to look (Phillips, Ford and Griffin, 1951, p. 62). I believe Phillips, Ford and Griffin's definition is as close to what we attempted as any. They say a type is: "a named abstraction, representing a combination of selected characters, susceptible of recognition from the sherds alone" (Phillips, Ford and Griffin, 1951, p. 66). Our work followed the pattern laid out by the Southeastern Archeological Conference held in 1938 at Birmingham, Ala., and by the subsequent type definitions issued in mimeographed form by the conference. The named pottery types used here are described in Appendix A. They are by no means standardized, and it is expected that as further analysis goes on at Macon and other sites, the types will be modified into sharper tools for the understanding of chronology and cultural processes.

No large site, in the author's experience at least, has pottery so drab and uninspired. The Macon Plateau people just were not interested in pottery decoration. Many of the jars have a strong, graceful shape but whether we can conclude, therefore, that these people were sophisticated enough to enjoy shape rather than surface elaboration, I do not know. At any rate, the pottery has very few characteristics to set it off from any other piece of baked clay. There is none of the usual incising, stamping, or punctating that make it easy to recognize the major pottery style in so many southeastern sites. Sorting depended on recognizing a series of almost intangible elements of color, paste, temper, surface, thickness, etc. It is inevitable that the judgment of the sorter will stray from the defined limits under these conditions. Nevertheless, I believe the Macon Plateau ceramic types are valid

within the framework we have erected. The earlier and later stamped and incised types are easier to sort and recognize in small sherds.

In spite of these limitations our main dependence was on the pottery. Stone traits were difficult to handle because they were less frequently associated with burials and hence less susceptible to chronological placement. Stone was much less common than pottery and many occurrences of its possible association with burials were ambiguous. For these reasons the discussion of traits other than ceramic necessarily will be somewhat limited. As analysis of other Macon Plateau components proceeds, it will certainly be possible to draw many of the nonceramic forms into a meaningful context. In each of the following discussions the pottery of that particular period will be discussed first, followed by such other traits as are available.

Stalling's Island Period

The only items that can be positively identified as belonging to this period are two pottery types: Stallings Plain and Stallings Punctate. These types have been adequately described by Claflin (Claflin, 1931), Griffin (Griffin, 1943), and Sears (Sears and Griffin, 1950, Fiber-tempered types 5 and 6), so that additional type description is not needed here. Of the 239 sherds found, only 13 occurred in a clear stratigraphic context below the mound in submound humus. These were about evenly divided between Stallings Plain (7), and Stallings Punctate (6). The remaining sherds are often too small to identify except by temper. However, both Stallings Plain and Stallings Punctate occur. At the Bilbo Site on the Georgia coast, the plain surface is earlier than any decorated but continues to the top of the midden (Waring, MS). Here there is no visible stratigraphy in the various kinds of surface treatment. The small amount of the Stalling's Island types indicates a very thin and probably sporadic occupation by that group.

It is probable that some of the heavy projectile points in the general Funeral Mound collections belong to the Stalling's Island period. None of those from the submound humus can be positively identified with it, however, and the question must be left open. It is certain that none of the burials in the submound humus are of this period.

Dunlap Period

There were 143 Dunlap Fabric Marked sherds found in the Funeral Mound excavations. They agree with the type described by Jennings and Fairbanks in 1939. Five of the sherds were found in the submound humus. This simply means that they are pre-Macon Plateau as there is no premound stratigraphic separation possible. In the original description, they were included in the Macon Plateau ceramic complex on the basis of fancied similarities to Bibb Plain in temper and color, plus a rather ambiguous distribution. This is now understood to be in error. Sears and Griffin summarize the chronological position of the type in the Southeast (Sears and Griffin, 1950). Their statement agrees well with the situation here. Dunlap Fabric Marked is probably to be found also as a member of either the Deptford or Mossy Oak complexes. However, at the Mossy Oak site across the river, it is not found with Mossy Oak Simple Stamped. Its position, while slightly ambiguous, is definitely in the early occupation of central Georgia.

Deptford Period

Two series of sherds with check stamped surface finish were found: 148 sherds of Deptford Bold Check Stamped (Caldwell and Waring, Jr., 1939) and 7 sherds of Deptford Linear Check Stamped (Ibid. Also Sears and Griffin, op. cit.). An additional four sherds with a diamond check are of late provenience, probably Lamar. Eight sherds of Deptford Bold Check Stamped were found in the submound humus. This pottery complex is much better known on the Georgia coast and in north Georgia than at Macon. At the present time no large collection of check stamped pottery has been found in central Georgia. In spite of its relative scarcity in central Georgia, it is definitely placed after the Stalling's Island period and before the Swift Creek period. As previously mentioned, the occurrence of Deptford sherds in Swift Creek sites does not prove the contemporaneity of the two complexes.

Mossy Oak Period

The Mossy Oak complex is well represented in the Funeral Mound collections by 410 sherds of Mossy Oak Simple Stamped (Jennings and Fairbanks, 1939), of which 3 came from the submound humus. There are also 209 sherds of sand-tempered plain ware that have been classified as Woodland Plain for want of a better segregation. This is a difficult group of sherds to sort, and it is possible that samples of several complexes are present. However, an apparently similar plain type was found at the Mossy Oak site associated with Mossy Oak Simple Stamped and it might as well be considered part of the complex until better typological characteristics are developed.

Mossy Oak probably followed Deptford and precedes Swift Creek in central Georgia. Again we are faced with lack of clear-cut stratigraphic evidence, but this seems to be the best answer to its various occurrences. Aside from the pottery, no traits can be directly associated with this complex at the Funeral Mound.

Swift Creek Period

Swift Creek sherds were a minority of the early types, there being only 160 Swift Creek Complicated Stamped and 68 Swift Creek Plain (Jennings and Fairbanks, 1939). There were no Swift Creek sherds in the submound humus. The Swift Creek Complicated Stamped is of the early and middle styles as defined by Kelly (Kelly, 1938, pp. 27–28).

Seven sherds of fingernail punctated style were found. They belong to the Alexander Pinched type (Griffin, 1939, pp. 136–39; Haag, 1942) of the substyle that was not really pinched but simply impressed with the fingernail. The Alexander Pinched type is almost certainly associated with the Swift Creek as they both seem to me to be associated with Copena in northern Alabama. Its position in the Lower Mississippi Valley is also consistent with this view (Phillips, Ford and Griffin, 1951, p. 72, fig. 17). The so-called Alexander series is still one of the most confusing groups of material in the southeast but it belongs in the general time period of Swift Creek.

Twenty-four cord-roughened sherds were also found. These sherds are harder to place but, in central Georgia, belong no

earlier than Swift Creek. They can, and do, occur as late as Macon Plateau and even Lamar. These sherds in question, however, on the basis of paste and temper, seem to belong to the Swift Creek period.

Eight sherds of Crooked River Complicated Stamped were found; all were from one jar—evidently a trade piece (Willey, 1949, pp. 435–36). This material seems to be at home on the northwest Florida coast and is there associated with the Santa Rosa-Swift Creek period. It is also very similar to a type that Preston Holder tentatively named St. Simons Herringbone Complicated Stamped from St. Simons Island on the Georgia coast (type collections deposited at Ocmulgee National Monument). Both occurrences seem to be well within the Swift Creek time level and there can be little doubt that Crooked River Complicated Stamped belongs with the rather thin Swift Creek occupation of the Macon Plateau.

Seven sherds of Napier Complicated Stamped were found—an extremely small number (Jennings and Fairbanks, 1939). This type seems to fall within the Swift Creek II time span or slightly later. It is nevertheless a separate complex on some sites at least. The Napier village site had large enough quantities to indicate it was a separate complex. In pits on the Macon Plateau it is mixed with either Mossy Oak or Swift Creek. It evidently represents small occupations during the Swift Creek period.

A number of artifacts from mound fill seem, on typological grounds, to belong to the earlier, premound levels. A fragmentary bone gorget with rounded ends, parallel sides and two holes, is very difficult to place but is probably from the Mossy Oak or Swift Creek level. Three heavy, trianguloid, chipped choppers were quite typical of the Swift Creek site and certainly belong in that period. There is also one fragmentary banner stone with rectangular wings. This type of atlatl weight is known to occur from late Archaic times into the Swift Creek period. It cannot be more definitely located on present evidence. A plummet of banded gray granite has a hole started at the base. It probably belongs in the Mossy Oak level but would not be out of place in either Swift Creek or with the Fabric Marked sherds. Another stone gorget is also fragmentary but seems to have been double tapered. The fragment has only one hole but probably the whole gorget had two. It is decorated with an incised design, possibly a concentric circle (see Lewis and Kneberg, 1946, Plate 68A–5). This seems to fit best in the Swift Creek period but none exactly similar is known from Swift Creek sites. Its identification rests rather on general time and style. We also have 3 steatite perforated "net sinkers" and 3 steatite vessel sherds. There is nothing really distinctive about these objects but their provenience is fairly constant. They occur in the upper levels of the Archaic, and perhaps continue as late as Swift Creek times. In view of their known occurrence in Archaic levels it is best to place them in the Stalling's Island period.

Both the ceramics and other artifacts found in the submound levels and those same types found in mound fill further the conclusions previously offered that the various premound occupations were scanty. The amount of materials simply is not great enough to account for any very permanent villages or for an occupation that would be responsible for the large submound pits. As there was no evidence of clearing of mound base before construction, we must conclude that the bulk of the premound remains are represented in the collections. The whole picture is one of very temporary camps of the pre-Macon Plateau peoples with no special concentrations. In fact, the submound humus at the Funeral Mound shows less concentration of these early remains than some other areas on the Macon Plateau. Submound Pits 9 and 61, of which only Pit 9 could possibly have been a burial pit, may belong to the early occupations. The other six are certainly Macon Plateau.

Macon Plateau Period

The Macon Plateau period is probably the best example in the Southeast of an invasion by one group into territory previously occupied by another. There is no evidence of the development of any traits in the Macon Plateau focus out of the earlier patterns found in central Georgia. It is a sharp break in the cultural sequence. We do not know how long it was between the Swift Creek occupation of the Mound C area until the arrival of the Macon Plateau people. I suspect the newcomers actually drove out the Swift Creek inhabitants. Whether they drove them away from this particular site or some point a few miles away does not make much difference in our understanding of what happened. We find remains of the invading Macon Plateau people blanketing the area.

The first thing which happened was the selection of this particular spot as the location of the burial center for the newly established village. Here the inhabitants dug large submound pits, erected log tombs, and made burials of important individuals. Very soon after these burials a mound was erected over the graves. It was a flat-topped mound and seems to have had some sort of temple on its summit. Burials were made in and around the mound, and as each mound stage was added it continued to be used as the burial center of the community. It is probable that the temples on each successive stage were primarily for burial rituals. The evidence of bone cleaning and complicated interments is sufficient to postulate elaborate rituals accompanying these operations.

Seven stages of the mound are known. It seems possible that these represent cyclical additions prescribed by some system. Or it may have been that each new chief raised a mound over the grave of his predecessor. I suspect some calendrical arrangement which required periodic rebuilding.

While the mound was in active use as a burial center, the surrounding area was part of the village. Just to the west were found the basal portions of a short section of the fortifications system of the town. This consisted of 1 and sometimes 2 large ditches which encircled the Macon Plateau village (Kelly 1939, pp. 12–14 where they are called dugouts). Thus the Funeral Mound formed an integral part of the village, although situated on the extreme western edge.

The Macon Plateau traits will be discussed in the following paragraphs. A complete list of traits, arranged by activity, will be found in Appendix D. The description of the pottery types will be found in Appendix A. Pottery will be discussed first because it seems to offer the best means of cultural identification.

Pottery

The major pottery type of the Macon Plateau focus is Bibb Plain—some 88 percent of the sherds are of this type. The formal type description is given in Appendix A and was originally written by Jennings and Fairbanks (Jennings and Fairbanks, 1939). Little can be added to this description here. It is a plain globular pot with straight, slightly flaring, or surged rim. The jars tend to be quite large but whole specimens are generally small to medium in size. Temper may be grit, shell, or shell and grit mixed. A variant that was counted had an extremely large proportion of shell temper so that it was a loose friable ware which crumbles very easily when the shell has decayed. It does not seem to differ from the more normal type except in amount of temper. The surfaces are usually carefully smoothed but rarely polished. The amount of red filming is in some question. About 0.1 percent of the Funeral Mound sherds are red filmed with an all-over fugitive red paint. These sherds were all thoroughly scrubbed in cleaning and it is very possible that in many cases the paint was removed. In other Macon Plateau collections, especially from the Middle Plateau, the proportion of red filming rises to slightly above 1 percent. It is evident that red filming is an element in the Macon Plateau ceramics. The lack of definite information on frequency has made me hesitate to set up the red filmed sherds as a separate type.

A total of 8,251 sherds of Bibb Plain were found at the Funeral Mound plus 5 whole or restorable pots. Of these 55 percent (4,538 sherds) were grit tempered, 40 percent (3,301 sherds) were shell tempered, and 5 percent (412 sherds) were mixed shell and grit tempered. Of the whole pots, 2 are shell tempered and 3 grit tempered. There were 319 sherds of the Bibb Plain Variant, the subtype with extremely abundant shell temper. From the sherd collection only 154 cases of loop handles are present, many of these fragmentary. Longitudinal grooves are common and there are often raised nodes at the top of the handles. These are usually paired but single and triple nodes are known. The whole pots are described in Appendix B. There is no evidence for any stratigraphic change in temper proportions. The only thing that can be said is that the Bibb Plain Variant is found in the lower stratigraphic cuts and seems to belong in the earliest levels of the Macon Plateau. In other words, shell temper was present from the beginning of the Macon Plateau period.

A type related to Bibb Plain is Brown's Mount Plain, not previously described. It agrees in all respects with Bibb Plain except that the form is restricted to shallow bowls with an erect modeled effigy above the rim. This is obviously a sorting type, only recognized because the rim effigies are sorted out. It is quite scarce, since there were only six effigies found, all rather crude owls. The type has been set up separately because excavation experience indicated it might have some stratigraphic significance.

Halstead Plain was a minority ware but an important one, as it furnished many of the pots found in the graves (Jennings and Fairbanks, 1940). Four whole pots and 485 sherds were found. The sherd type is described in Appendix A and the whole pots in Appendix B. This type is in many respects simply a refinement of Bibb Plain but in other respects has definitely individual characteristics. The paste is finer and grayer than Bibb Plain. Surfaces sometimes approach a sort of polished Bibb Plain but are more often a polished black. There is some red filming, obscured by over-enthusiastic washing. One case of a human effigy shows both white and red paint. The paint seems always to be either an overall red film or at least one which covers large areas. It is never a geometric or other line type of painting. This type is especially valuable to us because the effigies often show some elements of hair arrangement, etc. It does not appear to be a wholly funerary ware as numbers of sherds were found in the village refuse. However, it was used in graves to some extent. There is a suggestion in the stratigraphic series that Halstead Plain reaches its greatest popularity in the upper levels of the Macon Plateau period.

Two types of "salt pan" pottery were found in the Macon Plateau period: McDougal Plain (Jennings and Fairbanks, 1940, p. 6), and Hawkins Fabric Marked (Ibid., p. 5). These types both represent variations of a single vessel shape, the large open pan. The difference lies in the plain surface of McDougal and the fabric-marked surface of Hawkins. Some leaf-marked sherds are included in Hawkins Fabric Marked because they form a very small minority of the marked sherds (Fairbanks, 1940, pp. 65–66). The value of separating the two types, McDougal Plain and Hawkins Fabric Marked, lies solely in the sorting process. They are recognizable categories and thus are counted. There were 360 McDougal Plain sherds and 183 Hawkins Fabric Marked sherds. Stratigraphically McDougal Plain reaches its peak slightly later than Hawkins Fabric Marked. In either case the small amounts of each type in each stratigraphic level are less than a really ideal sample. There seems to be some difference between the two types in rim and lip shapes. This may also prove to have chronological significance. In passing it might be noted that these are apparently not large pans for boiling salt, as there were no salt springs near Macon. I believe they are large family eating pans like that pictured in John White's drawing of Virginia Indians (Lorant, 1946, p. 194).

The pottery type Macon Thick (Jennings and Fairbanks, 1940, p. 4) has caused more pain among some archeologists than any other of the Macon series. Various archeologists objected because some of these sherds may not be pottery vessels at all. The type as described has surfaces that are plain, stamped, incised, punctated, and cord impressed. It seems foolish to attempt a segregation of these surface finishes when the outstanding characteristic of the pottery is its thickness, together with the cylindrical shape of the vessels. I am also faced with the fact that it is quite soft and many sherds are so eroded as to make identification of surface treatment hazardous. The sherds represent pieces of deep cylindrical jars, often with incurving rims and a very restricted orifice.

There is also a group of sherds of clay balls with a small vertical hole. In some cases it is difficult to determine whether the sherds are Macon Thick or from these masses of burned clay. It may be that there is an actual series of specimens progressing from clay balls to cylindrical jars. However, I believe the sherds here discussed form a valid pottery type. There were 140 sherds—an extremely small sample. The paste and temper are rather distinctive but the sherds run in the same color range as Bibb Plain, McDougal Plain, and Hawkins Fabric Marked. There is no question but that it forms part of the Macon Plateau complex. The color range suggests the same firing conditions as the other

Macon types. The peculiar form and heavy execution suggest some special use. I cannot imagine what this use could be. In lighter moments I am tempted to say Macon Thick jars were made by men unaccustomed to pottery manufacture, perhaps for some exclusively male activity.

There is one fragmentary ladle that seems to belong to the Macon Thick type but is quite aberrant in shape. It is much thinner and may actually be a toy. Texture, color, and surface are similar to the Macon Thick sherds.

Fragments of pottery pipes are frequent but only a few were sufficiently complete to give any idea of the shape. Pipes apparently were not very common. One type of pipe is made of pottery very similar to Bibb Plain of the shell-tempered variety. It has a somewhat barrel-shaped bowl set at a slightly oblique angle to the stem. The stem is expanded slightly with a large orifice at the proximal end. There is a flattened and rounded projection of the stem beyond the bowl (see plate 21 E). The other identifiable type is slimmer, with obliquely set bowl and a long tapering stem that is slightly flattened. It seems to have ended in a subconical mouthpiece and had a pointed projection beyond the bowl. The bowl was sometimes finished with castellations and red filming seems to have been fairly common, if the number of red filmed fragments is a valid check. Only one pipe, of the first type, was found with a burial and the pipe complex is somewhat hazy. All seem to be of the projecting stem type, however.

The miscellaneous pottery objects category includes a few odds and ends. Most numerous are discs cut from Bibb Plain sherds. None are associated with graves but the fact that they are cut from Bibb Plain seems to place them in the Macon Plateau period. There is also a small spherical clay bead and a spool-shaped ear ornament with expanded lips. Several fragments of baked clay balls seem to be parts of the objects mentioned in the discussion of Macon Thick. They appear to have been masses of clay, shaped only with the hands and still showing finger marks, that had a vertical hole through them. Some may be pieces of baked clay from house plastering. None are definite enough to dignify by a name. The term "pottery standard" has been used for them and seems to be as good as any. There is one disc-shaped head for a mushroom-form pottery "trowel." A pottery trowel of this kind is known to be found in the Macon Plateau period and this specimen is similar to shell tempered Bibb Plain in texture. In all, ceramics were chiefly used for jars but a few other objects were made of this material. While not common, pipes were the most abundant of the pottery objects. Other objects were classified as both tools and ornaments.

Stone Objects

Stone objects were much less abundant than pottery fragments and on the whole much less satisfactory as objects for cultural analysis. This is partly because stone artifacts have not yet generally been satisfactorily assigned to cultural complexes in central Georgia. The chipped stone forms did not occur as burial furniture and, at the Funeral Mound, have not been in direct association with Macon Plateau materials. There is a good deal of white and pink quartz in the local red clay, remaining after the decay of the mother rocks. Many miscellaneous pieces of quartz are thus of no concern to the analysis as there is no evidence that they were brought there, much less used, by the Indians. The following discussion will treat of rough, chipped, and ground stone categories. The complete listing appears in Appendix D. The majority of objects come from mound fill collections and cannot certainly be associated with the Macon Plateau period.

Chipped Stone.—Of the large blades there were two types: oval (or lanceolate) and triangular. There were 34 oval or lanceolate blades ranging from over 75 millimeters to about 25 millimeters in length. They are generally heavy and show mainly percussion chipping, and may well be quarry blanks. Many are heavily patinated. They are shown in Plate 26. These are a rather common form and certainly not greatly specialized or very characteristic. If they do pertain to any one horizon more than another it is to the Archaic. These large blades certainly should not be considered as especially characteristic of the Macon Plateau complex.

There were 15 triangular blades from 50 to 107 millimeters in length. Many are unpatinated or only very thinly patinated. Chipping is generally heavy and again, they appear to be unfinished. They are probably only variants of the blades discussed above (see plate 27). Again I doubt that they should be considered fully typical of the Macon Plateau complex.

There are a number of projectile point forms, both stemmed and triangular. In these cases we are faced with lack of good evidence as to which forms are actually associated with Macon Plateau materials. There are only five medium-sized triangular points (25 millimeters long), fairly broad with convex sides and either straight or concave bases. They are generally thick and are definitely not the usual Late Mississippian type (see plate 26 R). Most do not show any sign of patination and, in spite of their relative infrequency, I believe they belong to the Macon Plateau complex. The other form of triangular projectile point had straight sides and either straight or concave bases of which there were 10, ranging from 35 to 58 millimeters in length. They are generally thinner than the other triangular type and slightly better chipped. One is quartz, the others are flint. The flint specimens are sometimes, but not always, patinated. These I also suspect belong to the Macon Plateau complex (see plate 26 M to Q). No small Late Mississippian forms were found except in the upper humus level.

Notched and stemmed forms are much more numerous and varied than the triangular forms. These forms are shown in Plate 27. The most common (63) are medium in size, average 58 millimeters long, with a narrow stem and either straight or sloping shoulders. They are generally of flint and show some patination, so that they appear white. The flints actually are gray and tan. The points are sometimes asymmetric but not markedly so. I suspect these are not truly characteristic of the Macon Plateau complex. The next group numerically are 39 fairly broad points. Stems are straight or slightly tapered. They are perhaps slightly less patinated than the previous group. Their resemblance to Archaic types suggests that they belong to the earlier level.

There are 26 points which have side or diagonal notches. There is some variation in form but all have edges beveled from opposite faces. This is a form called the "spinner point" in the belief that the beveling was an aboriginal attempt at rifling. It

seems doubtful that it would spin the arrow and I suspect the points were actually knife points. At least the opposite bevel makes a handy tool for cutting and shaving. This form is known to occur in the Archaic and perhaps in later horizons. It cannot be certainly identified with the Macon Plateau period.

There were 14 large (up to 70 millimeters in length) asymmetric points with sloping shoulders and stems. These forms surely belong to the Archaic and it is extremely doubtful if they can be identified with the Macon Plateau level. Many of them are chipped from slate and shale as is typical of many Archaic points. They are large enough to be dart points.

Ten side-notched points average 40 millimeters long. They are often patinated but not very heavily. The sides tend to be straight and the base slightly convex. The sides sometimes show regular notches or serrations. These forms appear white from patination but are almost all of tan flint. They quite certainly belong to the Macon Plateau complex. Only two diagonal notched points are recorded. They are of colored flints and are quite thin. I suspect that they belong to the Swift Creek complex, which was represented by sherds in the collections.

In summary, the projectile point complex of the Macon Plateau period at the Funeral Mound is not at all clear. Further work must be done in identifying types and working out associations at other areas where the picture is less confused. The larger types seem fairly well placed in the Archaic horizon. The medium sized triangular and stemmed or notched forms seem pretty certain to belong to the Macon Plateau period. There were no small Late Mississippian points such as occur in the historic Creek levels. From the evidence at the Funeral Mound it is far from clear whether the Macon Plateau people used the bow and arrow or the dart and throwing-stick. I suspect from the size of the points and the lack of throwing-stick weights that the bow was in use.

Five drills were found: 2 cruciform, 1 simple, and 2 very slender triangular ones. All show patination on the various colored flints of which they were made. They are the sort of ambiguous forms that can belong to almost any level in the Southeast. The cruciform pattern is found in the Archaic and may be confined to that horizon. None can surely be assigned to the Macon Plateau focus on the basis of present evidence.

There were in all 37 scrapers: 13 circular uniface, 14 triangular uniface, and 10 triangular side scrapers. All are of various flints and are mostly tan with patination. All are thick flakes with one or two faces still retaining the major flake scar. Secondary chipping consists of small retouches along one or more margins from one face only. These forms are found widely in almost all levels in Georgia and cannot be considered diagnostic at the present time.

There were two flakes with small notches along the sides. They may be saws or simply accidental productions. There were also 101 small flakes that show no signs of secondary retouch and very probably are simply scrap from flint chipping. This sort of flake is extremely common on early sites and probably most of them represent remains of the earlier groups at the Funeral Mound. There were also 47 broken blades which cannot be definitely typed. They probably represent pieces of large stemmed or stemless blades, an early feature.

It is certain that all the chipped forms do not belong to the Macon Plateau component at the Funeral Mound. Just what characteristic forms make up the chipped stone category of the Macon Plateau period is not yet certain. It can be said, however, that there is enough evidence to show that chipped stone was not of great importance to the technology of these people.

Ground Stone.—Celts were fairly common but occurred rarely as grave goods. Fifteen complete and broken specimens are represented in the collections. The form is typically the one shown in Plate 21A with generally convex sides, although straight sides do occur also. The cross section is oval, the poll always narrowed. The bit is usually convex but in some cases is nearly straight. Material is about evenly divided between a gray slate and a green compact slate. This latter slate seems to range considerably in hardness but is probably hard enough to serve as actual tools in the examples found. There are also two examples of a type of plano-convex adz in which the under side is flat while the upper side is slightly humped. The sides are tapered, usually straight, to a narrow, truncate poll. Both cases were made from a compact green slate.

