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Chapter 1: Introduction

The Southeastern Ceremonial Complex (SECC) is a shared corpus of similar artistic motifs that are found throughout the southeastern part of the United States and date from A.D. 900 to A.D. 1731 (see Fig 1-1). The complex was first identified in a paper by Antonio J. Waring and Preston Holder in 1945 (Waring & Holder 1977). At the time, SECC artifacts and artwork were believed to revolve around the three primary ritual centers of Spiro, OK; Moundville, AL; and Etowah, GA. While these centers remain the preeminent locales for SECC art and iconography, sub-centers have been identified in Tennessee, Florida, Arkansas, and Texas. Roughly defined, the SECC extends from Oklahoma to Florida and from the Gulf to the Great Lakes (King 2007).

Waring and Holder (1977) used four criteria to define the SECC: shared artistic motifs, God-Animal representations, ceremonial objects, and costume (now properly referred to as regalia). The artifact assemblages at Spiro, Moundville, and Etowah displayed similarities in these four categories. Waring and Holder concluded,
There existed in the prehistoric Southeast a highly-developed