There is also a greenstone spud 52 centimeters long. It has a bilobate bit and cylindrical shaft which tapers to a blunted poll. The bit is flattened. About one-quarter of the distance from the poll there is a band of scratches around the shaft that appear to be hafting marks. The material is a rather soft green slate or siltstone. It appears too soft for a useful tool and is evidently a ritual object. This spud was found in a pit adjacent to the Funeral Mound. There was no evidence of a burial in the pit nor other artifacts associated with this specimen.

Three bi-concave discoidals were found, two with the multiple burial in submound Pit 54. They range from 70 to 92 millimeters in diameter and 28 to 32 millimeters in thickness. The largest one is made from tan quartzite and is nicely polished, especially on the edges. The two smaller ones are made from a soft tan stone, perhaps a clay stone. The edges are polished but the concavities are not especially smooth. There are also two smaller discoidals or discs with flat faces.

A rude effigy, or perhaps an unfinished pipe, is carved from a hard white material that appears to be kaolinite. It was evidently never finished and it is difficult to say what the carver had in mind, perhaps a bird. There is also a piece of worked hematite showing grinding facets. This is evidently a hematite stone which was ground in the process of paint making. It seems safe to assume it is the source of some of the red paint found on Bibb Plain and Halstead Plain pottery.

Among the grinding stones there are 4 milling stones, 10 mullers, and 5 whetstones. The milling stones are simply flattish sandstone pebbles with shallow depressions in each flat face. They were probably used in connection with the mullers which are rectanguloid, roughly pecked to shape and ground flat on two faces. This is a type that is found at least as far back as the Swift Creek period but they may continue into the Macon Plateau period. They are not, however, numerous enough to grind all the corn of a fully agricultural group. Wooden mortars of the southeastern type were probably in use during this period. There were in addition five thin, flat pieces of sandstone slabs which

appear to be whetstones. The edges are somewhat beveled and there are small shallow depressions in the flat faces.

The gorgets and banner stones of the earlier occupations have already been discussed. The amount of, and execution of, ground stone in the Macon Plateau period indicates a well-developed ground stone complex. Celts were the most common article with discoidals next. The green slate used for the celts and the spud is not a local stone, and trade from elsewhere is indicated.

Rough Stone.—Objects of rough stone classification are difficult to handle in analysis because their nature makes it doubtful if any of them are actually artifacts. In many cases it is difficult to decide what uses some of them could have had. The largest numbers, however, are clearly hammerstones. Nineteen battered river pebbles were found, which may date back to the Archaic horizon where that type of tool was known. They also probably extend up to the Macon Plateau period as they seem a handy tool for many unspecialized jobs. There were seven small quartz pebbles, not definitely artifacts. These are not, however, the angular quartz pebbles found in the local clay. They are rounded and water-worn and seem to have been brought to the site from somewhere else. They are, perhaps, pottery polishing stones. There were two quartz crystals showing no signs of work which also must have been brought to the area. Little information can be gleaned from these rough stone objects.

Metal

The only metal considered here is that which belonged to the Macon Plateau period. The other, European metal, will be discussed in the section devoted to the Ocmulgee Fields occupation. These Macon Plateau copper ornaments have already been described in the section dealing with the burials. They were found with Burial 57 in Pit 66 of Mound V and thus can surely be identified with the Macon Plateau period. They seem to be unique specimens and I know of no close parallels. The copper has not been analyzed but is presumably native copper. It is certainly handled in aboriginal fashion. Cut animal jaws are found in Hopewell mounds but I know of none of this type. The sheet ornaments do not resemble the Hopewell ornaments nor do they resemble the elaborate anthropomorphic copper ornaments of the Southern Cult.

The following Creek migration legend, as recorded by Gatschet, gives an account that may explain the special significance of the puma jaws.

> The Coosaws complained that they were preyed upon by a wild beast, which they called man-eater or lion, which lived in a rock.
>
> The Cussitaws said they would try to kill the beast. They digged a pit and streached over it a net made of hickory bark. They then laid a number of branches, crosswise, so that the lion could not follow them, and going to the place where he lay, they threw a rattle into his den. The lion rushed forth, in great anger, and pursued them through the branches. Then they thought it better that one should die rather than all, so they took a motherless child, and threw it before the lion, as he came near the pit. The lion rushed at it, and fell in the pit, over which they threw the net, and killed him with blazing pinewood. His bones, however, they keep to this day; on one side, they are red, on the other, blue.
>
> The lion used to come every seventh day to kill the people. Therefore, they remained there seven days after they had killed him. In remembrance of him, when they prepare for war, they fast six days and start on the seventh. If they take his bones with them, they have good fortune. (Gatschet, 1884, p. 248.)

This points to a legendary basis for the special regard and preservation of puma remains. It may account for the objects here under consideration. To follow the legend and consider these objects as the sacred relics carried to war would be to regard the copper plates as representative of the puma's ears. They could represent ears but are not really much like them. While interesting, the copper objects are not of special significance in indicating cultural relationships. Another pair of copper-covered puma jaws was found in a pit on the Mound D Plateau to the east of Mound C. There can be no doubt that they form a regular element of Macon Plateau culture.

Shell Objects

Shell was quite abundant in the Funeral Mound and formed one of the important items of burial furniture. Two large, unmodified conch (whelk) shells were found with burials. There was also a conch cup made by removing the *columella* of a large conch. This conch cup is an element of the Southern Cult in its engraved form (Waring, 1945, p. 19). The example here is completely plain without any decoration. I believe the conch cup is evidence of the use of the Black Drink or cassena tea (*Ilex vomitoria*). The majority of early writers who describe the drinking of cassena tea on ceremonial occasions indicate it was served in the conch cup. The fact that the custom of drinking cassena tea was so widespread in the Southeast indicates that it has some antiquity. I believe we can take the cup as evidence of the existence of this trait at Macon Plateau levels.

One burial had several unworked fresh-water mussel shells and one had five eliptical, double pointed cut sections of mussel shells. I suppose these are to be considered gorgets although they show no perforation. The unworked mussel shells may be spoons or simply raw materials. There were 3 conch gorgets—2 large, and 1 small and somewhat oval. One large shell has two central perforations. The other has no perforations but the edge is notched. The small oval gorget has a single central perforation. The gorgets are so simple that little can be learned about their cultural relationships. It is worth noting that the shell work, like the pottery, is generally not decorated.

There were four types of shell beads associated with Macon Plateau burials. Small olivella (*Olivella mutica say*) beads were made by grinding down the apex of the shell to the interior opening. These were very numerous, thousands occurring with a single submound burial. They were scattered generally throughout the burial area and suggest that they were sewn on cloaks or robes. Marginella (*Marginella apicina menke*) beads are less common, only a few having been found. They were treated in the same way by grinding off the apex or a portion of the wing. Large disc shell beads were abundant and occurred with five burials. They were cut from the wing of the conch, and are like disc beads found in many foci. Another type of cut bead was found with only one burial. While not so common, it seems to be typical of the Macon Plateau period. It was cut from the wing of the conch and formed a long bead with a flattened barrel shape and truncated ends. The bead types are shown in Plate 22. They point to no particular cultural relationships but do indicate rather extensive trade with the south Atlantic coast and possibly the gulf coast where these shells grow. The

fresh-water shells are all types found in the Ocmulgee-Altamaha system.

Bone Objects

Bone is very rare at the Funeral Mound and on the Macon Plateau as a whole. This is certainly due in large part to the extreme acidity of the clay soils, heavy rainfall and high temperatures. However, it does seem that the small amounts of bone encountered may reflect the unpopularity of this material for tools and ornaments. The only artifacts are a single form of bone pin of which three examples were found with one submound burial. It is fashioned from a splinter of long bone ground down to a subrectangular, or round, cross section. The basal end is encircled by shallow grooves. They seem more likely to have been ornaments, perhaps hairpins, than utilitarian objects. The village site excavations show virtually no bone remains and only one bone tool. It is a long slender awl, or pin, made from a sliver of long bone without grooves or other modification except for the grinding of the point. Field notes frequently mention bone beads "of the usual type" as being found with burials. There are no bone beads in the collections and I am sure these were the shell beads previously described.

Wood and Fibers

Wood was extensively used but has decayed to such an extent that specific identification is impossible. Log tombs or cribs were built around the submound burials and some of the burials higher in the mound were provided with wood or bark covers. Posts were set in the summit platforms and evidently represent the remains of temples. Split cane was used for basketry, probably frequently, although only one fragment is preserved. The dirt of the mounds was almost certainly carried to the site in baskets. There is some evidence of an open twined fabric in the impressions on Hawkins Fabric Marked "salt pans." One has the impression of a closely woven twined fabric. The cord seems to be double strand and both right and left twists are present. The twining is always right hand twist as far as can be determined. All the fabric represented could have been, and probably was, produced on the suspended warp loom.

Subsistence

By rights this section should come at the beginning of the present discussion. It is left until now because of the archeological preoccupation with ceramics. Very little information is available from the Funeral Mound excavations as to the subsistence pattern. But we do know from other components of the Macon Plateau focus that these peoples were fully agricultural, in the American Indian sense. Corn was the main crop and may have been cultivated in rows. Beans, pumpkins, and tobacco were the other important crops. Hunting and collecting added important items to the diet. The root of the smilax formed an important starch element to supplement the cultivated forms. The agricultural economy, of course, is strongly reflected in all aspects of the community. There is so little food bone refuse at the Funeral Mound that it certainly does not give an adequate picture of their hunting practices. Deer seem to have been the main animal represented but smaller animals and birds were probably used.

Community Plan and Architecture

As previously pointed out, the Macon Plateau town was located on a low plateau above the river flood plain at a point near the fall line where trails crossed the river. It was protected by two wide, deep ditches and perhaps by a wall in addition. Temple mounds were scattered around the edges of the town and just outside. It is probable that the bulk of residences were in the fields scattered up and down the river. There may have been a large square in the center but any evidence of it has been destroyed by the railroad cut. I think it more probable that there was no central court but a series of smaller squares at each mound. The western edge of the town was devoted to burial practices.

Flat-topped pyramidal, or oval, mounds were built in stages. These stages were capped with hard clay plates of varying colored clays. On top of the various stages were important public buildings, presumably rectangular and of the small-log type. Near some mounds were circular earth lodges (see Fairbanks, 1946). Mound platforms were covered periodically with fine sand. They also may have been protected from erosion by encircling curbs. Palisades around the tops are a distinct possibility. Stepped ramps were the normal means of access to the mound summits. Buildings were of pole (small-log) construction, thatched, and perhaps daubed in spots.

Burial Practices

The western mound of the town was, partly or mainly, concerned with burial of the dead. Important individuals were buried in log tombs in the area in which the mound was later built. There is a suggestion of retainer burial in the multiple burials. Later individuals were buried in and around the mound. Bodies might be buried in the flesh, but the bulk were either wholly or partially cleaned of flesh. Burial positions were extended deposits of cleaned bones (rearticulated skeletons), bundles, a few flexed, and a few completely cremated. They were accompanied by grave goods consisting of both ornaments and useful tools and pottery vessels, the latter presumably containing food. It may be assumed that the temples on the various Funeral Mound platforms were locations of burial rituals. There is some suggestion, as in the case of the large post hole in the primary mound, that a scaffold may have been erected prior to, or during, mound construction. The nonmaterial implications of this burial complex will be discussed later more fully.

Dress, Ornament, and Art Forms

In Appendix D the items listed under these categories will be more exhaustively itemized. I think it sufficient here to point out that there is evidence of cloaks covered with shell bead appliques and suggestions that clothing had rank attributes. The important submound burials showed much larger amounts of shell beads than later burials. Ornaments consisted of shell beads and gorgets, copper ornaments, and bone pins. One burial had a leg band of shell beads below the knee. One water bottle shows the use of body paint: body, or at least the torso, red; face, white. The hair might be combed straight back from the forehead or more elaborately arranged. In one case, represented by a water bottle, the hair was parted in the middle and forms a roll along each side. Ears were often pierced on water bottles, and one pottery spool-shaped ear ornament is indicated.

In the matter of art forms, one dominant pattern is seen—the plainness of all objects. The pottery is predominantly plain, even in more finished types. Shell cups and gorgets are unornamented. We do get a little incised decoration on Macon Thick, some stamping and some cord impressing. There is also a very little effigy work. But I think it is obvious that the Macon Plateau people were sophisticated enough to appreciate plain, undecorated forms. The cultural level was elaborate enough to allow considerable decoration. They were undoubtedly in communication with people who produced pottery with beautiful surface decorations. The elaborateness of the burial complex and the massiveness of the temple mound construction indicates considerable energy applied to nonproductive ends. In short, I think they liked their pottery plain and could appreciate gracefully proportioned jars and plain surfaced shell gorgets.

Physical Type

Not a single measurable skull can be identified in the collections as belonging to the Macon Plateau period at the Funeral Mound. This is unfortunate as field photographs indicate many burials to have been in at least fair shape. Therefore, at present nothing can be said about physical type.

In summary the Macon Plateau component at Mound C presents the burial complex, with certain additional village elements, of an Early Mississippian group. It is far from a complete trait list for the community as a whole. However, the trait list in Appendix D will serve as a preliminary definition of the Macon Plateau focus and thus of the period. The pattern of life as it emerges is discussed in the section, "Life at the Site." Temporal positions and other southeastern groups related to the Macon Plateau focus are discussed in "Affiliations of the Macon Plateau Focus." The allusion here given to Macon Plateau traits not found at the Funeral Mound but occurring at other components is simply an attempt to round out the picture of the cultural entity which existed here.

Lamar Period

There is a major Lamar period site only 2½ miles below the Funeral Mound and another smaller Lamar site almost immediately across the river (the Central City Park Site). Yet there is an extremely small amount of Lamar period pottery at the Funeral Mound. Lamar complex pottery types present were:

Types	Number of Sherds	Percent
Lamar Plain	371	70.0
Lamar Complicated Stamped	64	12.1
Lamar Bold Incised	92	17.3
Mercier Check Stamped	3	0.6
Total Lamar Complex	530	100.0

Source: (Sears, 1951a, p. 32).

This is only 2.6 percent of the total sherds of the Funeral Mound collections. It indicates a very light occupation during the Lamar period. As the Lamar period forms an evolutionary sequence with Ocmulgee Fields period it is very possible that some Lamar sherds actually belong on the Ocmulgee Fields end of the ranges of the several pottery types. This is especially possible with Lamar Plain and Lamar Bold Incised, less possible with Lamar Complicated Stamped and Mercier Check Stamped which do not have comparable types in the Ocmulgee Fields horizon. At the present time we postulate a gap of some 250 years between the end of Macon Plateau and the beginning of Lamar. This is the period of the Etowah and Savannah complexes. It is possible that the small showing of Lamar sherds may be due to the Lamar period Indians having avoided the area for religious reasons. The large mounds might well have been objects of awe, and the evidence of Adair shows that even in the 18th century, Ocmulgee Fields was reputed to be the home of poltergeists and other spirits (Adair, 1775, p. 35). At any rate little cultural analysis is possible with the Lamar remains.

Ocmulgee Fields Period

The Ocmulgee Fields or Historic Creek occupation at the Funeral Mound area is much heavier than any of the early complexes or the Lamar occupation. It constitutes, in fact, a major occupation. The remains consist of burials, pottery, and some artifacts. No houses were identified and it is possible that the main village was to the east around the Carolinian trading post. The burials have been described in the section devoted to the village site adjacent to the Funeral Mound. Traits that can be identified with the Ocmulgee Fields component are summarized in Appendix D. Here it might be said that the trade objects, (mostly beads) are those which would be expected in the period from 1685 to 1716. Iron knives, copper cones (janglers), brass hawk bells, and some pieces of musket parts make up the list of trade objects. It is probable that all the materials are of English origin. However, one sherd of untyped Spanish Majolica was found at the trading post site. The large, tubular shell beads were made from the core of the conch. Two examples of conch cores in process of manufacture were found with infant burials. Some of the pits showed charred fragments of corn kernels but they were too small for further analysis.

Sherds make up the bulk of the collection, with all the Ocmulgee Fields types represented. They are as follows:

Types	Number of Sherds	Percent
Ocmulgee Fields Plain	2,190	31.7
Ocmulgee Fields Incised	1,654	23.9
Walnut Roughened	2,971	42.9
Kasita Red Filmed	102	1.5
Total Ocmulgee Fields Complex	6,917	100.0

These sherds were concentrated in the upper levels of the stratigraphic blocks, as would be expected. The fact that they also appear in levels of the Macon Plateau period is evidence of disturbances, not cultural evolution from Macon Plateau to Ocmulgee Fields. Actually the total picture is that of a discontinuous occupation with nearly 600 years between the two occupations. The types have been described previously and the description need not be repeated here (Jennings and Fairbanks, 1939, 1940). As far as I can see the sherd graphs show no differential concentration of Ocmulgee Fields types. Actually the

Ocmulgee Fields occupation is probably all in the humus and is a disturbed deposit.

The Ocmulgee Fields types are all evolutionary products derived from Lamar types. Thus Ocmulgee Fields Incised grew out of Lamar Bold Incised, Walnut Roughened out of Lamar Complicated Stamped, and Ocmulgee Fields Plain out of Lamar Plain, plus being the plain areas on Ocmulgee Fields Incised bowls. Kasita Red Filmed is an outgrowth of a rare, and unnamed, Lamar red or red and white filmed type. There is also one sherd of Kasita Red Filmed that also has black painted lines. The Kasita Red Filmed plates often have ring feet and in many ways remind one of the Spanish plate form. There is evidently some Spanish influence in this period in native ceramics.

The Walnut Roughened brushed or stippled forms are more of a problem. The Lamar Complicated Stamped has usually the appearance of a roughened surface without any coherent stamp elements visible. It is tempting to derive the rough surface of Walnut Roughened from Lamar Complicated Stamped. However, the great area of distribution of brushed surfaces lies in the Lower Mississippi Valley and southwestward, with such a type as Plaquemine Brushed (Quimby, 1951 pp. 109–111, fig. 12. See also Ford, 1951, pp. 85–6, Plate 21, i–n) which is identified with the Natchez.

Further to the west a brushed type is included in Dunkin Incised by Kreiger (Newell and Kreiger, 1949, pp. 114–116, fig. 44 a–e). This brushed subtype was once called Box Creek Brushed and Box Creek Cross-Brushed but was later included in the Dunkin Incised type. Two characteristics separate the Plaquemine Brushed and Dunkin Incised forms from the eastern types. Plaquemine Brushed and Dunkin Incised both seem to have been brushed on the upper portion of the jars, while Walnut Roughened is brushed on the lower part, or sometimes on the whole vessel. Also the Dunkin Incised brushing is a fine multiple incising rather than the type of random brushing and stippling found on the eastern type.

The wide distribution and variety of forms of brushing in the Mississippi Valley and further west in Texas argue for the center of dispersion to lie in that direction. The particular type of brushing in Walnut Roughened, however, seems to be an outgrowth of, and an end product of, the progressive deterioration of complicated stamping in the Southeast. In Georgia and Florida, Walnut Roughened is related to Chattahoochee Brushed (Bullen, 1950, p. 103, figs. 10 e, 11 b–d) and Stokes Brushed (Goggin, 1949, p. 37) which are identified with the Lower Creek and Seminole of the 18th and early 19th centuries.

In all, brushed surfaces are characteristic of the historic or late prehistoric groups from Texas almost to the Atlantic coast. The historic Creek pots from Oklahoma of the late 19th century are also brushed (Quimby and Spoehr, 1950, pp. 249–51, and Schmitt, 1950, pp. 3–8). They seem to be related more closely to Plaquemine Brushed and Dunkin Incised than to Walnut Roughened as far as the quality of the brushing is concerned. I suspect the brushing of the recent Creeks in Oklahoma is derived from the brushing of the Mississippi Valley.

Chipped stone seems to be confined to a small triangular projectile point, 20 millimeters long with straight base and slightly serrated sides. The basal corners project slightly. Bottle glass was used for end scrapers of the thumbnail type. Ground stone objects are not known from the Funeral Mound component of the Ocmulgee Fields period. Bone tools are almost completely lacking. Only one is surely identified—a long sliver bone awl without any special identifying characteristics. As pointed out in the discussion of historic burials, the shell bead type is a large heavy tubular bead of conch columella, found in Late Mississippi complexes, such as Etowah and Kolomoki.

In brief the Ocmulgee Fields Component at the Funeral Mound is part of a rather extensive village of the Ocmulgee Town of the Lower Creeks during the period around the beginning of the 18th century. It is not the complete remains of that town but represents several elements of it. Burials and pottery are the chief items of culture found. A complete analysis of the focus must wait on description of the remains around the trading post to the east. It is the last aboriginal occupation at the site and is followed by remains of the extensive white occupation which blanketed the area and destroyed much of the Indian remains.

Affiliations of the Macon Plateau Focus

The Macon Plateau focus is one element of the Early Mississippian or Temple Mound I time level (Ford and Willey, 1941, pp. 344–52). It represents the Mississippian pattern in its simple form without the addition of elaborately incised pottery, negative painting, elaborate vessel forms, or small triangular projectile points. It is characterized by temple mounds, small-log type of construction of temples, predominantly plain pottery, and full agriculture, including corn.

In the Southeast there are three representatives of this Early Mississippian complex: Macon Plateau; Norris Basin (Webb, 1938); and Hiwassee Island (Lewis and Kneberg, 1946). Each has its own peculiarities and probably differs slightly in time. Neither the Small-log Town-house group in the Norris Basin or the Hiwassee Island focus had any burial complex and thus comparisons with the Funeral Mound component are difficult. The Macon Plateau focus seems to represent a more elaborate community in that seven mounds are present and the burial complex is known. In the following discussion, traits from the rest of the Macon Plateau site will be mentioned where it is necessary to fill in details absent at the Funeral Mound but known to form part of the focus.

Norris Basin

The Small-log Town-house sites of the Norris Basin have been described by Webb (Webb, 1938) while the pottery was analyzed by James B. Griffin (Griffin, 1938, pp. 253–58). The sites in which this complex was found were: No. 2, Bowman Farm Mounds; No. 4, McCarty Farm Mounds; No. 5, Irvin Village Site; No. 6, Hill Farm Stone Mounds; No. 8, Richardson Farm Mound; No. 9, Harris Farm Mounds; and No. 17, Lea Farm Village and Mounds (Webb, op. cit.). In all these sites the general ceremonial structure type was one which Webb has defined as the "Small-log" type. This is well represented at Macon in structures at Mound D (the Cornfield Mound) and between Mounds A and B (Kelly, 1939, p. 10). It was also probably the type of structure on top of the various levels at the Funeral Mound. Unfortunately, it cannot be described from the

small scraps remaining of the Funeral Mound. At Macon there is an additional type of ceremonial structure, the circular earth lodge (Fairbanks, 1946). This forms a paired religious structure pattern with the Small-log type for the rectangular structures. This pairing is suggestive of Creek squares and "hot houses" of the historic period.

The major pottery type as described by Griffin for the Norris Basin sites is highly similar to Bibb Plain. Bibb Plain is usually more reddish than the Norris Basin sherds and shows less often the angled inner surfaces of the rim. It has loop handles exclusively and these are greatly similar, even identical, with those described and figured from the Small-log sites. The Norris Basin pottery was exclusively shell tempered whereas the Macon Plateau pottery may be either shell or grit tempered. In spite of the dependence placed on temper as a cultural determinant, it does not seem too important in this comparison in view of the near identity of the two types. There is an appreciable amount of this pottery in the Norris Basin that is cord marked. This type is also known at Macon Plateau but is extremely rare. I suggest that this is perhaps a local or temporal difference. If it is a time factor, the difference in temper may also be an indication of age.

The sites in both the Norris Basin and the Macon Plateau show minor amounts of red filmed pottery with the same general paste as the dominant pottery type. They both also show the presence of some textile-marked "salt pans." The Norris Basin sites apparently lack the plain "salt pan" of the type McDougal Plain which is present at Macon Plateau. The type Halstead Plain is not described in the Norris Basin sample by Griffin but effigy heads were apparently present. Macon Thick is also not present in Norris Basin. Thus the basic pattern of Norris Basin and Macon Plateau ceramics is highly similar. The differences are that the Small-log sites in the Norris Basin have considerably more cord-marked pottery, less plain "salt pans," exclusively shell-tempered ware, no Macon Thick sherds, and perhaps less of the Halstead Plain type.

In regard to other remains, the Small-log sites offer a number of similarities with that of the Macon Plateau. Discoidals of stone and stone discs are present in at least the Irvin, Harris, and Lea sites. Pottery discs are mentioned for only the Lea site, but the other sites often yielded very little material and it is perhaps not surprising that they are not mentioned. Projectile points for these three sites are both stemmed and medium sized triangular points not radically different from those at the Funeral Mound. Perforated shell hoes are often described, especially for the Harris site. These are foreign to the Funeral Mound component. Celts, where described, have a thick, oval, cross section form. They are similar to those found with burials at the Funeral Mound but are somewhat thicker and not as well finished. From the Lea site a stemmed pipe is illustrated that is somewhat similar to the large stemmed form at the Funeral Mound. Both series of sites seemed to be marked by the same two absences—lack of incised pottery and of small, triangular projectile points—except where those elements can be presumed to belong to later components at the sites. As many Funeral Mound component traits are burial complex elements, the agreement is sufficient to postulate a rather close relationship between the Small-log Town-house sites of Norris Basin and the Macon Plateau focus.

Hiwassee Island

The Hiwassee Island focus is described by Lewis and Kneberg as another Early Mississippi focus highly similar to the Small-log Town-house focus (Lewis and Kneberg, 1946). The ceremonial structures on the successive mound stages are of the Small-log type but more elaborate and varied. There is no burial complex but considerable information about village remains. The closest relationships are shown to Macon Plateau, as well as to the Small-log sites in Norris Basin, in the ceramics. The predominant pottery is a shell tempered type highly similar to Bibb Plain. This has an occurrence of 87.8 percent in the submound humus and 57.7 percent in the top mound level of pure Hiwassee Island component (Phase E 1). The percentage of cord-marked surface on the same type jar rises from 3 percent in the submound humus to 19.7 percent in the last Hiwassee Island phase. Other types present throughout the Hiwassee Island period were: Textile-impressed "salt pans" (7.5 percent to 9.3 percent), red filmed (1 percent to 1.7 percent), and Hiwassee Island Red on Buff (0.03 percent to 3.4 percent). A new type, Hiwassee Island Complicated Stamped, began in Phase F and continued to the top. It is shell tempered but highly similar in design and vessel form with Etowah Complicated Stamped. The whole ceramic complex is highly similar to Macon Plateau except for the addition of Hiwassee Island Complicated Stamped, Hiwassee Island Red on Buff (late types), and the increased amounts of cord marked. The plain "salt pan," similar to McDougal Plain, is absent as is Halstead Plain.

Other similarities with Macon Plateau are the presence of mushroom form pottery trowels, chipped-stone projectile points corresponding in general to Macon types, similar celts but somewhat less finished, and hematite pieces rubbed for pigment. Lewis and Kneberg experienced the same trouble determining what projectile points belonged with Hiwassee Island as I have for Macon Plateau. Items at Hiwassee Island not found at Macon are: Elaborate structures, stone pendants, pestles, pipes of short stemmed form, mica, bone tools, and shell hoes. The weaving techniques in both sites seem to be very much alike.

From the stratigraphic information on Hiwassee Island certain conclusions can be drawn concerning the relative time of the three foci, Small-log Town-house of Norris Basin, Hiwassee Island, and Macon Plateau. Lewis and Kneberg state that their analysis showed "that the Early Mississippi pottery of eastern Tennessee showed little variation" (Lewis and Kneberg, 1946, p. 94). At Hiwassee Island the cord-marked surface of the predominant jar form was increasing in popularity during the life of the site. This indicates it is late in the Early Mississippi period, in these sites at least. As it is absent or extremely rare at Macon, this would place Macon Plateau before Hiwassee Island and presumably Norris Basin. Hiwassee Island also showed the elaborate pottery type, , Hiwassee Island Red on Buff. While this is a quite restricted type it points to a somewhat later date than Macon Plateau. There were also at Hiwassee Island some complicated stamped sherds with sand temper that are similar to Etowah Complicated Stamped, and some Savannah Complicated Stamped (Lewis and Kneberg, 1946, pp. 92–93, Plate 51). These are absent from the Funeral Mound and suggest that Hiwassee Island is again later than Macon Plateau. This is suggested on the

basis that Etowah seems in general to be later than Macon Plateau. While there is yet no proof of stratigraphic change from grit to shell temper at Macon, it is still quite possible that the high proportion of grit temper in Macon Plateau is an early characteristic.

In summary, the following items point to the priority in age of Macon Plateau over the Tennessee sites:

1. Higher percentage of cord-marked surfaces in Tennessee.
2. Known late position of cordmarking in Tennessee.
3. Suspected late position of Hiwassee Island Red on Buff.
4. Trade sherds of Etowah Complicated Stamped in Tennessee.
5. Presence of Hiwassee Island Complicated Stamped.
6. Presence of grit temper at Macon Plateau.

As far as I know there are no items which point to a priority of Hiwassee Island over Macon Plateau. There is, of course, an alternative explanation for the demonstrated difference; i. e., that the differences are due to geographical position. I feel that this is the less likely of the two explanations. All indications are that Macon Plateau is slightly earlier than Etowah and that Hiwassee Island is contemporary with Etowah. To settle the problem thoroughly it will be necessary to get complete distributional studies of cord marking in the Southeast as well as the other traits involved. Probably obtaining radio carbon dates for the sites involved would be a simpler method.

There is, then, a marked similarity between the pottery, structures, and other artifacts of Macon Plateau, Hiwassee Island, and the Norris Basin Small-log sites. There seems to be a preponderance of evidence that the Tennessee sites are slightly later. All, however, form units of the southeastern variety of Early Mississippi and surely fall in that period. These seem to be the sites that are most closely related.

In northern and western Kentucky there are a number of sites which show a certain similarity in the predominant pottery type with the Macon Plateau. These sites are Tolu (Webb and Funkhouser, 1931), McLeod Bluff (Webb and Funkhouser, 1933), and Jonathan Creek (Webb, 1952). The similarity of Tolu and McLeod Bluff with Jonathan Creek rests mainly on the following statement by Webb: "The total pottery complex revealed [at Jonathan Creek], may be said to be so similar to that previously described at the Tolu site in Crittendon Co., Ky., as to be considered identical. . . . The same may be said of the occupancy of the McLeod Bluff site in Hickman Co., Ky., on Obion Creek not far from its mouth on the Mississippi" (Webb, 1952, p. 88). The material at the Jonathan Creek site is more fully described and will be considered first.

Jonathan Creek

The site at Jonathan Creek is a stockaded village with two periods of occupancy, each associated with a specific house type and palisade style. The pottery, however, is not segregated into two complexes. The earlier occupation, which Webb believes to be Chickasaw, built palisades with large bastions and square houses with wall trenches. The second occupation built small bastion stockades and square houses with individually set posts. Burials were near the houses, without any concentration and certainly without any mound structure. They were both extended and bundle-type burials. About 30 percent of the burials were accompanied by grave goods, which consisted exclusively of pottery vessels. A few broken celts were found and a fair number of projectile points, which were both stemmed, notched, and triangular. The stemmed and notched are generally slender, from 2½ to 4 inches long with square or rounded bases on straight or tapered stems. There is a definite suggestion of early complexes in these points. Small triangular projectile points, of types generally assigned to the Late Mississippian level, are also present. Chipped hoes and picks in sharp distinction to the Macon Plateau were found. Abrading stones, discoidals, and polished cylinders complete the stone complex.

The closest relationship to Macon Plateau of any of the artifactual assemblage is shown in the pottery. Webb's report states that no differentiation could be made between the collections coming from the two occupations. It may be that they were closely sequent and that little differentiation actually existed. On the other hand, it may be that the relatively shallow deposits were so badly mixed by Indian and White occupation that the differences now cannot be seen. One-third of the pottery was a "salt pan" type generally similar to the Hawkins Fabric Marked and McDougal Plain types at Macon. The "salt pan," however, is hardly a diagnostic element in Mississippian levels as it appears both early and late. In the "utility" ware Webb describes a type that, from his illustrations, is close to Bibb Plain. He says that about half the jars had lobed bodies, a form rare on the Macon Plateau. The handles are always of the loop type so characteristic of the Macon Plateau period. The handles in detail look a lot like those of Bibb Plain, with simple, noded, notched, and grooved forms. Rim form in general seems to be like Bibb Plain. The sherds have shell temper with some grit.

A form not present in Bibb Plain is the single- or multiple-pointed lugs below the lip. This is elaborately shown at the Jonathan Creek site and seems to form the most obvious difference between that site and Macon Plateau. Hooded bottles (see plate 17) of the same ware are present and seem to be of the same forms as their Macon counterparts rather than the smaller, more polished and more elaborate bottles of Late Mississippian. Strap handles are mentioned in the text of Webb's report, but I failed to find any in the illustrations. Plates are mentioned and would be a form foreign to Macon Plateau. Fish effigy bowls are also mentioned and are a Late Mississippian form absent at Macon. The effigy heads and open bowls seem to be of both the early (Macon) form and the later (Late Mississippian) forms.

As already mentioned, the "utility" ware at Jonathan Creek seems to be highly similar to Bibb Plain. The "salt pan" type there is also close to the comparable Macon Plateau types. The late features such as the strap handles, plates, and fish-effigy bowls may belong to the second occupation which could not be separated stratigraphically. The multiple lugs on the rim are an exotic feature and, while similar to Bibb Plain in temper and form, may be either a second occupation feature or a speciality of the Early Mississippian pottery certainly present at the site.

Tolu

The pottery illustrated in the Tolu report consists of textile-marked and plain "salt pans," lobed or plain jars, a polished, black open bowl with notched lip or lip fillet, rim lugs again, hooded bottles, strap handles, and some loop handles. The appearance of lobed jars in some numbers suggests that this is a

Kentucky feature. The polished black bowl with notched lip is a Late Mississippian element as are the strap handles. The loop handles seem to be much heavier and suggest a date later than Macon Plateau. Flint hoes and small, triangular projectile points at Tolu confirm this suggestion. There appears less Early Mississippian ceramic material, on a typological basis, at Tolu than at Jonathan Creek.

McLeod Bluff

The McLeod Bluff material, with several exceptions, seems roughly similar to Tolu on the basis of published photographs. There are the same notched-rim bowls, plates have incised rims, and jars seem to have strap handles. Hooded bottles are of the late type. Other bottles are of the carafe-neck form, definitely later than the short, straight necks of Macon Plateau. Jars sometimes have the heavy loop handles seen at Tolu but are never, as illustrated, of the lighter, and earlier Macon Plateau-Norris type. An interesting item is the heavy incised ware similar to what is called "Juice Press Wide-Mouth Jar 26" in the Kincaid report (Cole and others, 1951; p. 322, fig. 6–e; Webb and Funkhouser, 1933, p. 22, fig. 9). The sherds from McLeod Bluff are very thick and incised with a deep slash technique reminiscent of Macon Thick. The thickness and incised lines are the only similarities as the so called "juice press" is quite a different vessel from Macon Thick. It is evidently later than Macon Plateau and appears to be a variant of the usual Late Mississippian incised types. In all, Tolu and McLeod Bluff show much less similarity with Macon Plateau than does Jonathan Creek. They are evidently of the Late Mississippian period.

Guntersville Basin

The Guntersville Basin pottery of the Mississippian period does not show any ceramic complex similar to Macon Plateau as has been reported (Heimlich, 1952). It may be that similar types are represented in what Heimlich calls "Plain Shell" tempered pottery but they are not described as such.

Other southeastern sites showed a large number of burials and it might be well to consider the degree of relationship of those sites with the Macon Plateau. Those considered will be Etowah, Nacoochee, and Kolomoki. In none, however, is there a very close relationship.

Etowah

An obvious comparison to Macon Plateau is with the Etowah site near Cartersville, Ga. (Moorehead, et al, 1932). Mound C at Etowah contained a hundred burials and yet was basically a pyramidal mound. Moorehead's report does not indicate what sort of structures might have existed on the several mound stages. Some 60 of the burials were in stone-box graves or were covered with stone slabs. Associated artifacts were an elaborate array of copper ornaments. These ornaments are typical of the Southern Cult and quite different from the copper at the Funeral Mound. The pottery is Etowah Complicated Stamped, Etowah Incised, Lamar Complicated Stamped, Lamar Bold Incised, and Savannah Complicated Stamped.

It is probable that Mound C at Etowah was built by the Etowah group and that the Lamar material is later, occurring mostly on the surface (Wauchope, 1948, pp. 204–205). The Savannah and Lamar complexes, of course, are later than Macon Plateau. The Etowah complex seems to be slightly later. This is indicated by the very numerous examples of the Southern Cult objects. At Macon there are only 3 examples: The spud from the Funeral Mound, 1 plain conch cup, and 1 forked eye platform in the Mound D earth lodge. Thus it would seem that Etowah was definitely in the full bloom of the Southern Cult, while Macon Plateau was in a very early stage. There is also the virtual absence of Etowah Stamped, Etowah Complicated Stamped, or Etowah Incised in the Macon Plateau levels. In view of the difference in grave type, pottery, copper, and stone work, no very close relationship between Etowah and Macon Plateau can be postulated.

It is, however, interesting that Mound C at Etowah and the Funeral Mound at Macon both show a large number of burials in a platform mound. Hiwassee Island and the Small-log sites in Norris Basin showed virtually no burials in the pyramidal mounds and absolutely none belonging to the Small-log-Hiwassee Island period. As Etowah and Hiwassee Island are contemporary, we are faced with the conclusion that burial in temple mounds is a southern trait, not a temporal one. In view of the known elaborateness of Weeden Island burial complexes to the south in Florida it is perhaps not surprising to find the more southern complexes with an elaborate burial pattern. As reported by Moorehead, there were no submound burials at Etowah. The Early Mississippian period in the Southeast, at least for Etowah and Macon Plateau, contains elements of both the burial mound and temple mound complexes.

Nacoochee Mound

The Nacoochee Mound in northeast Georgia also contained a number of graves, of which 56, at least, were excavated by Heye, Hodge, and Pepper (Heye, Hodge and Pepper, 1918) and three more mentioned by C. C. Jones (Jones, 1873, pp. 213–224). There were at least five sub-mound pits containing burials. Mound burials were partly in stone slab graves and partly in simple pits. Extended, flexed, and bundle burials were found. The pottery from the site is a mixture of Etowah, Savannah, and Lamar types. The artifacts include pipes of Lamar type, copper axes, and a variety of shell pins, etc. There is apparently no plain pottery of the Macon Plateau or Hiwassee Island types. Some levels of the village site, at least, were in the historic period. Nacoochee Mound, then represents a later period than the Funeral Mound at Macon, being in part contemporary with Etowah. The Savannah and Lamar Complexes are evidently later still. The stone slab graves, Etowah pottery, copper axes, shell pins, etc., indicate that it is not closely related to Macon Plateau. The submound pits and inclusive pits for burials, together with the evidences of bone cleaning in the bundle burials, are other instances of the combination of temple mound and burial traits previously noted in the Macon Plateau and Etowah sites.

Kolomoki Mounds

The large Kolomoki mound group in southwestern Georgia consists of 1 large temple mound and 6 smaller mounds (Sears, 1950 a, 1951 a and b, 1953). Two of the smaller mounds, E and D, seem to have been pyramidal in shape but not true temple mounds. Each has a large submound pit with an important

burial. Later burials were made in the primary mound erected over the pit and in the final secondary mound. In each case there was a large Weeden Island style pottery deposit on the east side of the mound. Mound D had a pyramidal truncated secondary mound over the central pit and primary mound with large posts at each corner. Burials ran the whole gamut of forms: Extended, skull burials, cremated, semicremated, and just casually deposited on the mound. Each mound contained large numbers of sandstone boulders.

The pottery is a variety of Weeden Island plus Kolomoki Complicated Stamped and Mercier Red on Buff. Kolomoki Complicated Stamped is related to Swift Creek and evidently a late variety of it. Mercier Red on Buff, as well as many other vessels, show the rounded bases and rim treatments of Middle Mississippian type. There are a variety of small or medium-stemmed projectile points. Ornaments consist of copper ear spools, iron-covered ear spools, large conch columella beads, and pearls, often on the ear spools. The iron has a high nickel content and is surely prehistoric and of meteoric origin.

The present indications are that Kolomoki dates from the Etowah period and is slightly later than the Macon Plateau period. Its ceramic relationships are with Weeden Island and Swift Creek, its burial relationships with Weeden Island. There is a strong Mississippian influence shown in some of the pottery and the flat-topped mounds.

Here again we find a combination of platform mounds and extensive burials. Sears believes the posts around Mound D supported a Natchez-type scaffold on which burial rituals, including the killing of retainers, took place. In many respects, the burial complex at Kolomoki resembles that at the Funeral Mound at Macon more than it does that of any other southern site. It is, however, even more complex and has the additional elaboration of a very large deposit of pottery vessels. The stamped and decorated pottery, however, is quite foreign to the Macon Plateau. It is thus evident that Kolomoki is another group which shares with Macon and Etowah the same combination of platform mounds and burial complexes.

If we look to the west for similar cultures, the evidence is disappointing as there seems to be nothing, as yet excavated, which is either very close or a logical ancestor. Three sites, because of general similarities, might be discussed briefly. They are the Bynum Mounds in Mississippi and the Marksville and Gahagan sites in Louisiana.

Bynum Mounds

Possibly the best-reported Burial Mound I site in the Southeast is the Bynum Mound group in Mississippi (Cotter and Corbett, 1951). This mound group shows a number of similarities as well as differences with the Macon Plateau complex. Both complexes have mounds in which individuals, apparently important, were buried. Mounds at both sites had important subfloor pits with multiple burials. At the Bynum site these burials were in large pits occupying much of the area of the primary mound. Some sort of shelter had been erected over the area, and the pit was lined with, or surrounded by, logs. Half of the burials were cremations. This is a quite different picture than that at the Funeral Mound where separate pits were made and the log remains indicate rather small tombs. Macon Plateau also had few cremations.

Large greenstone celts, 29 in all, were placed with the burials on the pit floor in Mound B. They are highly similar to those at Macon. This type of celt, however, has a very wide distribution and, in itself, does not indicate any very close relationship. The abundance of celts with burials is a dissimilarity with Macon Plateau where they were quite rare. The conch shells in the Bynum graves do not seem to have been cups like those at the Funeral Mound. Also, shell hoes, found at Bynum, are foreign to Macon Plateau. At the Funeral Mound we did not find the copper spool-shaped objects, the rolled copper beads, or the galena that are so characteristic of Bynum. The manos and metates described from Bynum seem to resemble the mortars and mullers which occur sporadically at Macon. This type of grinding tool is, however, more characteristic of the Swift Creek period.

The burial mounds at Bynum are domed, erected over a burned structure, and were built in a continuous operation. The Funeral Mound was definitely flat-topped, a combined temple and burial mound, and it was built in at least seven separate stages. There is no evidence that it was built over a precedent structure. Lastly, the Bynum pottery is: Baldwin Plain, Saltillo Fabric Impressed, Furrs Cordmarked, Tishomingo Cordmarked, Tishomingo Plain, and Houlka Gray, along with minor amounts of Marksville and Alexander types. This is a quite different complex than the plain surfaced pottery of the Macon Plateau. Saltillo Fabric Impressed may be related to Dunlap Fabric Marked. It, and the other types, seem to be definitely earlier than Macon Plateau.

The affiliations of Bynum seem to be with Miller and Copena, and thus with Hopewell. It lies well within the Burial Mound horizon. Macon Plateau lies clearly within the Early Mississippian period, perhaps not greatly distant in time. What does seem to be significant is that these two cultural complexes share a large-pit, submound, elaborate-burial complex. While the two burial complexes differ widely in detail, certain traits like the use of logs, fire, large celts, and conch shells suggest cultural borrowing. It seems probable that the burial complex at the Funeral Mound represents a relatively old system carried forward into Early Mississippian times. Its source may well lie in some culture like Bynum. The origins of other cultural elements at Macon Plateau must, however, be sought elsewhere.

Marksville Site

The Marksville site was excavated by Fowke (Fowke, 1928, pp. 410–434) and reexcavated by Setzler and Ford (Setzler, 1933 a, 1933 b). Later, part of it, now called the Greenhouse Site, was excavated and reported by Ford (Ford, 1951). Setzler first called attention to the Hopewellian affiliations of the pottery. Ford now believes the first construction of the Greenhouse Site was started in about the second quarter of the Troyville period with occupation continuing through the Coles Creek period into the very beginning of the Plaquemine period.

At Greenhouse there were at least four rectangular flat-topped pyramidal mounds surmounted by buildings, possibly both rectangular and round. A small rise, not a platform mound, contained 84 human and 9 dog skeletons. This was obviously a burial area, but the skeletons were massed in the area and not in separate pits as in the Funeral Mound at Macon. While the

burial area at Greenhouse is immediately adjacent to the platform mounds, the burials do not form part of the temple mound structure. The dog burials, also, are not part of the Macon Plateau complex.

The pottery from the Greenhouse site belongs to the Troyville and Coles Creek periods with some Plaquemine period types. It includes a variety of stamped, incised, punctated, cord-marked and red filmed types in the Troyville period, and plain, incised, stamped, and punctated types in the Coles Creek period. There is very little resemblance between these types and the Macon Plateau types, either in paste, shape, or surface treatment. Pipes are both elbow and modified platform shape, some apparently with long stems, others with inserted stems. They are the same general types as found at Macon but differ radically in details and proportions.

Pottery trowels and ear spools were also found. Human figurines were fairly common, as were bird heads. These bird heads do not greatly resemble those of Brown's Mount Plain. The solid human effigies are foreign to Macon. Projectile points were stemmed but not exactly of the Macon Plateau type. There were boat stones, expanded center bar gorgets, and stone plummets. These items are all foreign to Macon Plateau. A number of bone and antler types are also known from the Greenhouse Site but, as very little bone was found at the Funeral Mound, the difference between the two sites, in this category, may be more apparent than real.

In all, the artifactual and mound assemblage at the Greenhouse Site is not very comparable with the Funeral Mound pattern. The mounds at Greenhouse are platform mounds, but the burials were not made in the mound itself. The burials are a sort of "accretional" deposit, not like the individual graves of the Funeral Mound, even containing more than one skeleton. Also the dog burials are quite foreign to Macon Plateau. The pottery and artifact complexes are quite different. Thus, although of the same approximate time level, the two cultures are discrete and have little connection with each other.

Gahagan Site

The Gahagan mound in Louisiana was first excavated by Clarence B. Moore (Moore, 1912, pp. 511–522) and later more completely excavated by C. H. Webb and Monroe Dodd, Jr. (Webb and Dodd, Jr., 1939). The mound was domed with perhaps a slight summit platform, although it seems to be definitely in the burial-mound class and not a platform mound. There were 3 large pits in the mound each of which contained 3, 5, and 7 extended skeletons. Some artifacts were associated directly with the bones but most lay along the sides of the pits. They consisted of a wide variety of elaborate objects: Three pottery vessels, spuds, pipes, and copper and bone objects. The pottery is of Alto focus types. The pipes are all elaborate effigy types. Copper objects were numerous and consisted of a variety of forms: Square ear ornaments with concentric circles, elliptical wooden beads covered with copper, copper-covered wooden "bear claws," two hand effigies, and both stone and wood spool ear ornaments covered with copper. The most elaborate ornaments were two small human masks with excessively long noses. These are similar to the "long-nosed god" found by Moore in the Grant Mound in Florida (Moore, 1895, pp. 486–7, figs. 39–42). Polished stone consisted of some long celts, discoidals, and a number of spatulate spuds. It is interesting that all these show a hafting mark similar to the Macon spud. There were flat bifurcated bone pins, antler tips, beaver incisors, and ear ornaments of bone. Shell was poorly preserved but included olivella (?) beads, conch beads, and ear ornaments. There was also galena, quartz crystals, and a piece of basketry.

The relationships between Gahagan and Macon Plateau sites do not seem very close. The Gahagan mound is a burial mound, not a platform mound. The pottery is of the Alto focus: Holly Fine Engraved, Hickory Fine Engraved, and Davis Incised. Krieger points out that the Gahagan grave specimens correspond well with the best material from the Davis site (Krieger and Newell, 1949, pp. 198–9). It is probable that the Davis and Gahagan sites represent village and grave components of the same or very similar groups. The Davis site, and the Alto focus, are regarded by Krieger as being early (Krieger and Newell, 1949, passim). Ford regards both Gahagan and Davis as being of Plaquemine date (Ford, 1951, p. 127).

The Crenshaw site in Arkansas (Lemley, 1936, Dickinson, 1936) also might be considered. It had large submound burial pits and Coles Creek pottery types. It is evident that the elaborate incised pottery types of Davis and Gahagan, the Alto focus in short, is not ancestral or closely related to Macon Plateau. They do, however, share the trait of elaborate burial practices with Macon Plateau. I think we can rule out Alto focus and Coles Creek period as close relatives of Macon Plateau.

The discoidals and spatulate spuds at Gahagan are related to those from Macon Plateau, but they are not enough alike to indicate any close relationship of the sites as a whole. The copper work at Gahagan is related to the Grant mound through the "long-nose god," and to Aztalan through two specimens at the Milwaukee Public Museum. Aztalan as a whole does not seem to be specifically related to the Macon Plateau, but it is an Early Mississippian site of about the same date. In this connection comparisons with Cahokia are of course pertinent.

Cahokia

The material from Cahokia has been so sporadically reported that I do not feel able to discuss it at any length. Powell Polished Plain is certainly a comparable type to Bibb Plain and the plain types at Hiwassee Island and the Small-log sites of the Norris Basin (Webb, 1938, passim; also Kelly and Cole, 1931). The tall beaker, shallow plates, and Ramey Incised pottery are foreign to Macon Plateau. I believe that the Old Village assemblage at Cahokia may be related to Macon Plateau. However, the incised types are completely foreign and the Old Village focus cannot be considered either intimately related to, or ancestral to, Macon Plateau. If we postulate that Macon Plateau resulted from a general eastward movement of Early Mississippian peoples, then Old Village may have resulted from a general northern (?) movement. Each branch developed certain peculiarities during this movement. As far as I know there is no common ancestral form. On a hunch I would say it might be found in east Texas and prove to be ancestral to both Alto focus and to Macon Plateau.

Moorehead cites the discovery of copper-covered deer jaws from the Mitchell mound group 8 miles north of Monks Mound

(Moorehead, 1928, p. 92). These jaws appear, from his description, to be cut in the same manner as the Macon Plateau specimens. They are, however, perforated like Hopewell specimens, and the whole Mitchell mound artifact complex may be Hopewellian. The copper-covered jaws are, nevertheless, interesting in view of other similarities between Cahokia and Macon Platau.

Copper-covered jaws of an unidentified mammal were also found by C. B. Moore in the Tick Island mound in Florida (Moore, 1894, pp. 153–154, figs. 26–27). These were the articular half of the jaw in contrast to the Macon Plateau specimen where the distal portions were used. At both Tick Island and Mitchell mounds the copper covered jaws were associated with copper turtle effigies similar to ones from Ohio Hopewellian sites. Thus they are themselves probably Hopewellian. The cut jaws in Macon Plateau may be derived from a source common to all these sites. They probably do not indicate contemporaneity of Macon Plateau with Tick Island and the Mitchell mounds.

SUMMARY

There would be little point in comparing Macon Plateau with the Lamar and Dallas components. These are clearly in the Late Mississippian period and the late additions, if they were ever present, mask the Early Mississippian elements. The Funeral Mound, and the Macon Plateau as a whole, therefore, are closely related to Hiwassee Island, the Small-log Town-house sites of Norris Basin. It appears to be slightly earlier than the Tennessee sites and Etowah. It shares a platform mound and burial complex with a number of Georgia complexes. Kolomoki is close in some respects but quite different in others. In view of the cultural break which marks the appearance of Macon Plateau, I believe we can make the following assumptions:

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 place of origin.

3. The Tennessee sites 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, snows a rather complete acculturation of local and Early Mississippian elements.

It may be said that we have some ceramic remains indicative of early periods: Stalling's Island, Dunlap, Deptford, Mossy Oak, Swift Creek, and Napier. They were minor and transient occupations. The major settlement was that of the Macon Plateau people who built the mounds and buried their dead there. There was a very ephemeral Lamar occupation and a rather heavy Ocmulgee Fields occupation, which, however, does not represent an adequate section of the community. There has been no attempt to list all the traits of each of these components or to make detailed cross checks with other components. In the case of the first occupations, this is impossible due to the fragmentary nature of the remains. They just do not add up to a complete sample of the respective cultures, and comparison would be misleading at best and more likely downright erroneous.

In the case of the Macon Plateau component it might seem that a detailed cross listing with the known relatives would be valuable. Instead, a narrative discussion of its affiliations is included. (See previous section: Affiliation of the Macon Plateau focus.) The existing trait lists of Early Mississippian sites do not reflect a complete inventory of the sites in question; it would only be a comparison of those items which the various authors thought worthy of mention. The trait list, given in Appendix D, is as complete as it can be made at this time. It is felt that an intelligent discussion of apparently significant similarities and differences will yield more understanding than a numerical checking of traits. No attempt has been made to list Lamar traits as they are almost completely absent except for ceramic ones. The trait list for Ocmulgee Fields is also given in Appendix D but it must be remembered that this gives only a partial picture of this component. In the Macon Plateau component trait list certain items are indicated as belonging to that period even though they were not found at the Funeral Mound. This is given to fill out the picture of the component. All such traits are actually identified as belonging to one of the Macon Plateau components and are included only to amplify the picture at the Funeral Mound.

Summary of Life on the Macon Plateau

The foregoing sections have described the physical setting of the archeological remains on the Macon Plateau, the remains found, their relationships, and temporal positions. Little has been said regarding the way the people lived in the various periods. One of the objectives of anthropology as a science should properly be to explain the culture of the people with whom it deals. In the case of archeological complexes this is difficult. It must always depend on a correlation of archeological material with information gathered from historic groups. It is based on the assumption that a given object had the same use and associations in the prehistoric past as it did in the historic period. Working on that assumption I have attempted to fill out the bare description with a running narrative of how these people lived. In general, detailed citations will not be used because the material has already been described in the earlier sections.

The first people represented at the Funeral Mound were the Stalling's Island group. They were hunters and food collectors who had specialized on one aspect of their environment: shellfish. Along the southeastern coasts they lived on marine shellfish, inland on river mussels. They also hunted deer and smaller game, while the women collected nuts, roots, and berries. Characteristically the bones in their middens are finely broken, probably to extract the marrow. Cupstones indicate considerable use of nuts, perhaps cracked for the meats rather than pounded for the oil. At first, these people did not make ceramics, and cooked by barbecuing or by stone boiling in skinlined pits. Later, stone vessels were made chiefly of steatite. Still later pottery was either introduced or invented, probably by a sort of stimulus-diffusion, that is, a diffusion of ideas, rather than actual objects, as the first pottery is quite crude and experimental. The throwing stick and dart in a variety of forms was the chief weapon. Burials were made in the settlement midden, in a standard flexed manner and sometimes accompanied by ornaments or weapons. This, plus sporadic evidence of antlers with burials, and the large shell rings such as that on Sapelo Island, suggest a somewhat developed ceremonial life. Dog burials indicate a special regard for them, their only domesticated animal. It is certain that this ceremonial was connected with the hunting and collection of wild foods. Houses were simple pole windbreaks and clothing was probably at a minimum. Ornaments were mainly beads of shell and carved bone pins.

The exploitation of river and marine mussels reduced the amount of wandering each band had to do. They must still, however, have been far from sedentary and the deep midden deposits along the coast probably represent camps repeatedly occupied rather than permanent settlements. We can assume that social organization was of the band type, patriarchal, and of little elaboration, and that the residence was patrilocal. Warfare was probably sporadic and involved quarrels over women or shellfish banks, if we can make a valid comparison between Stalling's Island people and historic groups with a similar way of life. Human populations must have been small and were located in widely scattered bands or settlements. Perhaps, late in this period, they would have exceeded the standard hunting band of 50 to 100 persons for each territory, but not by much.

Whether the Stalling's Island shellfish eaters gradually changed their ways or there was a replacement of them by another people I do not know. There is some evidence that they gradually developed pottery and other traits which mark the next periods. At any rate, little change took place and it is probable that new ideas very gradually filtered into the Southeast. The people who made the fabric-marked (Dunlap), check-stamped (Deptford), and simple-stamped pottery are roughly similar but so little is known about them that I hesitate to treat them except as a block. They had less dependence on mussels, relying mainly on hunting and the collecting of nuts, seeds, and roots. They used the throwing stick and dart as their chief weapon, built impermanent houses, and left remarkably few remains in the country.

New innovations were smoking pipes of stone which imply tobacco, used ritually and possibly medicinally. Perhaps they built mounds for the interment of the dead and rock effigies of eagles or vultures for some unknown ritual use. Their chief material advance seems to have been in ceramics which were now technically well made and decorated by a variety of paddling techniques. They were certainly predominantly hunters and collectors with constant hunger as their chief concern. They may, however, have nurtured certain wild crops, if they did not actually till them. Squashes, tobacco, chenopodium, and perhaps others may have added something to their diet. Their basic social pattern was probably still the wandering patriarchal band. Settlements were ephemeral in most cases, and hunting territories were the only larger units of organization. Religious practices became somewhat elaborated through gradual evolution rather than through any response to a basic economic need.

There can be little doubt that these peoples developed into those of the next period (Swift Creek) although the exact steps cannot be demonstrated on either a social or material level. This period, the Swift Creek, is characterized by partial agriculture and burial mounds (see plate 4). Cultivated crops were probably squash, beans, tobacco and such wild forms as chenopodium under partial domestication. The more sedentary communities are shown by the erection of burial mounds and even sporadic platform mounds. The temple complex, however, does not seem to be dominant. Hunting was still important and the throwing stick and dart the chief weapon, to judge from the evidence of the throwing stick weights. I picture these people as partly

PLATE 10. Artist's conception from Ocmulgee site during Macon Plateau times. Detail of Ocmulgee National Monument museum exhibit.

sedentary with fairly permanent villages at which women, children, and the aged would live most of the year. In the growing season all the community would be resident there. After the harvest the men, possibly with a few women, would range widely in search of game. Warfare would be more important than previously with leadership inferentially based on prestige. Pottery was elaborately decorated by means of carved paddles. Trade was well developed with areas to the north and south. With increasing population, the sociopolitical system was probably becoming more complex. As in most simple agricultural societies, we should expect that medicine men or shamans were the only religious practitioners.

It is postulated that the remains on the Macon Plateau during this period are all of the type of small winter camps of hunters. The Swift Creek village, 3 miles southeast, is the closest large settlement. At that place there was located a fairly permanent settlement with a domed mound that may have marked the location of a chiefly house. In this period the techniques of ceramics and other southeastern traits had been fully realized and the basic techniques of mound building were probably known. This culture was interrupted, in the central Georgia area, by the invasion of the Macon Plateau people (see plate 5).

This invasion resulted in the complete expulsion of the people making Swift Creek and Napier styles of pottery from the immediate area. The Macon Plateau people dominated the central Georgia area for a period of perhaps 200 years. Their linguistic affiliation is unknown, but I suggest, on the basis of a number of similarities with later cultures, that it may have been Muskhogean, probably Hitchiti. The Macon Plateau invaders set up a large village on the bluff above the river and fortified it with two encircling ditches. Burials were started in the Funeral Mound area and other mounds were also built (see plate 10).

We can picture the paired temple platforms and earth lodges as the scenes of colorful ceremonies—on the temple mounds in summer, in the earth lodges in winter (see plate 11). Aside from the ceremonies, to draw an inference from historic descriptions of southeastern Indians, two kinds of temples were used for daily assemblies of the town elders to discuss public affairs, to meet travelers, and to gossip. Their fields, planted with corn, beans, pumpkins, and tobacco, extended for miles up and down the river bottoms. At least one small field for seed or ritual tending by the priests was located inside the town. Many of the families must have lived near their fields. The town was the residence of the chief, priests, and officials. To it came the whole population in time of attack, to work on the mounds, earth lodges, and temples, and for the yearly round of ceremonies. A secondary town was located about 5 miles southeast on a high rocky bluff above the river swamps.

All the arts and crafts were well developed. It is probable that the bow and arrow were known. Flint was chipped and slates ground for weapons and tools. Wood must have been extensively used for tools and in building. Cane was made into baskets, mats, and utilized in the walls of both houses and temples. Shell was imported from the Atlantic and Gulf coasts

for manufacture into ornaments and, rarely, cups. Cassena and other herbal teas were used ceremonially. Pottery was well made in a variety of shapes but with little decoration. Imported copper was sometimes used to make insignia for the priests and chiefs. Feather work, so widespread in the Southeast, was certainly common in the form of ornaments and cloaks. Body paint and elaborate hair arrangements were usual, while clothing consisted of breechcloths for men, skirts for the women. Bare feet were the rule and skin cloaks were worn only in cold weather or for ceremonial processions. In short, the Southeastern pattern of material culture was virtually intact, except for details. It is remarkable how little material culture the Macon Plateau people borrowed from the earlier inhabitants. There are no pottery or artifact styles which show older sources, or the kind of thing sometimes ascribed to "captive women."

In their social structure also, the Macon Plateau people had reached nearly the stage found in early historic times. The social structure may have been similar to some form of the Iroquois type, probably matrilineal, with clans and moieties. It would be logical to expect that residence was matrilocal, descent matrilineal. The only item not present was probably the confederacy organization. Large mounds and earth lodges indicate that leadership was well developed, probably based in part on achievement but mainly hereditary in the clans. It involved conspicuous display of regalia, possibly carrying of chiefs on litters, and a council system of rule with numerous chiefs of various grades in the general Southeastern pattern (see plate 11). Warfare was mainly a matter of prestige but on occasion served as a means of conquest. The absence of older ceramic styles suggests there was no extensive adoption of captives, but whether these were simply killed or ritually sacrificed is uncertain. One deity was a bird with forked eye (the king vulture anthropomorphized).

One temple mound was reserved for burials (see plate 12). Here scaffolds were erected on which the bodies of the dead were aged until bone cleaning was easy if not pleasant. On the death of important personages, elaborate rituals took place that included retainer burial, placing of ornaments and food in the grave, and the erection of elaborate wooden tombs. On these occasions the mound platforms were carefully covered with clean sand. Periodically all mounds were raised in height and size as new, and larger, temples were built.

All this elaborate socioreligious structure was supported by the agricultural economy in which corn was the most important crop. Hunting and collecting added to the diet but the basic economy was agricultural. The population must have been considerably greater than in any former period, large enough to

PLATE 11. Detail from the diorama at Ocmulgee National Monument museum reconstructing a ceremonial scene inside the earth lodge.

PLATE 12. Artist's reconstruction of a structure on a flat-topped mound in Macon Plateau times. Use as a charnel house is hypothetical. Detail from a panel exhibit at Ocmulgee National Monument museum.

conquer the territory and remain aloof from the original population for generations. From April to September they engaged in planting their fields and in celebrating a series of rituals, one at least similar to the Busk (or Green Corn Dance), a ceremony so widespread that it must be old (see plate 13). From September to April some men were away hunting, but most of the people worked on the mounds and temples. Some went on trading expeditions or raids against neighboring groups. It was a tight, reasonably rich culture that probably gave its members a good deal of satisfaction and pride. What happened to it, I do not know, but it did disappear rather suddenly.

For generations the Macon Plateau was abandoned while the smooth clay sides of the mounds were gradually covered with grass, bushes, and, finally, trees. The neighboring tribes regarded these ancient monuments with awe and avoided them. But by A. D. 1400, or thereabouts, hunters, or farmers, from the nearby swamp village of Lamar camped there briefly, and heard ghosts of the Macon Plateau chiefs singing in the night. These people were Creeks and represent a mixture with new arrivals of the ancient inhabitants of the land. Perhaps they were less a mixture than the ancient people who had been conquered by advancing bands of Creeks and absorbed into the new community. The Lamar people lived in a palisaded town deep in the river swamp with their fields around them. Here they built two mounds for their temples, facing each other across the chunk-yard, now given over to the chunky and stickball games but retaining at one end the slave post where formerly an occasional captive was tortured. Houses were square, made of poles and thatched, and often raised on low platforms of earth.

Many changes had taken place but most of them were in matters of detail, and the basic pattern was much like that of the Macon Plateau period. Corn was still the main agricultural produce, and the cornfields were extensive along the river. Pottery was decorated with designs derived from the old stamped styles of Swift Creek as well as with newly introduced incising and punctating. The daily tools were made of stone as of old but wood and bone were more frequently used. Tobacco smoking had become habitual and many elaborate clay pipes were made. The Southern Cult, during the abandonment of Ocmulgee, had been very important at sites like Etowah. Just now it was suffering a slight decline, as indicated by the scarcity of cult insignia. Probably the priesthood had been absorbed into a priest-chief class, hereditary in certain clans. Within the recently formed confederacy, warfare had become extinct and the youths found an outlet for their exhuberance in bloody stickball games between neighboring towns. The formation of the confederacy and the adoption of whole towns of conquered people was probably the most significant development in the period.

Creek social structure had changed slightly to become what we know in the historic period as a Crow type of social organization. (By this we mean that type exemplified by the Crow and also present among many American Indian groups such as the Creek,

PLATE 13. Detail from a diorama at the Ocmulgee National Monument museum depicting the Busk "New Fire" ceremony. This diorama is based upon the similar Historic Creek ceremony.

Cherokees, Zuni, Hopi, and Choctaw. It is described in Murdock, 1949, pp. 245–248.) Descent was matrilineal and the exogamy rules were largely so. Residence was matrilocal in extended matrilineal families. Clans were matrilineal with totems. There were two grand divisions, red and white, which permeated the entire social and ceremonial structure. Marriage was monogamous but occasionally a man married his wife's sister as well. Certain clans possessed the right to name chiefs who ruled in all civil affairs. War chiefs were partly hereditary but had to prove their valor in battle. An elaborate religion, basically monotheistic, with a series of minor gods and helpers, prescribed a succession of feasts and ceremonies, of which the most important was the Busk, or Green Corn Dance, in July or August. Medicine men presided over the sick with a wide variety of herbal remedies. The only cloud on the horizon was the occasional report of Spanish, French, and English explorers in the region. Finally about A. D. 1600, the town moved west to the Chattahoochee River and came in full contact with the Spanish priests and soldiers.

Again the Macon Plateau was abandoned, this time for less than a century. The Lower Creek path still crossed the area and in A. D. 1690 a Carolinian established a pentagonal trading post across a small stream from the Funeral Mound. It lay on the Lower Creek path from Augusta to the lower towns on the Chattahoochee. The Ocmulgee townspeople of the Lower Creeks settled down around the post stockade to be close to the highly desirable English trade goods. Further, they hoped to escape the Spanish who had burned five Creek towns the year before in revenge for the Creeks having sheltered the English agent Henry Woodward. Here, near the post, they set up a village and gave their name not only to the fields around but to the river itself.

Great material changes had taken place in a few short years. Now the Creeks built no mounds, although some towns still maintained a square. Hereditary civil chiefs ruled, although the Mico still retained religious functions. There was also a class of military chiefs, partly hereditary. Corn, beans, and pumpkins were still planted, but during much of the year the men were away in the woods hunting deer in order to exchange the skins for all sorts of European objects. This hunting was much more prolonged and general than the winter hunting of former times and left much less time for community religious activities. The effect of trade is shown in the virtual disappearance of many ancient forms of tools and ornaments. The old pottery decorations broke down and new tools were substituted for old. Thus, scrapers were made of glass instead of flint, and muskets, iron hatchets, and swords replaced the old bow and wooden club.

In spite of these changes in the material culture and economic base, agriculture remained the chief support of the town. The social structure changed but little. The form was still the Crow pattern with an extension of incest taboos to both the father's and the mother's kin. Evidently the women remained home when the men went deer hunting and maintained the elaborate social system nearly intact. The religious system became highly simplified under the impact of economic pressures, and probably missionary activity as well. Where the religious system bolstered the confederacy it remained in force. It is also probable that

summer ceremonies continued longer than those which formerly took place in the winter. The social structure is a form of the most highly developed matrilineal organization known and probably served equally for an agricultural group whether they were self-sufficient or dependent on the trader for many daily necessities.

The confederacy also was sufficiently strong to resist the pressure of the changing times. Under Brim, Emperor of the Cowetas, it mobilized the Creeks and their relatives to the east against the English. When this attempt failed, the Creeks were pushed west to the Chattahoochee to live there until their final expulsion from Georgia. But they still maintained their claims to the area as hunting grounds and revered Ocmulgee Old Fields as an ancestral home. The confederacy remained strong during the entire colonial period and successfully resisted most white encroachments. After the American Revolution it was led by such men as McGillivray and McIntosh who successfully treated with both Americans and Spanish. In the last century it has withered away under steady American pressure but the loyalty to his native town still remains of paramount importance to the modern Creek. Some Creeks, at least, still retain vestiges of the old ways and feel a deep interest in Ocmulgee Old Fields.

PLATE 14. *Above*—Burial 68 in sub-Mound I log tomb showing compact position of bones in rearticulated burials. This was the most central and isolated burial and may have been the important person to whom the other individuals belonged as relatives or retainers.

PLATE 15. *Above*—Burial 48, rearticulated and extended with bundle alongside (foreground), located below primary mound. Disc and tubular-cut shell beads were scattered throughout burial area. This is typical of this class of burials except that the bone preservation is somewhat better than the average.

Lower right—Burial 69 in Pit 54 under primary mound consisted of a mass of three extended skeletons, head to left, four bundles on top. Olivella shell beads were scattered throughout the grave; a conch cup was deposited on top; shell gorget at extreme left; bone pins between skull in fore-ground and conch cup; and discoidals within a bundle.

Above—Bundle Burial 60, inclusive in Mound VI of the Funeral Mound.

Above—Burial 1, a typical historic flexed burial intrusive in the Funeral Mound.

PLATE 16. *Above*—Bibb Plain jar (Cat. No. 39–39/1 Bi 1). This jar is quite typical of the better grade of Bibb Plain found in the Funeral Mound with two grooved loop handles and two bifurcated nodes on the shoulder. Shell temper, 20 centimeters diameters, 14 centimeters high. With Burial 38–3.

Below—Bibb Plain jar (Cat. No. 39–186/1 Bi 1) of the more polished grade. Grit temper, diameter 13.5 centimeters, 6.5 centimeters high. With Burial 40, Mound III.

PLATE 17. *Above*—Halstead Plain effigy bottle (Cat. No. 39–203/1 Bi 1). Effigy is of the blank-face type with only hair and pierced ears shown. With Burial 76. Height 18 centimeters, diameter 13 centimeters; temper probably fine shell.

Below—Bibb Plain bottle (Cat. No. 39–181/1 Bi 1). Bottles are a comparatively rare form in Bibb Plain. Diameter 15.9 centimeters, height 16.5 centimeters. Grit temper, surface polished. With Burial 46, from humus.

Above—Halstead Plain effigy bottle (Cat. No. 39–190/1 Bi 1), with Burial 59, Mound II. Effigy is blank-face type with two semicircular ridges representing ears. Height 13.5 centimeters, body diameter 13.5 centimeters.

PLATE 18. *Right*—Halstead Plain effigy bottle (Cat. No. 38–155/1 Bi 1) found in village area. Height 11.4 centimeters. This is the upper half of a seated human figure; body is red, face white; oriface is at back of head.

Below—Bibb Plain sherds from general collections showing general range of loop handles.

PLATE 19. ***Above*—Sherds of early types from general collections.**

A, B—Napier Complicated Stamped. C, D, H—Swift Creek Complicated Stamped II. E, F, G—Deptford Check Stamped (G is a foot, probably tetrapodal). I, J, K—Dunlap Fabric Marked. L, M, O, P, Q—Mossy Oak Simple Stamped. N—Stalling's Island Punctate.

***Below*—Macon Plateau pottery types from the general collections.**

A—McDougal Plain. B, C, D—Incised shreds of Macon Thick. E, F, G—Hawkins Fabric Marked.

PLATE 20. Historic materials from the Creek occupation of the Funeral Mound area.

A.—Green glazed Spanish olive jar sherd (Cat. No. 11889/1 Bi 1) from miscellaneous collections.

B.—Blue-on-white Spanish majolica sherd cut into perforated disc (Cat. No. 38-11845) from village area.

C.—Long, blue glass bead with red and white stripes (Cat. No. 39-288/1 Bi 1) from village area.

D.—Three faceted white glass beads (Cat. No. 38-11892/1 Bi 1) with Burial 2.

E.—Spherical bead, at present black, but may have been green originally (Cat. No. 39-266/1 Bi 1) from village area.

F.—Two red glass beads with green centers, the Hudson's Bay bead, from Pit 38-1.

G.—Two blue glass pendants (Cat. No. 39-123 and 38-11892/1 Bi 1), the latter from Burial 2.

H.—Opaque white glass beads (Cat. No. 38-11896/1 Bi 1) from Burial 6.

PLATE 21. Macon Plateau artifacts, ground stone and pottery pipe from Funeral Mound.

A.—Large greenstone celt (Cat. No. 39-201/1 Bi 1) with Burial 72.
B.—Flattened greenstone adz (Cat. No. 39-39/1 Bi 1) with Burial 38-3.
C.—Small stone discoidal (Cat. No. 39-199/1 Bi 1) with Burial 69.
D.—Large stone discoidal (Cat. No. 39-280/1 Bi 1), village area.
E.—Pottery pipe (Cat. No. 39-40/1 Bi 1) with Burial 38-3.

PLATE 22. Bone and shell artifacts from the Funeral Mound. The large conch-shell cores in process of manufacture into beads are Historic Creek, the rest are Macon Plateau.

A.—Conch cup (Cat. No. 39-195/1 Bi 1) with Burial 69.
B.—Disc conch beads (Cat. No. 39-198/1 Bi 1) with Burial 68.
C.—Olivella Beads (Cat. No. 39-135/1 Bi 1) with Burial 69.
D.—Bone pins (Cat. No. 39-196/1 Bi 1) with Burial 69.
E.—Historic Creek conch columellae in process of manufacture into beads (Cat. No. 38-11902/1 Bi 1) with Burial 4.
F.—Flattened barrel-shaped shell beads (Cat. No. 39-185/1 Bi 1) with Burial 48.
G.—Small disk shell beads (Cat. No. 39-185/1 Bi 1) with Burial 48.
H.—Notched conch-shell gorget (Cat. No. 39-197/1 Bi 1) with Burial 69.

PLATE 23. *Above*—Copper sun disks and copper-covered cut puma jaws found at the Funeral Mound. These are original specimens. The sun disk at the right has been pieced out by means of riveting. United States National Museum Cat. No. 385590. Courtesy United States National Museum.

Below—Reproductions of copper sun disks and copper-covered cut puma jaws showing probable original condition. Prepared for exhibit at Ocmulgee National Monument museum.

PLATE 24. Walnut Roughened sherds from Historic Creek period at the Funeral Mound.

PLATE 25. Ocmulgee Fields Incised and Kasita Red Filmed sherds from Historic Creek occupation of the Funeral Mound area.

A, B.—Ocmulgee Fields Incised, incised upper surfaces of flaring rim plates. C.—Ocmulgee Fields Incised type, flaring rim, an uncommon form. D.—Kasita Red Filmed sherd. E to L.—Ocmulgee Fields Incised, usual range of type on cazula rims.

PLATE 26. Chipped stone artifacts from the Funeral Mound.

A to F and K.—Uniface scrapers. G to J.—Blades. L and S.—Drills. M to Q.—Medium-sized points. R.—Small Late Mississippian point of the Okmulgee Fields period.

PLATE 27. Chipped stone artifacts from the Funeral Mound.

The two upper rows are forms believed to belong to the Macon Plateau period.
D.—Bevelled blade. G.—Cruciform drill. P to S.—Asymmetric forms known to belong to the Stalling's Island focus of the Archaic period.

PLATE 28. *Above*—Bibb Plain jar (Cat. No. 39-162/1 Bi 2) from unnumbered pit in south face of Funeral Mound.

Below—Bibb Plain jar (Cat. No. 39-183/1 Bi 1) with Burial 46. Shell temper.

Bibliography

ADAIR, JAMES

1775. The History of the American Indian, etc., London. (Reprinted with notes by Samuel Cole Williams as "Adair's History of the American Indians," Watauga Press, Johnson City, Tenn., 1930.)

BARTRAM, WILLIAM

1791. Travels through North and South Carolina, Georgia, East and West Florida. London.

1943. Travels in Georgia and Florida, 1773–1774, A Report to Dr. John Fothergill. American Philosophical Society, Transactions, n. s., Vol. 33, pt. 2, pp. 121–242. Philadelphia, Pa. Ed. by Francis Harper.

BOLTON, HERBERT E.

1925. Arredondo's Historical Proof of Spain's Title to Georgia. University of California Press. Berkeley, Calif.

BULLEN, RIPLEY, P.

1950. An Archaeological Survey of the Chattahoochee River Valley in Florida. Journal of the Washington Academy of Sciences, Vol. 40, No. 4, pp. 101–125, Washington, D. C.

CALDWELL, JOSEPH

1950. A Preliminary Report on Excavations in the Allatoona Reservoir. Early Georgia, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 5–21. Athens, Ga.

1952. The Archeology of Eastern Georgia and South Carolina. In Archeology of Eastern U. S., J. B. Griffin, Ed., pp. 312–21. Chicago, Ill.

CALDWELL, JOSEPH, AND WARING, ANTONIO J., Jr.

1939a. Pottery type descriptions. Newsletter. Southeastern Archaelogical Conference, Vol. 1, No. 5, pp. 4–12. Mimeographed.

1939b. Newsletter. Southeastern Archaeological Conference, Vol. 1, No. 6. Mimeographed.

CLAFLIN, WILLIAM H., JR.

1931. The Stalling's Island Mound, Columbia County, Georgia. Peabody Museum of American Archeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, Papers, Vol. 14, No. 1. Cambridge, Mass.

COLE, FAY-COOPER, AND OTHERS

1951. Kincaid, A Prehistoric Illinois Metropolis. Chicago, Ill.

COTTER, JOHN L. AND CORBETT, JOHN M.

1951. Archeology of the Bynum Mounds, Mississippi. National Park Service Archeological Research Series No. 1. Washington, D. C.

CRANE, VERNER W.

1928. The Southern Frontier. Durham, N. C.

DICKINSON, S. D.

1936. Ceramic Relationships of the Pre-Caddo Pottery from the Crenshaw Site. Bulletin, Texas Archaeological and Paleontological Society, Vol. 8, pp. 56–68. Abilene, Tex.

FAIRBANKS, CHARLES H.

1940a. "Salt Pans" from the Southeast. American Antiquity, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 65–67. Menasha, Wis.

1940b. The Lamar Palisade. Proceedings of the Society for Georgia Archaeology, Vol. 3, No. 1, unpaged, mimeographed.

1946. The Macon Earthlodge. American Antiquity, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 94–108. Menasha, Wis.

1950. A Preliminary Segregation of Etowah, Savannah, and Lamar. American Antiquity, Vol. 16, No. 2, pp. 142–51. Salt Lake City, Utah.

FORD, JAMES A.

1951. Greenhouse: A Troyville-Coles Creek Period Site in Avoyelles Parish, Louisiana. Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History, Vol. 44, part 1. New York, N. Y.

FORD, JAMES A., AND WILLEY, GORDON R.

1940. Crooks Site, A Marksville Period Burial Mound in LaSalle Parish, Louisiana. State of Louisiana, Department of Conservation, Anthropological Study No. 3. Baton Rouge, La.

1941. An Interpretation of the Prehistory of the Eastern United States. American Anthropologist, n. s., Vol. 43, No. 3, pp. 325–63. Menasha, Wis.

FOWKE, GERARD

1928. Archaeological Investigations II. Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Annual Report. No. 44, pp. 399–540. Washington, D. C.

GATSCHET, ALBERT S.

1884. A Migration Legend of the Creek Indians. Vol. 1, Philadelphia, Pa.

GOGGIN, JOHN M.

1949. A Florida Indian Trading Post circa 1763–1784. Southern Indian Studies, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 35–38. Chapel Hill, N. C.

GRIFFIN, JAMES B.

1938. The Ceramic Remains from Norris Basin, Tennessee. In Webb, 1938, pp. 252–58.

1939. Report on the ceramics of Wheeler Basin. In Webb, 1939, pp. 127–65.

1943. An Analysis and Interpretation of Ceramic Remains from Two Sites near Beaufort, South Carolina. Anthropological Papers, No. 22, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 133, pp. 155–168. Washington, D. C.

HAAG, WILLIAM G.

1942. A description and analysis of the Pickwick Pottery. In Webb, 1942, pp. 509–26.

HARPER, FRANCIS

1936. The Vultur Sacra of William Bartram. The Auk, Vol. 53, October, pp. 381–92. Cambridge, Mass.

HAWKINS, BENJAMIN

1848. A Sketch of the Creek Country, in 1798 and 1799. Georgia Historical Society, Collections, Vol. 3. Savannah, Ga.

HEIMLICH, MARION DUNLEVY

1952. Guntersville Basin Pottery. Geological Survey of Alabama, Museum Paper 32, University of Alabama. Tuscaloosa, Ala.

HEYE, GEORGE G., HODGE, F. W., AND PEPPER, GEORGE H.

1918. The Nacoochee Mound in Georgia. Contributions, Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation, Vol. 4, No. 3. New York, N. Y.

HOLMES, WILLIAM H.

1903. Aboriginal Pottery of the Eastern United States. Bureau of American Ethnology, Annual Report No. 20, pp. 1–210. Washington, D. C.

JENNINGS, JESSE D.

1939. Recent Excavations at the Lamar Site, Ocmulgee National Monument, Macon, Georgia. Proceedings of the Society for Georgia Archeology, Vol. 2, No. 2, unpaged. Mimeographed.

JENNINGS, JESSE D., AND FAIRBANKS, CHARLES H.

1939. Pottery type descriptions. Newsletter, Southeastern Archaeological Conference, Vol. 1, No. 2. Mimeographed.

1940. Pottery type descriptions. Newsletter, Southeastern Archaeological Conference, Vol. 2, No. 2. Mimeographed.

JONES, CHARLES C., JR.

1873. Antiquities of the Southern Indians, Particularly of the Georgia Tribes. D. Appleton Co. New York, N. Y.

KELLY, ARTHUR R.

1938. A Preliminary Report on Archaeological Explorations at Macon, Georgia. Anthropological Papers, No. 1, Bureau of American Ethnology. Bulletin 119, pp. 1–69. Washington, D. C.

1939. The Macon Trading Post, An Historical Foundling. American Antiquity, Vol. 4, No. 4, pp. 328–33. Menasha, Wis.

KELLY, ARTHUR R., AND COLE, FAY-COOPER

1931. Rediscovering Illinois. Blue Book of the State of Illinois. Springfield, Ill.

LEMLEY, HARRY J.

1936. Discoveries Indicating a Pre-Caddo Culture on Red River in Arkansas. Bulletin, Texas Archaeological and Paleontological Society, Vol. 8, pp. 25–55. Abilene, Tex.

LEWIS, T. M. N., AND KNEBERG, MADELINE
1946. Hiwassee Island, An Archaeological account of four Tennessee Indian peoples, University of Tennessee Press. Knoxville, Tenn.
LORANT, STEFAN
1946. The New World. Duell, Sloan and Pearce. New York, N. Y.
MERENESS, NEWTON D., ed.
1916. Ranger's Report of Travels with General Oglethorpe, 1739–1742. In "Travels in the American Colonies." New York, N. Y.
MEYER, WILLIAM E.
1928. Indian Trails of the Southeast. Bureau of American Ethnology, Annual Report, No. 42, pp. 727–857. Washington, D. C.
MOORE, CLARENCE B.
1893. Certain Shell Heaps of the St. Johns River, Hitherto Unexplored. American Naturalist, Vol. 27, pp. 8–13, 113–17, 605–24, 709–33. Philadelphia, Pa.
1894. Certain Sand Mounds of the St. Johns River, Florida, Part II. Journal of the Academy of Natural Sciences, n. s., Vol. 10, pp. 5–105. Philadelphia, Pa.
1895. Certain River Mounds of Duval Co., Florida. Journal of the Academy of Natural Sciences, n. s., Vol. 10, pp. 449–502. Philadelphia, Pa.
1912. Some Aboriginal Sites on Red River. Journal of the Academy of Natural Sciences, n. s., Vol. 14, pp. 367–480. Philadelphia, Pa.
MOOREHEAD, WARREN K.
1928. The Cahokia Mounds, Part I. University of Illinois Bulletin, Vol. 26, No. 4. Urbana, Ill.
1932. Etowah Papers. Part 3, A Study of the Ceramic Art of the Etowans. Published for Phillips Academy, Department of Archaeology, by Yale University Press. New Haven, Conn.
MURDOCK, GEORGE P.
1949. Social Structure. New York, N. Y.
NEWELL, H. PERRY, AND KRIEGER, ALEX D.
1949. The George C. Davis Site Cherokee Co., Texas. Society for American Archaeology, Memoire No. 5. Menasha, Wis.
PHILLIPS, PHILIP, AND FORD, JAMES A., AND GRIFFIN, JAMES B.
1951. Archaeological Survey in the Lower Mississippi Oluvial Valley, 1940–1947. Papers, Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, Vol. 25. Cambridge, Mass.
QUIMBY, GEORGE I.
1951. The Medora Site West Baton Rouge Parish, Louisiana. Anthropological Series, Field Museum of Natural History, Vol. 24, No. 2. Chicago, Ill.
QUIMBY, GEORGE I., AND SPOEHR, ALEXANDER
1950. Historic Creek Pottery from Oklahoma. American Antiquity, Vol. 15, No. 3, pp. 249–51. Menasha, Wis.
SCHMITT, KARL
1950. Two Creek Pottery Vessels from Oklahoma. Florida Anthropologist. Vol. 2, Nos. 1–2, pp. 3–8. Gainesville, Fla.
SEARS, WILLIAM H.
1950a. The Cultural Position of Kolomoki in the Southeast. Microfilm, University of Michigan. Ann Arbor, Mich.
1950b. Preliminary Report on the Excavations of an Etowah Valley Site. American Antiquity, Vol. 16, No. 2. Salt Lake City, Utah.
1951a. Excavations at Kolomoki—Season I. University of Georgia Series in Anthropology, No. 2. Athens, Ga.
1951b. Excavations at Kolomoki—Season II. University of Georgia Series in Anthropology, No. 3. Athens, Ga.
1952. An Archaeological Manifestation of a Natchez-type Burial Ceremony. Florida Anthropologist, Vol. 5, No. 1–2, pp. 1–7. Gainesville, Fla.
1953. Excavations at Kolomoki—Season III and IV. Mound D. University of Georgia Series in Anthropology, No. 4. Athens, Ga.
SEARS, WILLIAM H., AND GRIFFIN, JAMES B.
1950. Fiber-Tempered Pottery of the Southeast. Museum of Anthropology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
SETZLER, FRANK
1933a. Hopewell Type Pottery from Louisiana. Journal of the Washington Academy of Sciences, Vol. 23, pp. 149–53. Washington, D. C.
1933b. Pottery of the Hopewell Type from Louisiana. Proceedings U. S. National Museum, Vol. 82, Art. 22, Washington, D. C.
SETZLER, FRANK, AND JENNINGS, JESSE D.
1941. The Peachtree Mound and Village Site, Cherokee Co., North Carolina. Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 131. Washington, D. C.
SWANTON, JOHN R.
1922. Early History of the Creek Indians and Their Neighbors. Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 73. Washington, D. C.
WARING, ANTONIO J., JR.
N. D. MS. The Bilbo Site.
WARING, ANTONIO J., JR., AND HOLDER, PRESTON
1945. A Prehistoric Ceremonial Complex in the Southeastern United States. American Anthropologist, n. s., Vol. 47, pp. 1–34. Menasha, Wis.
WAUCHOPE, ROBERT
1948. The Ceramic Sequence in the Etowah Drainage, Northwest Georgia. American Antiquity, Vol. 13, No. 1, pp. 201–9. Menasha, Wis.
WEBB, CLARENCE H., AND DODD, MONROE, JR.
1939. Further Excavations of the Gahagan Mound: Connections with a Florida Culture. Bulletin, Texas Archaeological and Paleontological Society, Vol. 2, pp. 92–126.
WEBB, WILLIAM S.
1938. An Archaeological Survey of the Norris Basin in eastern Tennessee. Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 118. Washington, D. C.
1939. An Archaeological Survey of the Pickwick Basin in the adjacent portions of the states of Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee. Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 129. Washington, D. C.
1952. The Jonathan Creek Village Site 4, Marshall Co., Kentucky. University of Kentucky, Reports on Anthropology, Vol. 8, No. 1, University of Kentucky Press. Lexington, Ky.
WEBB, WILLIAM S., AND FUNKHOUSER, W. D.
1931. The Tolu Site in Crittenden Co., Kentucky. Publications of the Department of Anthropology and Archaeology, University of Kentucky, Vol. 1, No. 5. Lexington, Ky.
1933. The McLeod Bluff Site in Hickman Co., Kentucky. Publications of the Department of Anthropology and Archaeology, University of Kentucky, Vol. 3, No. 1. Lexington, Ky.
WEBB, WILLIAM S., AND DE JARNETTE, DAVID L.
1942. An Archaeological Survey of Pickwick Basin in the adjacent portions of the States of Alabama, Mississippi and Tennessee. Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 129. Washington, D. C.
WILLEY, GORDON R.
1949. Archaeology of the Florida Gulf Coast. Smithsonian Misc. Collections, Vol. 113. Washington, D. C.

Appendix A

Pottery Type Descriptions

The purpose of this paper has been to report the Funeral Mound excavations. As the Macon Plateau period is the level of paramount importance there and the other periods are represented by only fractional materials, only the Macon Plateau pottery types will be presented by descriptions. The definition of these types depends on the material from the whole Macon Plateau as it has been examined over the years. It is not confined to the 20,207 sherds found at the Funeral Mound. The descriptions below supplement those first issued in the Newsletter, Southeastern Archeological Conference, Vol. II, No. 2, March 1940, pp. 2–6. They represent the latest sorting characteristics used by the author in handling these sherds.

BIBB PLAIN

PASTE:

Method of Manufacture: Coiled, coil fractures occur.

Temper: Grit (55 percent), shell (40 percent), or shell and grit mixed (5 percent), sometimes an extremely abundant shell, which has been sorted as Bibb Plain Variant because of its extreme friability. Grit temper is medium to coarse; sand, crushed limestone, or crushed quartz; moderate to abundant. Shell, often leached out, is coarse and abundant, extremely abundant in Bibb Plain Variant. In mixed-temper sherds, shell seems to predominate.

Texture: Slightly gritty when grit tempered; clay, fine texture. Some diagonal laminations.

Hardness: 2.5 to 5 (rarely).

Color: Core, black to dark brown, rarely buff. Surfaces red-brown to chocolate, rarely buff. Exterior mottled and smudged. Predominant color is red-brown.

SURFACE FINISH:

Smooth, rarely polished, usually eroded and showing gritty core. Red filming occurs on something less than 0.1 percent of the sherds. It is an allover red filming. Cord marking occurs in less than 1 percent of the sherds.

DECORATION:

Technique: Modeled nodes, simple or bifurcated.

Distribution: Bifurcated nodes on shoulder between handles. Single or multiple nodes, grooves, or rarely crude animal (?) effigies, on handles.

FORM:

Rim: Slightly flaring (43 percent), flaring (32 percent), straight (22.5 percent), surged (2.5 percent); generally short. Surged rim is actually a shoulder area, true rim being absent.

Lip: Generally rounded, or flattened; rarely squared, narrowed or rounded, or slightly extruded. Very rarely interior beveled rim.

Body: Globular, slight shoulder; with surged rim, shoulder is sharply angled. "Melon" or lobed pots are known rarely as are straight-necked bottles, and seed-bowl forms. Vessels 3 to 30 cm. diameter, 8 to 25 cm. high.

Base: Generally rounded, simple, flattened in large bottles.

Thickness: Lip, 3 to 6 mm.; body, 4 to 9 mm.

Appendages: Loop handles, welded to lip, riveted to shoulder, cross section average 17 x 14 mm. Often with raised boss above lip, nodes on handle or longitudinal groove. Two handles per pot. Rarely bifurcated nodes on shoulder between handles.

CHRONOLOGICAL POSITION: Macon Plateau focus, above Middle Swift Creek, slightly earlier than Etowah Complicated Stamped. Comparable to but slightly earlier than plain type at Hiwassee Island and Norris Basin Small-log Town-house sites.

PROBABLE RELATIONSHIPS: This is the predominant Macon Plateau type, near 90 percent of all collections, in the Macon Plateau period. It is closely related to the types at Hiwassee Island, Norris Basin, and perhaps a similar type in the Old Village levels at Cahokia. It is the Early Mississippian plain, loop-handled jar form. In most areas this type is shell tempered. The grit temper here may be an early feature of the Macon area.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Kelly, 1938, Plate 11b; Jennings and Fairbanks, 1940, p. 2; Webb, 1938, pp. 57–58, Plate 32b, upper row, p. 82, Plate 45a, etc.; Griffin, 1938, pp. 288–9 passim; Lewis and Kneberg, 1946, pp. 90–94, Plate 59.

HALSTEAD PLAIN

PASTE:

Method of Manufacture: Coiled, coil fractures present rarely.

Temper: Shell, fine, scarce, often lacking.

Texture: Fine, some diagonal laminations.

Hardness: 2.5 to 4.

Color: Core, generally grey, buff; surface tan to brown-mottled-black, some gray, rarely black.

SURFACE FINISH: Very smooth, usually polished, some crackling.

Filming: Rarely (1 percent), red or red and white.

DECORATION:

Technique: Appliqué modeling, narrow incised lines, paint.

Design: Details of effigy. Incised hair, appliqué ears, hair, etc., paint on face and body of effigy. Perhaps allover red, but rare.

Distribution: Usually head of effigy, simple bottles not decorated.

FORM:

Rim: Straight, short, on simple bottles, rarely flaring or slightly flaring. Neck on effigy bottles tapers from body.

Lip: Narrowed and rounded, rounded.

Body: Flattened globular, somewhat too markedly flattened, effigy form rare. Seed bowl and open bowl rare. Bottles usual form.

Base: Simple, rounded.

Thickness: Lip, 2 to 4 mm.; body and rim, 3 to 6 mm.; base 6 mm.

Appendages: Modeled appliqué on effigy bottles to form ears, hair crest, etc.

CHRONOLOGICAL POSITION: Macon Plateau, later than Middle Swift Creek, earlier than Etowah, Savannah, and Lamar.

PROBABLE RELATIONSHIPS: This seems to be a fairly straightforward Mississippian smooth or polished plain type, usually found on blank-faced effigy bottles. The details differ from other comparable types. It is evidently not a utility ware.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Jennings and Fairbanks, 1940, p. 3.

MACON THICK

PASTE:

Method of manufacture: Some coil fracture, some vessels possibly modeled.

Temper: Grit, medium to fine, scarce to moderate. Some coarse clay fragments.

Texture: Even to fine.

Hardness: Generally 2, but occasional specimen up to 4.

Color: Core, red to buff, sometimes mottled; surface buff, red, brown; little difference between core and surface, except surface sometimes weathered.

SURFACE FINISH: Surface fairly even, matte, some temper appears on surface.

DECORATION:

Technique: Broad, deep incising, lines triangular in section. Cord impressed, stamped, punctate, plain.

Design: Horizontal incised lines, diagonal incised lines, combinations of vertical and diagonal lines, some curvilinear incised designs, all simple, widely spaced. Punctate combined with incising and cord impression. Cord impressions vertical. Some concentric circle stamp.

Distribution: Sides of vessel, on lip surface rarely.

FORM:

Rim: Vertical, not differentiated from walls.

Lip: Frequently surged at right angle, frequently rounded, some flattened, or expanded and flattened. Restricted orifice common.

Body: Walls straight; rarely very slightly curved. Cylindrical jars with small orifice. Height about twice diameter. Diameter ca. 100 mm.

Base: Flat, rarely rounded, possibly flared.

Thickness: Lip, 6 to 20 mm., body, 13 to 20 mm.

CHRONOLOGICAL POSITION: Macon Plateau period, above Swift Creek, earlier than Etowah Complicated Stamped, etc.

PROBABLE RELATIONSHIPS: This thick, cylindrical jar type seems to be unique to Macon Plateau and Brown's Mount. I can find no very close similarities in any other sites. It differs radically in appearance, form, and decoration from the other Macon Plateau types yet is part of the complex. Some sherds seem to approach in form and material the casually baked clay objects with central hole that have been called pottery standards or torch holders. Macon Thick is a pottery type, however, and not a pottery object. Vaguely similar forms, not really comparable, are found in Holmes, 1903, Plate IIId.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Jennings and Fairbanks, 1940, p. 4.

HAWKINS FABRIC MARKED

PASTE:

Method of Manufacture: Coil fractures occur very rarely. Probably it was made in a fabric- or leaf-lined pit.

Temper: Generally shell, abundant, coarse; rarely grit, coarse, abundant.

Texture: Laminated, not greatly contorted.

Hardness: 2 to 4; average 2 to 2.5.

Color: Core, red, chocolate, rarely tan or black, usually but slightly darker than the red, chocolate, gray or brown surface, some smudging.

SURFACE FINISH: Impressed with plain twined open-work fabric over entire surface up to lip. Rarely twilled twined fabric, banded. Interior smooth.

Fabric: Cord a double strand, 1 to 2 mm. diameter, weft spaced 4 to 14 mm., warp spaced 1 to 3 mm. Cord and weft weaving clockwise twist, very rarely a plain twined close-woven fabric resembling "basketry."

FORM:

Rim: Straight, slightly tilted outward from base.

Lip: Plain (57 percent), thickened (43 percent), more commonly rounded than flat, rarely longitudinal groove.

Body: Large, open circular basin, slightly flaring to flaring sides.

Base: Flattened.

Thickness: Wall, 8 to 13 mm.; lip, 8 to 21 mm.

Appendages: None.

CHRONOLOGICAL POSITION: Macon Plateau period.

PROBABLE RELATIONSHIPS: This is the typical Mississippian "salt pan." It is found in quantity at most Mississippian sites, early as well as late. It is almost certainly not a salt pan at all but the family eating bowl and baking pan. It is certainly characteristic of the Mississippian but is not confined to the early period.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Jennings and Fairbanks, 1940, p. 5.

McDOUGAL PLAIN

PASTE:

Method of Manufacture: Coil fractures occur rarely but these pans were probably made in a basin-shaped pit like Hawkins Fabric Marked.

Temper: Generally shell, coarse, abundant, some coarse sand and grit, rarely mixed shell and grit.

Texture: Generally laminated, rarely contorted.

Hardness: 2 to 2.5 average, range 2 to 4.

Color: Core, red, chocolate, rarely tan or black, usually a little darker than the red or chocolate surface. Rarely smudged.

SURFACE FINISH: Poorly smoothed, generally area below the lip for about 10 cm. is smoother than basal portion.

FORM:

Rim: Straight, rarely thickened below lip, either rounded or flattened area below lip. Slightly tilted outward from base.

Lip: Flat. less commonly rounded, rarely ridged or longitudinally grooved.

Body: Large circular basin with slightly sloped sides, 60 cm. diameter, 12 cm. deep.

Base: Flat, rarely slightly rounded.

Thickness: Body, 8 to 13 mm.; lip, 8 to 20 mm.

Appendages: None.

CHRONOLOGICAL POSITION: Macon Plateau period. May be slightly later than Hawkins Fabric Marked, but both are typical of period.

PROBABLE RELATIONSHIPS: This is apparently a common variant of the typical Mississippian "salt pan" form. It occurred at the Norris Basin at both Small-log and Large-log sites. It seems to be more characteristic of Large-log (Late Mississippian) than of Small-log (Early Mississippian) sites. A variety of pans were found at Hiwassee but apparently no plain ones. At Kincaid, a late site, plain pans increased in frequency in the later levels. The plain pan on the basis of Macon Plateau evidence is not exclusively a late type.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Jennings and Fairbanks, 1940, p. 6; Griffin, 1938, pp. 266–7, 293, 298; Cole, 1951, pp. 139–140.

BROWN'S MOUNT PLAIN

(Very similar to Bibb Plain)

PASTE:

Method of Manufacture: Coil fractures present.

Temper: Grit usually, some shell, and grit and shell mixed, rarely extremely abundant shell (like Bibb Plain Variant).

Texture: Slightly gritty when grit tempered, some diagonal laminations, somewhat finer than Bibb Plain.

Hardness: 2 to 2.5 average; some as hard as 4.

Color: Core, black to dark brown, rarely buff. Surfaces red-brown to chocolate, sometimes buff. Exterior sometimes smudged.

SURFACE FINISH: Smooth, rarely polished, usually eroded and showing gritty or leached shell-tempered core.

DECORATION:

Technique: Modeled heads, a bird that may be an owl, and a human with round topknot. Crudely done; eyes, mouth, nose only slits.

Distribution: On rim of shallow bowls, facing inward.

FORM:

Rim: Straight or very slightly curved.

Lip: Generally rounded, narrowed and rounded, rarely squared.

Body: Hemispherical bowls, about 20 cm. diameter, 6 cm. high.

Thickness: 3 to 7 mm.

Appendages: Modeled effigies above lip, heads only, no tails, etc.

CHRONOLOGICAL POSITION: Macon Plateau, probably throughout the period.

PROBABLE RELATIONSHIPS: This is the type of Early Mississippian effigy bowl. It differs in a number of respects from the Late Mississippian effigy bowl in that fish are never present, types of effigy heads are much simpler, effigies face inward, there are no tails, effigies are much simpler or crude in execution. It is found at Hiwassee Island on Hiwassee Island Red Filmed where it has a thickened folded rim. The information on the Small-log sites is not clear but it was not common at least. Somewhat similar inward-facing crude effigies are found as far northwest as Cahokia, where it occurs on Monks Mound Red, and at Aztalan. It is also found as far west as the East Mound in Arkansas where it appears on a type similar to Davis Incised. To the south, it sometimes occurs in Weeden Island Incised. Most Weeden Island Incised effigies are, however, a later type and face outward. Actually this type probably belongs with Bibb Plain. It is given type status solely because it is easy to sort and it was hoped that the effigy head might have chronological or other significance.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Jennings and Fairbanks, 1940, p. 3; Phillips, Ford and Griffin, 1951, p. 162.

Appendix B
Descriptions of Whole Vessels

39–162/1 Bi 1. Bibb Plain jar. Grit temper. Outer surface polished but shows burnishing marks, interior smooth. Diameter 10.2 cm., height 9.6 cm. Base round, shoulder angled sharply on exterior, rim surged, lip rounded and somewhat everted, buff to reddish core, surfaces tan to buff, some smudging on exterior. Two bifurcated nodes on shoulder between two slender loop handles which have raised nob at lip attachment. Hardness 2.5 to 3. Found in unnumbered, undescribed pit on south face of mound.

39–181/1 Bi 1. Bibb Plain short-neck bottle. Grit temper. Outer surface polished with some crackle, interior smooth. Height, 16.5 cm.; diameter. 15.9 cm., diameter of mouth, 7.5 cm.; neck, 4.5 cm. high. Base somewhat flattened, neck straight. Lip narrowed and somewhat flattened. Color dark buff with general smudging on exterior and interior. Hardness 2.5 to 3. Found with Burial 46 in Pit 2 which contained disc shell beads, a Bibb Plain bottle, a Bibb Plain jar, 2 mussel shells, and a projectile point (missing from the catalogued collections). Pit 2 originated in the new sod but is clearly Macon Plateau in time. (See middle photograph, plate 17.)

39–183/1 Bi 1. Bibb Plain jar. Leached shell temper. This is almost too soft to be called Bibb Plain Variant. Diameter, 14 cm., 10.5 cm. high. Base rounded, body somewhat lopsided, probably recent warping. Shoulder somewhat angled, rim surged and slightly concave, lip squared and slightly thickened. Two loop handles, somewhat square in profile, upper corner notched. Color buff to brown, heavily smudged on interior and exterior. Hardness 2. Found with bottle above (39–181/1 Bi 1) in Pit 2, Burial 46.

39–186/1 Bi 1. Bibb Plain jar. Diameter, 13.5 cm.; height, 7.5 cm. Base rounded, shoulder angled on exterior, rim surged, lip rounded. Grit temper. Exterior shows burnish marks, fair polish. Color brown with reddish-buff mottling, smudged on exterior and interior. Two loop handles with a longitudinal groove about half the length. Hardness 4.5 to 5. Found in Pit 27, Burial 40, which dated from the period of the completion of Mound III (see lower photograph, plate 16).

39–155/1 Bi 1. Halstead Plain human effigy bottle, upper half only, arms missing. Shell temper scarce. The pottery is a mottled tan with some smudging. Neck and hair, unpainted; body, red; face, white. Body with head, arms missing, hole at back of head appears to have been orifice but now somewhat chipped around margins. Clavicles and nipples clearly shown, face simple, slits for eyes, simple nose, simple slit mouth, hair combed straight back shown by thin incised lines, ears pierced. Height 11.4 cm. Found at a depth of 1.3 feet in village area south of mound. (See upper photograph, plate 18.)

39–190/1 Bi 1. Halstead Plain blank-face bottle. Grit temper, scarce. Body globular, neck slightly tapered with orifice at side. On each side of mouth are raised semicircular ridges that may represent ears. Diameter of body, 13.5 cm.; total height, 13.5 cm.; neck diameter, 6 cm.; neck height, 9 cm.; color, gray with some smudging on exterior, well smoothed showing some burnish marks. Hardness 2.5 to 3. Found in Pit 63, Burial 59, which was under the clay plate of Mound II.

39–203/1 Bi 1. Halstead Plain blank-face bottle. Shell temper, fine, badly leached. Body globular, base rounded, neck tapers slightly, mouth at side surmounted by stylized human head, only hair and ears identifiable. Hair is a triangular area with roll of hair around sides, point to back, center of hair shown by fine incised lines. Ears at sides of mouth, pierced for ear pins. Total height, 18 cm.; neck height, 9 cm.; diameter, 13 cm.; neck diameter, 5 cm. Color of core is gray, surface, black, polished. Hardness 2.5, found in Pit 93, Burial 76. There are no descriptive notes on this burial. (See upper photograph, plate 17.)

39–39/1 Bi 1. Bibb Plain jar. Leached shell temper. 20 cm. diameter, 14 cm. high. Shoulder angled sharply on exterior, rim surged, lip squared. Two small bifurcated lugs on shoulder between two loop handles, square in cross section and squared in profile, with longitudinal grooves. Surface smooth but not polished, dark chocolate brown with general smoke smudging. Hardness 2.5 to 3. Base rounded. Found with Burial 38–3. (See upper photograph, plate 16.)

Appendix C
Sherd Statistics

There are four groups of sherds from the Funeral Mound: (1.) Sub-mound sherds, (2.) General mound collections, (3.) Kelly's stratigraphic cuts, and (4.) Willey's stratigraphic pits. The material from these is presented in this appendix. The sub-mound and general collections will be listed in detail by number of sherds and percentages of the various types. The material from the two stratigraphic series is presented in Figure 6. All of the whole or restorable pots are described in detail in Appendix B.

Types	Number	Percent
Submound sherds:		
Stallings Plain	7	18.4
Stallings Punctate	6	15.8
Deptford Bold Check	8	21.0
Dunlap Fabric Marked	5	13.2
Mossy Oak Simple Stamped	3	7.9
Bibb Plain	9	23.7
Total submound	38	100.0
General collections		
Early types:		
Stallings Plain	73	5.5
Stallings Punctate	62	4.7
Deptford Bold Check	148	11.2
Deptford Linear Check	7	.5
Dunlap Fabric Marked	143	10.8
Mossy Oak Simple Stamped	410	31.0
Woodland Plain	209	15.8
Swift Creek Complicated Stamped	160	12.1
Swift Creek Plain	68	5.1
Crooked River Complicated Stamped	7	.5
Alexander Pinched	7	.5
Napier Complicated Stamped	7	.5
Cord Roughened	24	1.8
Total early types (7.3 percent)	1,325	100.0
Macon Plateau types:		
Bibb Plain	8,251	84.6
Grit temper	4,538	54.9
Shell temper	3,301	40.0
Mixed temper	412	5.1
Whole pots, 5.		
Bibb Plain Variant	319	3.3
Halstead Plain	485	5.0
Whole pots, 3.		
McDougal Plain	360	3.7
Hawkins Fabric Marked	183	1.9
Macon Thick	140	1.5
Brown's Mount Plain	6	.....
Total Macon Plateau types (53.7 percent)	9,744	100.0
Lamar types:		
Lamar Complicated Stamped	64	40.3
Lamar Bold Incised	92	57.9
Late Check Stamped	3	1.8
Total Lamar types (0.9 percent)	159	100.0
Ocmulgee Fields types:		
Ocmulgee Fields Plain	2,190	31.7
Ocmulgee Fields Incised	1,654	23.9
Walnut Roughened	2,971	42.9
Kasita Red Filmed	102	1.5
Total Ocmulgee Fields types (38.1 percent)	6,917	100.0
Total general collections (100 percent)	18,145	100.0

Figure 6 shows in graphic form the sherds from the stratigraphic cuts along the old road and the sherds from Willey's stratigraphic pits. In each case the bars represent the percentages of sherds in each type for that level, with the total number of sherds in the level as unity. These graphs are constructed in a similar manner to those in Phillips, Ford, and Griffin, 1951. The cultural sequences are quite different in type from those found in the lower Mississippi Valley. These two graphs represent an interrupted series rather than the developmental series postulated in the lower Mississippi Valley.

In the first place, Figure 6 represents 2 short series. One graph has only 4 levels, the other 5. In both cases the top level is the plow zone. The bottom level seems to be largely post holes, etc., in the subsoil. The known occupation pattern is, however, different from that postulated by Phillips, Ford and Griffin.

In the second place, this series is an interrupted one. It may be that from Stalling's Island period through the Dunlap, Deptford, Mossy Oak, and into Swift Creek periods, there was a continuous evolutionary ceramic series. In fact, there is evidence that indicates the various pottery styles may have gradually developed one from another. But the occupations by the early groups at Ocmulgee are discontinuous in themselves and do not represent a constant occupation of the plateau. Macon Plateau represents an abrupt break from the previous period. There is a gap between Macon Plateau and the very scant Lamar occupation. From Lamar to Ocmulgee Fields is an interrupted occupation but there is a stylistic evolution which took place mainly outside the area. The distributions are, in the greatest part, discrete and discontinuous. The presence of late types in the early levels is purely a matter of disturbance of those lower levels by intrusions from the upper levels. The graphs do, however, show where the types belong. I suppose we could take the preponderant types as typical of each level, at least as far as the major occupations are concerned. Actually the determination of the pottery complexes must depend on other evidence, such as can be derived from house and grave excavations in the main.

Appendix D
Trait Lists

MACON PLATEAU

Items starred were not found at the Funeral Mound but are known to form part of the complex from other parts of the area.

I. Subsistence Activity

A. Agricultural Complex

1. *Charred corn cobs, 8- and 10-row, Southeastern Big Butt corn.
2. *Cultivated field, in rows, presumably ceremonial, inside fortifications, with temple in center, later covered by platform mound
3. *Pumpkin effigy in pottery
4. Tobacco, presumptive from pipes

B. Hunting Complex

1. Bones of deer, bear, turkey, puma, etc.
2. Fish and turtle bones less common
3. Weapons as listed in Stone Complex

C. Collecting Complex

1. Fresh-water mussels, shells frequent in refuse

II. Ceremonial and Political Activity

A. Community Plan Complex

1. Village located on "red hills" at fall line
2. Village short distance from river
3. Village extensive, ca. 35 acres
4. Village surrounded by double ditch fortification
5. Mounds numerous (7)
6. Mounds located around edges of fortified village (4)
7. Mounds located outside village area (3)

B. Architectural Complex

1. Mound area before construction an important burial center
2. Mound stages were burial centers
3. Mound stages composed of basket-laid soil
4. Each stage covered with compact clay plate
5. Flat-topped pyramidal mounds
6. Successive stages (7) of mound construction
7. Stepped ramp on west side (primary mound), perpendicular to mound face
8. Structures on mound tops, evidence incomplete
9. Some mounds were structure platforms only, no burials
10. Funeral Mound a structure platform and burial mound combined
11. Upper structure, at least, rectangular, with wall trenches (Small-log)
12. Large post hole in primary mound (scaffold?)
13. Clay curbs on edges of summit platforms
14. Possible palisade on summit platform
15. Successive stages not symmetrically placed
16. Sand "wash" on summit platforms, probably intentional sand mantle
17. *Earth lodges, near platform mounds
    a. Circular, four center posts, peripheral seats, central fire pit, eagle platform, tunnel entrance, clay basins in front of seats, earth covered
18. *Residences Small-log type
19. Burned clay floor in residences (accidental?)
20. Circular cache pits, shallow, near residences
21. Cache pit with large flint blades

C. Burial Complex

1. Burials very abundant below and immediately adjacent to mound
2. *Burials sporadic in village area
3. Burials beneath primary mound in log tombs
4. Burials beneath primary mound multiple, 1 to 7 bodies (retainers?)
5. Burials beneath primary mound, bundle
6. Burials beneath primary mound cleaned and rearticulated
7. Burials beneath primary mound with grave goods
8. Submound pits, basin-shaped
9. Inclusive mound burial pits narrow, oval, rectangular, deep
10. Burials from fill or plate of mound stages
11. Inclusive burials, bundle
12. Inclusive burials, extended
13. Inclusive burials, flexed, rarely
14. Use of fire in cleaning bones
15. Inclusive burials cremated, rarely
16. Burials with red paint on bones
17. Inclusive burials accompanied by grave goods
18. Grave goods: pottery vessels, shell beads, conch shells, conch cup, shell gorgets, shell cut objects, clay mass, copper "sun" plates, copper-covered puma jaws, discoidals, bone pins, adz, celt, pipe, mullers, projectile points

III. Craft and Artistic Activity

A. Chipped Stone Complex

1. Large oval or lanceolate blades
2. Medium triangular blades, straight or concave base
3. Drill
    a. Triangular with expanded base
    b. Simple, parallel sides
    c. Cruciform
4. Medium-sized, narrow-stemmed, sloping shouldered projectile points
5. Medium-sized, side-notched projectile points
6. Medium-sized, side-notched, opposite-bevelled projectile points (questionable)
7. Scrapers, uniface, circular
8. Scrapers, uniface, triangular
9. Scrapers, side, triangular or ovate

B. Ground Stone Complex

1. Celts, greenstone, convex bit, straight or convex sides, narrow poll, elliptical cross section
2. Adz, greenstone, squared bit, tapered sides, truncate poll
3. Spud, greenstone, bilobate shaft round, tapered
4. Hematite showing grinding facets
5. Shallow milling stones
6. Whetstone, flat-bevelled edges
7. Mullers, rectangular
8. Discs, biplane, small, not polished
9. Discoidals, biconcave, edges polished
10. Effigy, crude kaolin, (unfinished pipe?)

C. Rough Stone Complex

1. Pebble hammerstones
2. Quartz pebbles, smooth
3. Quartz crystals

D. Bone Complex
1. Split bone awls, round cross section, grooved basal end, polished
2. Split bone awls, slender without grooves

E. Shell Complex
1. Large unmodified conch (whelk) shells with burials
2. Conch cup or dipper
3. Circular shell gorgets, central perforation
4. Circular shell gorgets, notched edge
5. Small oval shell gorgets, central perforation
6. Elliptical cut sections, mussel shell
7. Beads, *Olivella mutica*, apical perforation
8. Beads, *Marginella apicina*, apical perforation
9. Beads, cut disc, large
10. Beads, cut, long, flattened, barrel-shaped
11. Spoons, slightly worked mussel shells

F. Wood Complex
1. *Posts for houses, temples, earth lodges
2. Log tombs

G. Metal Complex
1. Copper sheet ornaments, oval, ridged "sun" design
2. Copper sheet covering cut puma jaws
3. Copper ornaments of riveted sheets
4. Copper disc (gorget?)

H. Textile Complex
1. Basketry, cane, over-3-under-3 diagonal twilled plaiting
2. Fabric impressions on Hawkins Fabric Marked pans
3. Open twined fabrics
4. Close woven twined impressions (Tapestry woven)
5. Cord double strand, right and left twist
6. Twining right hand twist only
7. Warp spaced 4 to 14 mm., weft spaced 1 to 3 mm.

I. Pottery Complex
1. Pottery types
   a. Bibb Plain
   b. Halstead Plain
   c. McDougal Plain
   d. Hawkins Fabric Marked
   e. Macon Thick
   f. Brown's Mount Plain
2. Shell, grit, and mixed shell and grit temper
3. Loop handles exclusively
4. Predominantly plain surfaces
5. Effigy forms, blank face and complete effigy, human
6. Rim effigies, inward facing, human and bird
7. Pipes, projecting stem
8. Pottery trowels, mushroom type
9. Sherd discs
10. Spherical clay bead
11. Spool-shaped ear ornament
12. Baked clay balls, or "standards"

IV. Costume and Ornament Activity

A. Dress Complex
1. Appliqué beads on fabric or skins, disc or olivella
2. Fabrics, openwork or tapestry, twined

B. Ornament Complex
1. Gorgets, circular shell, plain or notched edge
2. Beads
   a. Olivella
   b. Marginella
   c. Cut disc
   d. Cut barrel-shaped
3. Elliptical cut shell sections
4. Shell bead garter below knee
5. Copper-covered cut puma jaws
6. Copper shell ornaments, "sun" plates
7. Grooved bone pins
8. Body paint
   a. Rubbed hematite
   b. Pure clay mass with burials
   c. Effigy bottle with red body, white face
9. Ears pierced for ornaments, on effigy bottles
10. Spool-shaped pottery ear ornament
11. Clay bead, spherical
12. Hair dress from effigy bottles
   a. Combed straight back
   b. Parted in middle with rolls at side

C. Art Motif Complex
1. *Forked-eye design
2. *Eagle effigy, clay
3. Sun symbol, copper plates
4. Pottery decoration
   a. Knobbed and grooved loop handles
   b. Nodes on shoulder
   c. Crosshatch incised
   d. Cord marked
   e. Stamped circles (Macon Thick)
   f. Effigy heads on bowls
   g. Effigy bottles
   h. Notched gorgets (sun symbol?)

V. Smoking Activity

A. Pipe Complex
1. Pottery pipes, projecting stem, attached or detached stem

VI. Games Activity

1. Disc, pottery or stone
2. Discoidals, biconcave, stone

VII. Trade Activity

1. Copper, presumed source Lake Superior
2. Conch shells, presumed source gulf coast
3. *Olivella mutica* shells, presumed source Atlantic and gulf coasts
4. *Marginella apicina* shells, presumed source Atlantic coast
5. Greenstone, presumed source Great Smoky Mountains

VIII. Military Activity: Wars of Conquest, Evidenced by Abrupt Break in Cultural Sequence

A. Tools and Weapons Complex
1. Stone points and axes from stone complexes
2. Use of bow and arrow possible
3. Use of dart and throwing-stick possible

B. Fortifications Complex
1. Double ditch system around town
2. Possible palisade on some mound platforms

OCMULGEE FIELDS 1685–1716

Items starred are not known from the component of Ocmulgee Fields at the Funeral Mound but were found near the trading post stockade. Items prefaced by (D) are known from documentary sources and seem to complete our knowledge of the period.

I. Subsistence Activity

A. Agricultural Complex
1. *Corn; charred cobs; 8- and 10-row, Southeastern Big Butt corn; (D) Tobacco; pumpkins; beans; sunflowers; sweet potatoes (late).

B. Hunting Complex
1. Bones of deer, turkey, bear, racoon
2. Fish bones less common
3. Tools and weapons as in stone and trade complexes
4. (D) Hunting for deer skins on barter basis, important commercial activity

C. Collecting Complex

1. Fresh-water mussels, shells infrequent
2. (D) Nuts for oil
3. (D) Smilax root for starch

II. Ceremonial and Political Activity

A. Community Plan Complex

1. Village located on low plateau near river
2. Village in immediate vicinity of Carolinian trading post
3. (D) Creek-type square probable
4. Houses around trading post
5. Mounds not built

B. Architectural Complex

1. Houses oval or rectangular with rounded ends
2. *Houses with thatch sides and roof
3. *Houses small, ca. 20 x 15 feet

C. Burial Complex

1. Burials in shallow pits, 1 to 4 feet deep
2. Burials, flexed, partly or fully
3. *Burials, extended on back, hands on chest, rare (Christian?)
4. *Infant burials under large sherd or broken pot
5. Burials near or in Macon Plateau mounds
6. *Burials near or in houses
7. Burials often accompanied by grave goods
8. Grave goods
   a. Iron knives
   b. *Axes
   c. *Hoes
   d. *Muskets
   e. *Pistol
   f. *Sword
   g. Glass beads
   h. *Brass harness bells
   i. *Copper cone janglers
   j. *Copper rings
   k. *Buttons
   l. *Copper arm bands
   m. *Brass or iron buckles
   n. Conch columella cores
   o. *Musket balls
   p. *Cinnabar

III. Craft and Artistic Activity

A. Chipped Stone Complex

1. Small triangular projectile points, eared base
2. *Small uniface circular scrapers
3. Glass, chipped into oval uniface scrapers
4. Blades, triangular, large rare

B. Ground Stone Complex

1. *Celts, small, flat cross section, narrowed poll, rare
2. *Pipes, steatite, English type bowl, rare
3. Mullers, rectangular

C. Rough Stone Complex

1. Pitted hammerstones
2. Unpitted pebble hammerstones

D. Bone Complex

1. Split bone awls, rare
2. *Turkey tarsius bone awls, rare

E. Shell Complex

1. Conch columella beads
2. Conch columella cores
3. Knobbed conch columella core ear pins, rare
4. Mussel shells, slightly smoothed, as spoons

F. Wood Complex—lacking

G. Metals Complex (see Trade Complex)

H. Textile Complex—evidence lacking

I. Pottery Complex

1. Pottery types
   a. Ocmulgee Fields Plain
   b. Ocmulgee Fields Incised
   c. Walnut Roughened
   d. Kasita Red Filmed
2. Pottery pipes, equal armed, heavy, rare
3. Pottery discs, small, of all pottery types, common
4. Temper shell or carbon flecks, or absent
5. Vestigial strap handles
6. Appliqué rim fillets, notched or pinched
7. Cazuela bowl
8. Deep bowl
9. *Squared bowl, southeastern basket form, rare
10. Mug with handle, native manufacture, European form
11. Ring feet on plates and urn shapes, European influence

IV. Costume and Ornament Activity

A. Dress Complex

1. (D) Breech clout, males
2. (D) Wrap around skirt, females
3. *Pouches at waist
4. *Buckles at belt and wrist

B. Ornament Complex

1. Necklaces, glass beads
2. *Bands of harness bells at waist
3. *Arm bands of sheet copper, copper wire, iron wire
4. *Copper cone janglers
5. *Copper wire rings
6. *Brass and copper buttons
7. *Knobbed shell ear pins

C. Art Motif Complex

1. Incised line designs
2. Painted line designs
3. Guilloche, spiral, chevron, diamonds, X, etc.
4. Designs derived from Lamar
5. Designs sloppy and poorly executed

V. Smoking Activity

A. Pipe Complex

1. English clay pipes, very abundant
2. Pipes, pottery, equal armed, heavy, rare
3. Pipes, steatite, English shape bowl, rare

VI. Games Activity

1. Discs, small, sherd, abundant
2. (D) Stickball

VIII. Trade Activity

1. Settlement on Lower Creek Trading Path
2. Dependence on Trade with Europeans
3. Predominantly English sources
4. Spanish sources slight
5. Iron objects
   a. Hoes, eye type
   b. Axes, eye type
   c. Sword, with basket hilt
   d. Muskets, including dog lock ca. 1640
   e. Flint lock, 1670–1710
   f. Pistol, flintlock
   g. Knives, iron wire bracelets
   h. Forks, 2-tine with bone handle
   i. Candle trimmer
   j. Cones
   k. Janglers
   l. Strike a lights, U-shaped

6. Copper objects
   a. Sheet copper arm bands
   b. Cones, janglers
   c. Harness bells, marked KW
   d. Wire rings
   e. Wire bracelets
   f. Flat buttons
   g. Tubes, rolled sheet, small
7. Glass objects
   a. Bottles, rare
   b. Uniface scrapers, oval
   c. Mirrors, small
8. Beads: Seed in blue, red, white, black; Cornaline d'Alleppo or Hudson's Bay, clear faceted, black with white inlay, opaque white with blue or red lines, blue faceted
9. Pipes: English clay, TD and RT marks
10. Lead objects: Musket balls, 60 caliber to No. 6 shot, bale seals
11. Silver objects
   a. Spanish coin, Philip IV, 1664, Mexico City Mint
   b. Double-pierced coin
12. Ceramics
   a. Majolica, blue and white
   b. Olive jar sherds with green glaze
   c. Rhenish salt glaze mug wares

VIII. Military Activity

A. Tools and Weapons Complex
1. Bow and arrow
2. Musket, pistol and sword
3. Axe

B. Military Organization Complex
1. (D) Creek Confederacy
2. (D) Allied with Great Britain against Spanish and Spanish Indians

Appendix E

TABLE III.—*Summary of Funeral Mound Pits*

Pit No.	Horizon [1]	Depth	Size	Orientation	Burial No.	Remarks
1	(?)	3.0	(?)		(?)	Precedent to Pit 2.
2	New sod	3.1	Long oval		46	Intrusive to Pit 1. 6 Bibb Plain, 1 Deptford Bold Check.
3	Group II	2.6	(?)		27	Horizontal logs at sides of pit.
4	IV	3.1	5.9	E-W	12	Cuts water-laid sand.
5	IV	3.5	3.3	E-W	None	Refuse pit.
6	(?)	(?)	(?)		(?)	Previously disturbed by railroad.
7	(?)	(?)	4.7	E-W	14	Disturbed by railroad, precedent to Pit 15, may be intrusive.
8	(?)	(?)	6.0	E-W	13	Disturbed by railroad.
9	Sub-Mound I	2.9	7.0	E-W	(?)	No bones but a high phosphate content.
10	(?)	(?)	5.0	E-W	11	Intrusive to Pit 11, originates in slump.
11	(?)	2.2	2.6	E-W	(?)	Precedent to Pit 10.
12	(?)	2.4	4.0	E-W	10	
13	(?)	(?)	None		None	Not on profile.
14	(?)	(?)	(?)		(?)	Do.
15	(?)	(?)	(?)		(?)	Intrusive from Pit 7, from slump.
16	III	1.7	1.7		25	Pit size in error, extended burial.
17	(?)	(?)	5.0 long		26	Origin confused in notes.
18	(?)	(?)	1.8 diameter		18	Notes confused.
19	III	3.2	8.6 3.5	E-W N-S	20 21	Precedent to Pits 21, 22, and 28, from slope of Mound III.
20	IV	.8	2.0	E-W	22 (?)	Refuse pit, intrusive to Pit 19.
21	V	1.9	2.1	E-W	None	Refuse pit, precedent to Pit 22.
22	V	1.7	1.6 diameter		15	Intrusive to Pit 21.
23	V	2.1	2.3	E-W	19	
24	(?)	1.8	2.3	E-W	No number	Teeth only, outside mound area.
25	(?)	4.1	(?)		(?)	Origin questionable.
26	(?)	(?)	(?)		(?)	No record.
27	III	3.0	3.9 5.0	E-W N-S	40	Long oval outside Mound II.
28	IV	1.5	2.1	E-W	37	Irregular shape, intrusive to Pit 19.
29	V	(?)	6.8	E-W	24	From cap of Mound V.
30	(?)	(?)	(?)		28	Disturbed by railroad.
31	V	(?)	(?)		35	No size given.
32	IV	2.3	3.6 3.3	N-S E-W	None	Refuse or cache, 7 large flint blades, numerous flakes.
33	Old sod	2.2	2.9 diameter		36	Burial extended, pit size in error.
34	II	3.0	2.4	E-W	None	May be refuse pit.
35	II	4.8	6.8 3.5	E-W N-S	43	Long oval, slightly W by S and E by N, from slope of Mound II.
36	-V	2.7	5.1	E-W	No number	Burial not given number, extended w/conch cup, 6 Bibb Plain.
37	IV	3.1	3.0 diameter		70	Refuse pit, no bones.
38	II	3.2	7.6	E-W	None	Edge of Mound II.
39	-V	2.1	1.1 3.0	E-W? N-S?	32	From base of water-laid sand.
40	(?)	2.0	3.5	E-W	None	No notes.
41	IV	3.5	5.0	N-S	29	Intrusive to Pit 70.
42	-V	2.6	5.5 4.0	E-W N-S	42	Below water-laid sand and red clay of Mound V, outside Mound V.
43	Old sod	2.7	7.3 4.1	E-W N-S	53	
44	-V	3.7	2.5	E-W	44	Covered by Mound V plate below water-laid sand.
45	IV	3.5	7.2 2.5	NW-SE NE-SW	No number	Slight faulting of water-laid sand, burial not described.
46	-V	2.4?	3.1	E-W?	....do	Under water-laid sand; burial not described but was present.
47	Old sod	3.9	2.8 diameter			Destroyed by rains, description incomplete.
48	-V	2.5	7.0 4.0	E-W N-S	63	Precedent to Pit 75, some slumping of water-laid sand in pit.
49	II	3.2	6.0 (?) 3.0 (?)	N-S E-W	52	Fill of Mound II.
50	-V	2.9	2.7 diameter (?)		45	Under water-laid sand.
51	II	3.1	2.5 5.5	E-W N-S	65	Bark or log molds on walls, instrusive to Pit 80. Fill of Mound II.
52	New sod	5.1	9.1 3.9	NE-SW NW-SE	47	Long oval pit.
53	Sub-Mound I	3.0	8.8 5.0	E-W N-S	48 A and B	Possible log tomb; slumping slight walls slope, base basin-shaped.
54	....do	6.6	11.0 4.0	E-W N-S	69	Precedent to Pit 57; basin-shaped; bark cover, faulting into pit.
55	....do	2.7	8.0 4.0	E-W N-S	50	Long oval no slumping; some decayed bark, ends rounded.
56	....do	3.8	8.0 5.0	NE-SW NW-SE	49	Long oval, log tomb, walls vertical, faulting.
57	....do	5.7	11.0 5.0	E-W N-S	68	Basin-shaped, log tomb, 5.7 x 3.7 feet, faulting into pit.

See footnote at end of table.

TABLE III.—*Summary of Funeral Mounds Pits*—Continued

Pit No.	Horizon [1]	Depth	Size	Orientation	Burial No.	Remarks
58	(?)	3.1	5.0	E-W?	6?	Does not show on profiles.
59	Group I	4.1	7.7 3.0	E-W N-S	(?)	Intrusive to Pits 73 and 74. No notes. Faulting into pit.
60	New sod	1.8	1.9 diameter		None	Refuse pit, glass bead, 9 Ocmulgee Fields sherds and 1 Dunlap Fabric Marked.
61	Sub-Mound I	2.9	3.0 diameter		do	Refuse pit.
62	-V	2.1	6.6 4.0	E-W N-S?	51	Profile shows origin in subsoil. Precedent to Pit 76.
63	II	3.8	6.9 6.0	E-W N-S	59	Under plate of Mound II.
64	(?)	4.3	4.6	E-W	None	Refuse pit.
65	-V	4.8?	(?)		55	No notes.
66	V	3.7	3.0 (est.) 8.0	E-W N-S	57	Precedent to Pit 67.
67	Old sod	2.9	5.5	N-S	56	Intrusive to Pit 66.
68	VI	4.1	3.5 2.5	E-W? N-S	60	Long oval?
69	IV	2.7	5.5 2.0	NE-SW NW-SE	38	Intrusive to Pit 85.
70	III	2.0	3.5 2.2	E-W N-S	64	Cut by Pit 41.
71	VII	2.5	8.4 2.2	E-W N-S	58	Water-laid sand faulted into pit.
72	Group I	3.3	3.5 diameter		No number	No notes.
73	Group II	2.5	4.3	E-W	do	Intrusive to Pits 74 and 59. No notes.
74	III	1.7	3.2	E-W	do	Precedent to Pits 73 and 59.
75	IV	4.0	3.3 3.3	E-W N-S?	62	Intrusive to Pit 48.
76	New sod	2.7	4.1 3.5	E-W N-S?	54	3 Bibb Plain, 1 Dunlap Fabric Marked. Intrusive to Pit 62.
77	do	4.4	6.2 4.2	E-W N-S	72	Irregular shape.
78	Old sod	2.6	2.2	E-W	None	Refuse pit contained rocks and 2 Bibb Plain sherds.
79	Group II	2.4	5.5	E-W	No number	No burial described in notes.
80	II	1.8	6.5	E-W	67	Precedent to Pit 51.
81	III	3.3	1.8 diameter		None	Refuse pit.
82	VI	2.3	2.1 diameter		do	Refuse pit. Sherds: 1 Bibb Plain, 1 Dunlap Fabric Marked.
83	III	1.0	3.7	E-W	do	Refuse pit.
84	IV	1.9	2.0 diameter		do	Refuse pit. Intrusive to Pit 85.
85	IV	3.9	3.5? 5.0?	E-W N-S	66	Precedent to Pits 84 and 69. Notes confused; pit size uncertain.
86	Sub-Mound I	4.5	5.9 4.2	E-W N-S	71	Basin-shaped, floor flat, log tomb (?) faulting into pit.
87	(?)	(?)	(?)		(?)	No notes or profile.
88	(?)	2.2?	(?)		None	Questionable, 3 rocks in subsoil so given pit number.
89	Group II	1.2	1.5 3.1	E-W N-S	No number	Few teeth, no burial number given. No notes.
90	(?)	3.6?	4.1 2.0	E-W N-S	74	Probably part of Pit 82.
91	II	3.0	6.5	E-W	77	From top of Mound II.
92	II	1.8	7.0	E-W	75	From fill of Mound II.
93	(?)	1.6	7.2	E-W	76	No notes, not on profile.
94	(?)	(?)	(?)		(?)	Do.
95	(?)	2.2	8.5	E-W	(?)	Do.
96	Group II	4.1	6.7 5.0	E-W N-S	86 A and B	Rectangular pit. Intrusive to Pit 97. Lined with grass.
97	Group I	3.3	3.9 3.3	E-W N-S	None	Precedent to Pit 96, oval, rounded ends.
98	do	1.7	3.6	E-W	(?)	Notes incomplete.
99	do	(?)	6.5 1.6	E-W N-S	(?)	4 post holes around pit. No burial described but a long oval.
100	do	(?)	7.2 5.0	E-W N-S	(?)	No burial described but a long oval pit.
101	Group II	1.4	6.0 2.0	E-W N-S	87	Long oval pit with rounded ends.
102	do	2.6	1.5	N-S	None	Very irregular, may be a stump.
103	do	(?)	5.0 5.8	E-W N-S	88	Precedent to Pit 110.
104	do	(?)	2.4	E-W	(?)	No notes, no profile.
105	Group I	(?)	(?)		(?)	Notes confused, probably subsand, no profile.
106	do	(?)	7.8	E-W	80	Precedent to Pit 107.
107	Group II	(?)	4.5	E-W	(?)	No burial described. Intrusive to Pit 106.
108	(?)	(?)	1.9 diameter		(?)	May be post hole.
109	(?)	(?)	4.8 2.6	N-S E-W	(?)	No burial described, no profile.
110	Group II	3.3	2.0 diameter		(?)	Intrusive to Pit 103; no burial described.
111	do	1.0	4.7	E-W	(?)	No burial described.

[1] Roman numerals refer to Mound stages. Group I refers to those pits which were entirely under the sandy wash and thus were dug before the completion of the mound but which cannot be more exactly dated. Group II pits cut some of the sandy wash but did not cut it all the way through to the humus. They date from the period of building of the mound. -V refers to those pits which can only be dated as dug before Mound V.

TABLE IV.—*Summary of Burials*

No.	Position	Age	Sex	Grave	Head to	Level	Pit No.	Remarks
1	PF	A	F	1 red glass bead	E	Historic	None	On right side, legs flexed to right, arms across torso.
2	PF	C	C	Conch shell cores, glass bead.	SE	Historic	(?)	On right side, 1.2 feet deep, Ocmulgee Fields sherds.
3	PF	A	F		N	(?)	(?)	2.5 feet below surface on right side.
4	PF	C	C	Conch cores, glass bead.	N	Historic	(?)	1 foot below surface, face down.
5	FF	A	F	Iron knife, red oxide.	W	Historic	(?)	1.9 feet below surface.
6	(?)	C	C	Yes	(?)	Historic	58	Glass beads, olivella bead, 1.4 feet below surface, skull only.
7	(?)	A	(?)	No	(?)	(?)	(?)	3.5 feet below surface, no pit, skull only.
8	E	A	(?)		W			2.5 feet below surface.
9	PF	C	C		E			Circular pit, 2.1 feet below surface.
10	E	A			S	(?)	12	On back, arms at sides, condition fair.
11	E	C	C		N	(?)	10	On back, arms across chest.
12	B					IV	4	2 individuals, disordered bundle, long bones, and skull fragments.
13	B					(?)	8	2 bone piles, 2 persons or 1 disturbed extended. Photo shows flexed.
14	E	A		Yes	S	(?)	7	400 olivella, 46 tubular conch beads, 2 discs, 1 pot. Sherds near head scattered, beads along neck and legs. Disturbed by Pit 15.
15	B					V	22	Bundle of long bones.
16	E	A			SE	(?)	(?)	Unknown pit.
17	E	C	C		NE	(?)		Right arm flexed, on back.
18	B	A				(?)	18	Skull only.
19	B					V	23	Bundle of fragmentary long bones
20	E				W	III	19	On back, with Burial 21, fragmentary.
21	B					III	19	Bundle, 2 tibiae, with Burial 20.
22	B					IV	20	Few scattered long bones.
23	B						(?)	Scattered pile, probably bundle, no pit number.
24	E & B				W	V	29	2 burials, both fragmentary, 1 extended, 1 bundle.
25	E(?)	A	M		E	III	16	Notes say bundle. Femur and 2 tibiae, probably extended.
26	E					(?)	17	Skull only, on right side.
27	E	A	M	Yes	S	Group II	3	Extended on back, all bones represented fragmentary. Grave goods: wood.
28	E					(?)	30	3 pieces of long bone seem to indicate an extended burial.
29	B					IV	41	Teeth only, preservation very poor.
30	E	A		Yes	E	(?)	(?)	Extended on back, historic. Projectile point at left femur.
31	E	A	F		SW	Old sod	(?)	Legs only, on back. Possibly historic.
32						-V	39	Teeth only, very poor preservation.
33	E	A	M	Yes	W	Historic	(?)	3.7 feet below surface. No pit described. Projectile point.
34	E				SW	Old sod	(?)	Possibly historic, on back, fragmentary.
35	E	A	F		SW	V	31	On back, condition fair.
36	E					Old sod	33	May be extended, perhaps historic.
37	(?)					IV	28	Teeth and fragments of mandible.
38	E	A		Yes	SW	IV	69	On back. Conch shell and muller above bones.
39	E	A	F		NW	Old sod	(?)	Face down, possibly historic.
40	B			Yes		III	27	Cremation, ash and calcined bones. Small pot in center. Mussel shell.
41	E	A			W	Old sod	(?)	On back, fragmentary.
42	E				W	-V	42	Skull and femora only.
43	E			Yes	SW	II	35	Teeth and fragments of femora. Unfired clay mass.
44	B					-V	44	Long bones, 2 skulls, 1 jaw.
45	B					-V	50	No skull, bundle 2.7 feet long.
46	F			Yes		New sod	2	Cremation(?), bark cover, Bibb Plain bottle and jar, 18 disc shell beads, 2 shell spoons.
47	E	A		Yes	SW	...do	52	On back, fragmentary.
48 A & B	E & B	A	M	Yes	W	Sub-Mound I	53	A is bundle, B is rearticulated extended, log tomb, 387 barrel-shaped, 17,582 disc beads.
49 A, B, C	E	A, J, J			E	...do	56	All possibly rearticulated. Log tomb.
50 A & B	E, E	A, A			W	...do	55	Both fully extended, log tomb.
51	(?)					-V	62	2 long bones only.
52	E(?)				S	II	49	Skull, long bone fragments. Photo shows bundle burial.
53	E			Yes	E	Old sod	43	Fragmentary. Flat disc beads at right tibia.
54	B					New sod	76	Skull only.
55	B					-V	65	3 pieces leg bone. Bundle 2.2 feet long.
56	B					Old sod	67	Fragmentary long bones and teeth.
57	B(?)			Yes		V	66	2 pieces long bones. Copper plates, copper-covered puma jaws, matting, fur.
58	E	J	J		W	VII	71	Arms, legs, skull.
59	E			Yes	E	II	63	Teeth only. Halstead Plain bottle at position of pelvis.
60	B					VI	68	Skull at end, 4 to 5 persons, bundle of long bones.
61	B			Yes		Old sod	(?)	Bundle of long bones, parallel, 4 Bibb Plain sherds.
62	E	J	J	Yes	SW	IV	75	Fragmentary, 4 pebbles, 2 oval mullers.
63	F(?)				N	-V	48	Teeth and 2 leg bones.
64	B	C	C			III	70	Skull, femur, 2 tibiae and fibulae.
65	E				S	II	51	Fragmentary, cuts torso of Burial 67.
66	E				NW	IV	85	2.5 feet long. Skull with fragments of long bones.
67	E			Yes	W	II	80	On back. Cut by Burial 65. Olivella shell beads around legs.
68	E			Yes	SW	Sub-Mound I	57	Rearticulated extended. Log tomb, 14 disc shell beads at right side.

TABLE IV.—*Summary of Burials*—Continued

No.	Position	Age	Sex	Grave	Head to	Level	Pit No.	Remarks
69	3E, 4B			Yes		Sub-I	54	Log tomb. 3 extended rearticulated, 4 bundle. Shell gorget, 26,000 olivella beads, 2 discoidals, 3 bone pins, 1 conch dipper.
70	(?)					IV	37	No bones described.
71	E				W	Sub-Mound I	86	Rearticulated extended. Marked faulting.
72	E			Yes	W	New sod	77	Fragmentary, skull and legs, possibly rearticulated. Celt 1 inches long at head.
73	B					(?)	(?)	Skull and fragment of long bone 0.9 foot below.
74	F	A			E	(?)	90	Legs partly flexed to right, skull on right side.
75	E	A			W	II	92	Fragmentary, rearticulated on back.
76	(?)			Yes		(?)	93	Burial not described. Halstead Plain effigy bottle 39-203/1 Bi 1.
77				Yes		II	91	Burial not described. Beads, shell, near bones and a white shredded substance (wood?)
78								Not described.
79								Do.
80	E				SE	Group I	106	On back, skull, vertebrae, 1 leg, 1 arm.
81	B			Yes			(?)	Columella shell bead near head, teeth only.
82	B(?)						(?)	Fragmentary, possibly cremation, pit unknown.
83	E				E		(?)	No pit number. On back, fragmentary.
84	E				SW		(?)	No pit number. Fragmentary, leg only.
85	(?)			Yes				No pit number. 1 shell bead, few teeth and fragments of bone.
86 A & B	E, E	A, A			W, E	Group II	96	On back, heads in opposite directions.
87	E			Yes	E	...do	101	On back, fairly complete.
88	E				NE	...do	103	Legs disturbed, may have been flexed.
89	E			Yes			(?)	No pit number. Fragmentary skull and legs. Celt, projectile point.
41-1	F	A				Village	41-1	Partly flexed on right side.
41-2	B					...do	41-2	Bundle of long bones.
38-1	E	A			E	...do	38-1	2.5 feet below surface.
38-2	E	A			SW	...do	38-2	2.6 feet below surface.
38-3	F	A		Yes	W	...do	38-3	On right side, Pit 3.5 feet deep, Bibb Plain pot, shell gorget, adz, clay pipe, 5 elliptical mussel shell objects, 1 oval shell gorget, 2 pieces cut shell.

TABLE V.—*Old Road Survey Sherd Distribution*

Levels (feet)	Bibb Plain		Bibb Plain Variant		Halstead Plain		Hawkins Fabric Marked		McDougal Plain		Lamar Complicated Stamped		Lamar Plain		Ocmulgee Fields Plain		Ocmulgee Fields Incised		Walnut Roughened		Kasita Red Filmed		Dunlap Fabric Marked		Mossy Oak Simple Stamped		Swift Creek Complicated Stamped		Deptford Check Stamped		Woodland Plain		Stallings Incised & Punctate		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
0-0.5	1,351	47.5	71	2.5	59	2.0	29	1.0	42	1.5	27	1.0	86	3.0	539	19.0	184	6.5	286	10.0	30	1.0	28	1.0	16	0.5	14	0.5	14	0.5	43	1.5	31	1.0	2,850	100
0.5-1	1,827	58.0	94	3.0	142	4.5	32	1.0	63	2.0	16	.5	78	2.5	440	14.0	109	3.5	173	5.5	14	.5	17	.5	51	1.5	15	.5	17	.5	49	1.5	16	.5	3,153	100
1-1.5	1,594	61.0	104	4.0	78	3.0	39	1.5	87	3.3	8	.3	73	2.8	223	8.5	52	2.0	93	3.5	6	.2	29	1.0	66	2.5	28	1.0	12	.5	103	4.0	14	1.0	2,609	100
1.5-2	28	75.7	1	2.7	1	2.7	1	2.7	1	2.7			2	5.4	1	2.7	1	2.7											1	2.7					37	100
Total	4,800		270		280		101		193		51		239		1,203		346		552		50		74		133		57		44		195		61		8,649	

TABLE VI.—*Willey's Test Pits Sherd Distributions*

[All figures are nearest whole percent]

Levels (feet)	Bibb Plain		Macon Thick		Hawkins Fabric Marked		Halstead Plain		Lamar Complicated Stamped		Late Checked Stamped		Ocmulgee Fields Plain		Ocmulgee Fields Incised		Walnut Roughened		Kasita Red Filmed		Mossy Oak Simple Stamped		Dunlap Fabric Marked		Miscellaneous		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
0-0.5	82	11.0	2	(1)			1	(1)	15	2.0			434	61.0	108	15.0	59	8.0	3	(1)	6	1.0			7	1.0	717	100
0.5-1	52	20.0	2	1.0					8	3.0	1	(1)	133	53.0	30	12.0	22	8.0			2	1.0			2	1.0	252	100
1-1.5	97	54.0	3	2.0	1	(1)			5	3.0			45	26.0	13	7.0	10	6.0			1	(1)	1	(1)	3	2.0	179	100
1.5-2	41	69.0			2	3.0							14	23.0	2	3.0					1	2.0					60	100
2-2.5	1	33.0											2	67.0													3	100
Total	273		7		3		1		28		1		628		153		91		3		10		1		12		1,211	

[1] Percentage too small to be significant.

Index

Abrading stones—51.
Accretional mounds—13.
Adair, James—6, 48.
Adena—11.
Adz—35, 45, 68.
Agkistroden mokasen mokasen—5.
Agriculture—13, 15, 45, 47, 49, 55, 57, 58, 60, pre-Columbian conditions for—5.
Alabama—11, 41.
Alexander Pinched—41.
Alexander series—41, 53.
Alto Focus—54.
Ameiurus natalis—5.
American contact—61.
American Revolution—61.
Antler—61; artifacts of—8, 54.
Archaic—8, 9, 11, 15, 42, 44, 45; classic sites 8; distribution in Georgia—8; Later Archaic—8; loss due to silting conditions in Georgia—8; pottery—8; (*See* Stalling's Island, Bilbo); trait list—8.
Arched-roof construction—31.
Archeological projects (CWA): California—1; Florida—1; Georgia—1; North Carolina—1; Tennessee—1.
Arundinaria gigantea—3.
Asimina triloba—3.
Atlatl—8, 10, 56; hooks of antler—8; weights—8, 42.
Augusta—6, 60.
Awl. (*See* Bone artifacts.)
Axes: copper—52; iron—60; three-quarter groove—8.
Aztalan site—54.

Baldwin Plain—53.
Banner stone—42. (*See* Atlatl weights.)
Barnwell formation—3.
Barrel-shaped beads—39, 46.
Bartram, William—5, 6, 16.
Basketry—31, 47, 57.
Bass—5.
Beads—8, 62; copper—53; copper-covered wood—54; disc—8, 22, 29, 30, 34, 39, 46, 54; tubular—8, 35; with burial—22, 29, 30, 35. (*See also* Glass beads; Conch beads.)
Beans—47, 56, 57, 60.
"Bear Claws," copper-covered—54.
Beaver—3; incisors—54.
Bell pestles—8.
Bibb Plain—11, 21, 25, 28, 29, 34, 35, 38, 43, 44, 50, 51, 54, 63, 64, 65, 75, 79, 81; Variant—26, 43, 50.
Bilbo Site—41.
Bilobed spud—13, 34, 45.
Birds—5.
Bison—5.
Bison bison bison—5.
Black bear—3.
Black drink—46. (*See also* Cassena Tea.)
Blades—29, 73, 74; ovate—29, 44; square base—29; triangular—44.
Blue-gill—5.
Boat stones—54.
Bobwhite—5.
Body paint—47, 58.
Bolton, H. E.—40.
Bone artifacts—8, 50, 54, 59, 62; awl—49; fish hooks—8; gorgets—42, 47; pins (*See* Bone pins.)
Bone cleaning—27, 42, 47, 52, 55, 58.
Bone pins—8, 23, 39, 47, 56, 62, 69; flat bifurcate—54; incised—8; long—8; short—8.
Bottle glass—49.
Bottles—51, 52, 63, 81; Bibb Plain—34, 63; hooded—51, 52. (*See also* Effigy bottles.)
Bow and arrow—10, 57, 60.
Bowman Farm Mounds—49.
Box Creek Brushed—49.
Box Creek Cross-Brushed—49.
Brass artifacts—48.
Breech cloths—58.
Brim—61.
Brown's Mount Plain—11, 43, 80.
Brown's Mount Site—13.
Brushed Surface Tradition—14, 49.
Bullen, R. P.—49.
Burial Mound I Period—10, 11, 53. (*See also* Miller I.)
Burial Mound II Period—11, 12. (*See also* Miller II.)
Burial mounds—11, 13, 52, 53, 54.
Burials, general—21, 42, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 54, 56, 62, 89, 90; bones painted—23, 24; bundle—23, 24, 26, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 47, 51, 52, 62; burial 57—vi, 31–32; disarticulated—22, 23, 24, 26, 29, 47; extended—22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 47, 51, 52, 53, 62; fired—22, 23, 24, 34, 47, 53; flexed—8, 32, 33, 35, 47, 52, 56, 62; furniture—22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 47, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 62; Mound I—62; Mound II—26–27; Mound III—28–29; Mound IV—29–30; Mound V—31–33; Mount VI—33, 62; Mound VII—33; multiple—21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 47, 53, 54, 55, 62; new sod—34; old sod—34; retainer—47, 53, 55, 58, 62; rituals—47, 52, 53, 58; Submound—21, 21–24, 38, 41, 62; skull—29, 34, 35, 53; Village Site—35.
Busk dance—59, 60.
Busycon—22.
Busycon perversum—35.
Bynum Mounds—53.

Cache pits—32.
Cahokia—54–55.
Caldwell, Joseph—9, 38.
Caldwell and Waring—9, 21, 41.
Candy Creek—11.
Cane, giant—3, 57.
Cane matting—31, 47, 57.
Carolina trading post—(See Trading post, historic).
Carafe-neck jars—52.
Cartersville—11, 38, 52.
Carya sp.—3.
Cassena tea—46, 58.
Castanea dentata—3.
Castor canadensis carolinensis—3.
Catfish—5.
Cathartes aura septentrionalis—5.
Cazuela bowls—13.
Celts—10, 23, 34, 39, 45, 46, 50, 51, 53, 54, 68.
Central City Park Site—48.
Central of Georgia Railway—6, 17, 20, 24, 25, 35.
Ceremonials—56, 58, 59, 60.
Charnel house—59.
Chattahoochee Brushed—49.
Chattahoochee River—60, 61.
Check Stamped (pottery)—9, 13, 56.
Chelydra serpentina—5.
Chenopodium—56.
Cherokee—11, 14, 60; correlation with northern Lamar—14.
Chickasaw—51.
Chipped stone—44–45, 50, 51, 52, 53, 73–74.
Choctaw—60.
Choppers—42.
Chunky—59.
Chunk-yard—59.
Civil War—15; fortification—35.
Civil Works Administration—1.
Claflin, William H., Jr.—8, 41.
Clans—58.
Clay: balls—43; beads—44; plate—25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33.
Cloaks, beaded—47; feather—58; skin—58.
Clovis fluted point—8.
Cole, Fay-Cooper—52.
Coles Creek Period—11, 53, 54.
Colinus virginianus virginianus—5.
Columella—46.
Community plan—47.
Complicated Stamped—9, 11, 13, 48, 49.
Conch: beads—48, 49, 53, 54, 69; cup—13, 29, 32, 39, 46, 48, 52, 62, 69; gorgets—46, 69; shells—53. (*See also* Gorgets, shell.)
Confederacy—59, 60, 61.
Conical pipes—10.
Conoidal base pottery—10.
Contact: European. (*See* Spanish, French, English contact.)
Coosaws—46.
Copena—41, 53.
Copper artifacts—31, 32, 46, 47, 48, 52, 53, 54, 55, 58, 70; gorget—31; janglers—48; plates—31; sun disks—31, 32, 70.

Copper-covered: "bear claws"—54; deer jaws—54; jaws, unidentified mammal—55; puma jaws—31, 70.
Copperhead—5.
Coragyps atratus atratus—5.
Cord-marked (roughened) pottery—9, 13, 41, 50–51, 53, 54, 55.
Cord-wrapped stick impressed (pottery)—9.
Corn—45, 47, 48, 49, 55, 59, 60.
Cornfield Mound (Mound D)—16, 17, 35, 49.
Cotter, John L. and Corbett, John M.—53.
Courts—57.
Coweta—16, 61.
Cox Mound—33.
Crane, Verner W.—14, 40.
Crataegus sp.—3.
Creek—6, 11, 14, 15, 16, 20, 35, 38, 40, 45, 48–49, 50, 59–61; correlation with Lamar—14; in Oklahoma—16; trading path—3, 14, 60; use of vulture feather standard—5.
Creek migration legend—46.
Cremations. (*See* Burials, fired.)
Crenshaw Site—54.
Cretaceous—3.
Crittendon County, Ky.—51.
Crooked River Complicated Stamped—42.
Crooks Site—25.
Crotalus horridus articaudatus—5.
Crow type social organization—59–60.
Cruciform drills—45.
Cup. (*See* Conch cup.)
Cupstones—56.
Curbs, clay—25, 28, 29, 47.
Cussitaws—46.

Dallas component—55.
Dart points—45.
Davis Incised—54.
Davis Site—54.
"Decayed asbestos"—27.
"Decayed fur"—31.
Deer—3, 47, 56; Florida whitetail—3; bones—34, 47.
Deptford Bold Check Stamped—9, 11, 21, 26, 41, 66.
Deptford Complicated Stamped—9, 11.
Deptford Cord Marked—9.
Deptford Linear Check Stamped—9, 11, 41.
Deptford Period—9–10, 11, 39, 41, 55; pottery complex—11, 21, 38, 56.
Deptford Plain—9.
Deptford Simple Stamped—9, 11.
Deptford Zone Punctuated—9.
Diagonal notched points—44.
Dickinson, S. D.—54.
Didelphis virginiana virginiana—3.
Diospyros virginiana—3.
Discoidals—23, 39, 45, 50, 51, 54, 62, 68.
Dog—8; burial—8, 53–54, 56.
Domed (burial) mounds—17, 53, 54, 56.
Dress—47.
Drills—8, 21, 45, 73, 74.
Duck—5.
Dunkin Incised—49.
Dunlap Fabric Marked (Impressed)—9, 11, 21, 23, 24, 34, 38, 41, 53, 66.
Dunlap Period—9, 11, 39, 41, 55; Mound—16 17, 18; pottery complex—11, 21, 38, 56.

Eagle—5, 56; figures—32.
Ear; ornaments—54; spools—53, 54.
Early Farmers—12, 13.
Early Mississippian—11, 13, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54, 55.
Early Woodland—9, 10, 11.
Earth lodges—13, 25, 26, 47, 50, 57, 58.
Eatonton—10, 11.
Echetee—16.
Ectopistes migratorius—5.
Effigies: 26, 47, 54, 56, 64; bottles—27, 64, 65; bowls—51; fish—51; hand—54; heads—50, 51, 54, 64; human—43, 54, 65; mounds—10; owls (on Brown's Mount Plain)—43; pipes—54; possibly pipes—45; turtles—55.
Elaborate structures—50.
English contact—14, 16, 48, 60, 61.
Eocene Barnwell—3.
Etowah Complicated Stamped—50, 52.
Etowah Incised—52.
Etowah Period—11, 13, 48, 50, 51, 55, 59; site—52.
Etowah Stamped—52.
Euarctos americanus americanus—3.
Euarctos americanus floridanus—3.
Excavations, Funeral Mound—20.
Exogamy—60.
Expanded center bar gorget—54.
Expanding stem points—21.
Expulsion (Creek)—61.

Fabric Impressed (Marked) pottery—8, 9, 56.
Fairbanks, Charles H.—13, 17, 38, 40, 43, 50.
Featherwork—58; cloaks—58; fans—5; ornaments—58.
Felis concolor—3.
Fiber tempered pottery—8, 41.
Fish—5.
Fish hooks—8; bone—8.
Flat-topped mounds. (*See* Platform Mounds.)
Flexed burials. (*See* Burials, flexed.)
Flint—21, 44, 57, 60; hoes—51.
Florida—11, 49, 55.
Fluted blade complex—8.
Folsom—11, 15.
Ford, James A.—1, 49, 53, 54.
Ford and Willey—10, 25, 49.
Forked eye—13, 32, 58; platform—52.
Forsyth Period—9, 11.
Fort Hawkins—15.
Fortification trenches—35, 42, 47, 55, 57.
Fowke, Gerard—25, 53.
Fox—3.
French contact—60.
Fugitive Red Paint—43.
Funeral Mound (Mound C)—16, 17, 20–35, 40, 41, 42, 47, 58, 59; construction stages—24, 42; cyclical additions—42; occupation—39–40, 42; stratigraphy—37.
Funeral Mounds, general—38.
Furrs Cord Marked—53.

Gahagan Site—53, 54.
Galena—53, 54.
Gar—5.
Gatschet, Albert S.—16, 46.
Georgia Central Railway—6. (*See* Central of Georgia.)

Glass beads—34, 35, 48, 49, 67; Cornaline d'Allepo (Hudson's Bay)—35; Venetian—35.
Glass scrapers—60.
Goggin, John M.—49.
Gorgets: bone—42; copper—31; expanded center bar—54; ground stone—10, 42; ovate—10; rectangular—10; shell—35, 39, 46, 47, 48, 62, 69; two-hole bar—10; two-hole circular—35.
Grand Mound—54.
Granular temper (pottery)—9.
Grave goods. (*See* Burial furniture.)
Great Temple Mound—16–17, 34, 35.
Greenbriar, lanceleaf—3.
Green Corn Dance—59, 60.
Greenhouse Site—53. (*See* Marksville)
Greenstone, adz—68; celt—23, 34, 39, 53, 68.
Griffin, J. B.—21, 41, 49.
Grinding stones—45. (*See also* Mano, Metates, Mortar, Muller, Pestle.)
Grit tempered pottery—13, 50, 51, 63, 64; Woodland-like—38.
Grooved loop handles—28, 35, 51, 63. (*See also* Loop handles.)
Ground stone artifacts—10, 42, 45–46, 68.
Guntersville Basin—52.

Haag, William G.—41.
Hachuring—12.
Hair arrangement—47.
Haliaeetus leucocephalis leucocephalis—5.
Halstead Plain—11, 26, 27, 39, 43, 50, 64, 65, 79, 81.
Hamilton component—35.
Hammerstones—46.
Harper, Francis—5.
Harris Farm Mounds—49.
Hatchets, iron—60.
Hawk bells—48.
Hawkins, Benjamin—16.
Hawkins Fabric-Marked—11, 35, 43, 47, 51, 66, 80.
Haws—3.
Heimlich, Marion Dunlevy—52.
Hematite—45, 50.
Hemispherical stones—10.
Hereditary leadership—58, 59, 60.
Hereditary priesthood—59.
Heye, Hodge, and Pepper—52.
Hiatus in occupation—13, 39.
Hickory—3.
Hickory Fine Engraved—54.
Hickman County, Ky.—51.
Hill Farm Stone Mounds—49.
Historic horizon—11, 48–49.
Hitchiti—14, 16, 57.
Hiwassee Island—11, 13, 35, 49, 50, 51, 52, 55.
Hiwassee Island Complicated Stamped—50, 51.
Hiwassee Island Red-on-Buff—50, 51.
Hoes chipped—51; flint—52; perforated—50; shell—50, 53.
Holder, Preston—42.
Holly Fine Engraved—54.
Hooded bottles—51.
Hopewell—11, 13, 32, 46, 53, 55.
Hopi—60.
"Hot houses"—50.
Houlka Gray—53.
Houses—56, 59.

Hunting—11, 47, 56, 58, 60, 61.

Ictalurus furcatus—5.
Ilex vomitoria—46. (*See* Cassena tea.)
Incised pottery—8, 13, 48, 49, 50, 52, 54, 59.
Indian Springs, Butts County—16.
Irene Period—11.
Iron artifacts—15, 48, 53, 60.
Iron-covered ear spools—53.
Iroquois—58.
Irvin Village Site—49.

Janglers, copper—48.
Jars—81; Bibb Plain—28, 34; carafe-neck—52; "juice press wide-mouth 26"—52; lobed—51.
Jennings, Jesse D.—40.
Jennings and Fairbanks—21, 39, 41, 42, 43, 48.
Jonathan Creek Site—51.
Jones, Charles C., Jr.—6, 16, 18, 26, 52.
"Juice Press Wide-Mouth Jar 26"—52.

Kaolinite—45.
Kashita—14.
Kasita Red Filmed—11, 49, 72.
Kellog Cord-Wrapped Stick Impressed—9.
Kellog Period—11, 38.
Kelly, Arthur R.—1, 8, 12, 13, 14, 25, 35, 40, 41, 49.
Kelly and Cole—54.
Kentucky—11.
Kincaid report—52.
King vulture—5, 58.
Knives—45; iron—48.
Kolomoki Complicated Stamped—13, 53.
Kolomoki: Complex—11, 12, 44, 52, 53, 55; Site—25, 52–53.
Krieger and Newell—54.

Ladle—44.
Lamar Bold Incised—11, 40, 48, 49, 52.
Lamar Complicated Stamped—11, 40, 48, 49, 52.
Lamar Period—11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 39, 40, 42, 48, 52, 55, 59; complex—11; pottery complex—11, 48.
Lamar Plain—11, 40, 48, 49.
Lamar (Unnamed) Filmed—49.
Laminated clays—25, 26; sands—25.
Late Mississippian—11, 44, 49, 51, 52, 55.
Lawson Field—14.
Leaf-marked (pottery)—43.
Lee Farm Village—49.
Legband, shell bead—47.
Lemley, Harry J.—54.
Lepisosteus sp.—5.
Lepomis sp.—5.
Lesser Temple Mound—16, 17.
Lewis and Kneberg—13, 35, 49, 50.
Line sinkers—8; soapstone—8; steatite—8.
Linear punctate pottery—8.
Lithic. (*See* Stone.)
Litters—58.
Lizards—5.
Lobed jars—51.
Log: steps—33; tombs—22, 23, 24, 38, 42, 47, 53, 58.
Longitudinal groove loop handles—43.
"Long-nosed god"—54.
Loom—47.
Loop handles—35, 43, 50, 52, 63, 65. (*See also* Grooved loop handles.)
Lorant, S.—43.
Louisiana—11.
Lower Creek—3, 6, 14, 15, 16, 49.
Lower Creek Trading Path—3, 14, 60.
Lugs—51.
Lutra canadensis canadensis—3.
Lutra canadensis vaga—3.

McCarty Farm Mounds—49.
McDougal Mound (Mound B)—16, 17, 18.
McDougal Plain—11, 43, 50, 51, 66, 80.
McGillivray—61.
McIntosh—61.
McLeod Bluff Site—51, 52.
Macon, Dublin and Savannah Railroad—17.
Macon Plateau—14, 15, 16, 40–41; area map—4; chronology—8; ecology—3; geological background—3.
Macon Plateau Culture—11, 13, 14, 15, 42–55, 57, 59–61; cultural affiliations—49–55; culture complex—11, 35, 42–48; components—40–49; pottery complex—11, 21, 38, 39, 43–44; trait list—83–84.
Macon Plateau Focus—39, 48.
Macon Plateau Period—11, 35, 38, 39, 42–48, 57, 58–59.
Macon Thick—43–44, 48, 66, 79–80.
Majolica—48, 67.
Manos—53.
Marginella beads—46.
Marksville, La.—1.
Marksville (Greenhouse): Mound—25; Period—11; pottery complex—54; site—53–54.
Masks—54.
Master Farmers—13, 14, 15.
Matrilineal: clans—58, 60; descent—58, 60.
Matrilocal residence—58, 60.
Matting. (*See* Cane matting.)
Mature Mississippian—11, 39, 53.
Meleagris gallopavo silvestris—5.
Mercier Check Stamped—11, 48.
Mercier Red-on-Buff—53.
Mereness, Newton D.—6.
Metal artifacts—46. (*See also* Brass artifacts, Copper artifacts, Iron artifacts.)
Metates—53.
Meteoric iron—53.
Meyer, William E.—3.
Mica—50.
Mico—60.
Micropterus floridanus—5.
Middens—16, 17.
Midden burials—8.
Middle Woodland—10, 11.
Miller I Period—11, 53. (*See also* Burial Mound I.)
Miller II Period—11. (*See also* Burial Mound II.)
Milling stones—45. (*See also* Grinding stones.)
Milwaukee Public Museum—54.
Mississippi: State—11; lower Mississippi Valley—49; River—8.
Mississippian—11, 13, 15; Early—11, 13, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54, 55; Late—11, 44, 49, 51, 52, 55; Mature—11, 39, 53.
Mitchell Mound Group—55.
Moieties—58, 60.
Monks Mound—54–55.
Monogamy—60.
Moore, Clarence B.—54, 55.
Moorehead, Warren K.—52, 54, 55.
Mortars—53; wood—45. (*See also* Grinding stones.)
Moss temper—8.
Mossy Oak Period—10, 11, 13, 15, 39, 41, 55; pottery complex—11, 21, 38.
Mossy Oak Simple Stamped—10, 11, 21, 41, 66.
Mossy Oak Site—10, 41.
Mound A. (*See* Great Temple Mound.)
Mound B. (*See* Lesser Temple Mound.)
Mound C. (*See* Funeral Mound.)
Mound D. (*See* Cornfield Mound.)
Mound I—24–25.
Mound II—25–27.
Mound III—27–29.
Mound IV—29–30.
Mound V—30–33.
Mound VI—33.
Mound VII—33.
Mounds—13, 47; correlation of names—16; Jones' description of 1873—6; modern description of—16–18; structures on—25.
Mourning dove—5.
Muller—29, 45, 53. (*See also* Grinding stones.)
Murdock, George P.—60.
Muskets—15, 48, 60.
Muskogean (langauge)—15, 57.
Muskohge—6.

Nacoochee Mound—52.
Napier Complicated Stamped—11, 14, 42, 66.
Napier Period—11, 12, 13, 15, 39, 55; pottery complex—11, 12, 57.
Narrow-stemmed points—21.
Natchez traits—25, 49, 53.
Negative painting—49.
Net sinkers—8, 42; soapstone—8; steatite—8, 42.
Newell and Krieger—49.
New sod—34.
Nineteenth-century artifacts—35.
Nodes, on loop handles—43.
Non-ceramic groups—8.
Norris Basin aspect—13, 31, 33, 49–50, 55.
Notched lip—51.
Notched points—44, 45, 51.
"Nut stones"—8.

Oaks—3.
Ocmulgee-Altamaha System—47.
Ocmulgee Fields: Culture Complexes—11, 15, 39, 40, 48–49; Focus—39, 48–49; Period—11, 39–40, 48–49, 55; pottery complex—11, 39, 48–49; trait list—84–86.
Ocmulgee Fields Incised—11, 34, 48, 49, 72.
Ocmulgee Fields Plain—11, 34, 48, 49.
Ocmulgee National Monument—1, 17, 20, 42; archeological areas (map)—7; historical background—1–2.
Ocmulgee Old Fields—6, 14, 40, 60–61.
Ocmulgee River—3, 4, 6, 7.
Ocone—6.
Odocoileus virginianus osceola—3.
Oglethorpe, expedition of 1739—6.
Ohio—11.
Oklahoma—15, 49.
Okmulgee, Okla.—16.
Old Oconee Town—14.

Old Road Survey—35, 36, 39, 90.
Old sod—33–34, 40.
Old Village focus—54.
Olivella mutica say—27; beads—39, 46, 54, 69.
Open courts—13.
Oppossum—3.
Orange—11.
Otter—3.
Oval mounds—47.
Ovate gorget—10.

Paddle-stamping—15, 56, 57.
Paired Pyramidal Mounds—11, 13.
Paleo-Indian—8, 9, 11.
Palisade—30, 47, 51, 59; with bastions—51.
Passenger pigeon—5.
Patriarchal band—56.
Patrilocal residence—56.
Pawpaw—3.
Peachtree Mound—33.
Pearls—53.
Pecans—3.
Pendants, stone—50; glass—67.
Persimmon—3.
Pestles—50; bell—8.
Phillips, Ford, and Griffin—40, 41.
Picks—51.
Pine—3; loblolly—3; shortleaf—3.
Pins. (*See* Bone pins.)
Pinus echinata—3.
Pinus teada—3.
Pipes—10, 35, 44, 50, 52, 54, 56, 59, 68.
Pit, cache—32.
Pit houses—35.
Pits—20, 22, 87–88; Mound I—24–25; Mound II—25–27; Mound III—27–29; Mound IV—29–30; Mount V—30–33; Mound VI—33; Mound VII—33; New sod—34; Old sod—33–34; Submound—21–24. (*See also* Tables III and IV, Appendix E.)
Pits, refuse—13; Mound II—26; Mound III—28; Mound IV—29–30; Mound V—31; Mound VI—33; New sod—34; Old sod—34; Submound—21; Village Site—34–35.
Pits, stratigraphy of—21–34.
Plaquemine Brushed—49.
Plaquemine Period—11, 53, 54.
Plates—52, 54.
Platform (Temple) Mounds—11, 16, 17, 18, 20, 24, 25, 26, 47, 52, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59.
Plummets—10, 42, 54.
Plums, wild—3.
Points. (*See* Projectile points.)
Polished cylinders—51.
Polished surface (pottery)—43, 52.
Polishing stones—46.
Political organization—60.
Poltergeists—48.
Post-Civil War—15.
Posts and postholes—20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30–31, 33, 47, 53.
Pottery—8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 21, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 63–67, 68, 71, 72, 75, 79–82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 89, 90; analyses—21, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43–44, 48, 50–51, 79–82, 90.
Powell Polished Plain—54.
Pre-cretaceous—3.
Pre-Funeral Mound—21, 38–39.
Procyon lotor elucus—3.
Procyon lotor varius—3.
Projectile points—8, 9–10, 21, 41, 44–45, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 73; Macon Plateau Complex—44–45.
Prunus sp.—3.
Puma—3, 46.
Puma jaws—31–32, 46.
Pumpkins—47, 57, 60.
Punctate decorated pottery—8, 54, 59; zoned—8.
Pyramidal mounds—26, 47, 52, 53.

Quartz—44, 46, 54.
Quartzite—45.
Quercus coccinea—3.
Quercus rubra—3.
Quimby, George I.—49.
Quimby and Spoehr—15, 49.

Rabbit—3.
Raccoon—3.
Radio-carbon dates—51.
Railway cuts—6, 7, 8, 17.
Ramey Incised—54.
Ramp—8, 25, 26, 33, 47.
Rattlesnake—5.
Rectangular gorget—10.
Red-filmed—43, 54.
"Red Hills"—3.
Refuse pits. (*See* Pits, refuse.)
Religion—56, 57, 58, 59, 60.
Repoussé design—31.
Reproductions—vi, 70.
Residences—47.
Richardson Farm Mound—49.
Rim folds—12, 14.
Ring feet, on pottery—49.
Rock Eagle Effigy Mounds—10.
Rough stone artifacts—46.

St. Simons Herringbone Complicated Stamped—42.
Saltillo Fabric Impressed—53.
"Salt Pan"—43, 47, 50, 51.
Sandstone vessels—8.
Sand tempered (pottery)—10.
Santa Rosa-Swift Creek Period—10, 12, 13, 41–42.
Sapelo Island—56.
Sarcoramphus papa—5.
Savannah—8, 9.
Savannah Complex—11, 12, 13, 48, 52; coastal affiliations—13.
Savannah Complicated Stamped—50, 52.
Savannah River, sites on—8.
Saws—45.
Scaffolds—3, 6, 25, 53, 58.
Schmitt, Karl—15, 49
Scrapers—8, 45, 60, 73.
Sears, William H.—8, 13, 25, 48, 52, 53.
Sears and Griffin—21, 41.
Seminole—49.
Setzler, Frank—1–2, 53.
Setzler and Jennings—33.
Shallow plates—54.
Shamans—57.
Shell—8, 33, 35, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 58, 69; beads—22, 23, 24, 27, 29, 30, 34, 35, 39, 47, 48, 49, 54, 56, 62, 69; gorgets—35, 39, 46, 47, 48, 62, 69; hoes—50, 53; pins—52; ornaments—8, 56, 58, 69; rings—56; spoons—34.
Shellfish (fresh-water mussels)—5, 46.
Shellfish subsistence—8, 10, 56.
Shell tempered (pottery)—13, 26, 50, 51, 52, 63, 64, 75.
Shinholsters—14.
Side-notched projectile points—21, 45.
Simple-stamped (pottery)—56.
Sinkers—8; evidence of burning—8; line—8; net—8; soapstone—8; steatite—8.
Skirts—58.
Skull deformation—8.
Skunk—3.
Slate—45, 57; spud of green slate—34.
Slave post—59.
Small-log Temples—47, 49.
Small-Log Town-house Sites—11, 31, 49, 50, 51, 54, 55.
Smilax lanceolata—3, 47.
Smithsonian Institution—1–2.
Snakes—5.
Soapstone—8; sinkers—8.
Social organization—56, 57, 58, 59, 60.
Society for Georgia Archeology—1.
Southeast Mound—16, 17. (*See* Trading Post.)
Southeastern Archeological Conference—40, 79.
Southern Cult—11, 13, 32, 46, 56, 59.
Spanish: artifacts—67; contact—14, 48, 60.
Spanish-Indian Period—11.
Spanish moss—8.
"Spinner points"—21, 44–45.
Spools, copper—53, 54.
Spoons, mussel-shell—34.
Spud—13, 34–35, 45, 52, 54.
Squirrel—3.
Stab and drag decoration—8.
Stalling's Island Period—9, 11, 13, 39, 41, 42, 55, 56; pottery complex—11, 21, 38; artifacts—41.
Stalling's Island Plain—11, 21, 41.
Stalling's Island Punctate—11, 21, 24, 41, 66.
Stamping tradition—8, 9, 11, 13, 15, 54.
Statistical analyses—82, 90.
Steatite, line sinkers—8; net sinkers—8, 42; vessels—8, 42, 56.
Stemmed points—9, 10, 44, 45, 50, 51, 53, 54.
Steps—25, 26, 33, 47.
Stickball—59.
Stippling—14, 49.
Stirling, M. W.—1.
Stockade. (*See* Palisades.)
Stokes Brushed—49.
Stone artifacts: Funeral Mound Period—44–46.
Stone boiling—8, 56; stones for—8.
Stone-box graves—52.
Straight-stemmed points—21.
Strap handles—51, 52.
Stratigraphy, general—37.
Strong, W. D.—1.
Structure on summit—30–31, 33, 54.
Submound: area—20; pits—52, 53, 54. (*See also* Pits.)
Sun-disks, copper—31–32, 70.
Surged rim—35.
Surveys, Sears Southwest Georgia—8.
Swanton, John R.—16.

Swift Creek Complicated Stamped—11, 13, 26, 41, 53, 66.
Swift Creek Period—10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 39, 41, 42, 45, 53, 55, 56, 57; pottery complex—11, 13, 57, 59.
Swift Creek Plain—11, 41.
Sylvilagus floridanus mallurus—3.

Tall beaker—54.
Temple complex—56, 57.
Tennessee—11.
Temple Mound, Ocmulgee—16, 17.
Temple Mound I Period—11, 49.
Temple Mound II Period—11.
Temple Mounds—13, 15, 16, 17, 49, 52.
Test pits. (*See* Willey's test pits.)
Tetrapodal feet—10.
Texas—49, 54.
Textile-impressed "salt pans"—50.
Thatched roofs—47, 59.
Throwing-stick. (*See* Atlatl.)
Tick Island Mound—55.
Tillandsia usnoides—8.
Tishomingo Cord Marked—53.
Tobacco—47, 56, 57, 59.
Tolu Site—51–52.
Torture—59.
Totems—60.
Trade goods—48.
Trading post, historic—14, 16, 17, 35, 40, 48, 60.
Trait lists—55.
Trench, Mound V—30–31.
Triangular drills—45.
Triangular points—9, 21, 44–45, 49, 51.
Trionyz ferox—5.
Trowels, mushroom form—50, 54.
Troyville Period—11, 53, 54.
Tubular pipes—10.
Turkey—5.
Turtle effigies—55.
Turtles—5.
Tuscaloosa sands—3.
Two-hole bar gorget—10.

Unnamed Plain—11.
U. S. National Museum—31.

van der Schalie, Dr. Henry—27.
Vessels, sandstone—8; steatite—8, 42, 56; stone—8.
Village Site—34–35.
Vultur sacra—5.
Vulture—5, 56; plumes—32.

Walnut Creek—3, 6.
Walnut Roughened—11, 48, 49, 71.
Warfare—56, 57, 59.
Waring, Antonio J., Jr.—8, 41, 46.
Watts Bar—11.
Wauchope, Robert—52.
Webb, William S.—31, 33, 49, 51, 54.
Webb and Dodd—54.
Webb and Funkhouser—51, 52.
Weeden Island—13, 53; pottery—53.
Whetstones—46.
White, John—43.
Wildcat—3.
Wild plums—3.
Willey, Gordon R.—20, 35, 39, 40, 42.
Willey's test pits—20, 35, 36, 39, 90.
Wood—30, 33, 47, 57; club—60; evidence of, with burials—23, 26, 27, 38; mortars—45.
Woodland—11, 23; Early—9–10, 11; Middle—10, 11.
Woodland Plain—41.
Woodstock—11, 13.
Woodward, Henry—60.

Yammssee War—14.

Zenaidura macroura carolinensis—5.
Zuni—60.

Classics in Southeastern Archaeology • Stephen Williams, *Series Editor*

This detailed study of a premier mound site offers a wealth of primary data on mortuary practices in the Mississippian Period.

The largest prehistoric mound site in Georgia is located in modern-day Macon and is known as Ocmulgee. It was first recorded in August 1739 by General James Oglethorpe's rangers during an expedition to the territory of the Lower Creeks. The botanist William Bartram wrote extensively of the ecology of the area during his visit in 1773, but the 1873 volume by Charles C. Jones, *Antiquities of the Southern Indians, Particularly of the Georgia Tribes,* was the first to treat the archaeological significance of the site.

Professional excavations began at Ocmulgee in 1933 under the auspices of the Smithsonian Institution, using Civil Works Administration labor. Investigations continued under a variety of sponsorships until December 1936, when the locality was formally named a national monument. Excavation of the mounds, village sites, earth lodge, and funeral mound revealed an occupation of the Macon Plateau spanning more than 7,000 years. The funeral mound was found to contain log tombs, bundles of disarticulated bones, flexed burials, and cremations. Grave goods included uniquely patterned copper sun disks that were found at only one other site in the Southeast—the Bessemer site in Alabama—so the two ceremonial centers were established as contemporaries.

"A good book, well organized and well presented . . . based on conscientious analysis of the raw data."

—*American Antiquity*

"Charles Fairbanks's Funeral Mound monograph is a true archaeological classic. It is both a reflection of archaeological knowledge in the mid-1950s and a valuable contribution to Mississippian studies. Mark Williams's introduction adds an important dimension which helps us better understand the development of thinking about the famed Macon Plateau site at Ocmulgee National Monument."

—Jerald T. Milanich, Florida Museum of Natural History

Charles H. Fairbanks and Frank M. Setzler are both deceased. Mark Williams is Lecturer in Anthropology at the University of Georgia and coeditor of *A World Engraved: Archaeology of the Swift Creek Culture.*

COVER DESIGN BY ANDER MONSON
COVER ILLUSTRATION: HALSTEAD PLAIN EFFIGY BOTTLE
(PHOTOGRAPH BY MARK WILLIAMS)

The University of Alabama Press
Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35487-0380
www.uapress.ua.edu

ISBN 0-8173-1309-5
90000
9 780817 313098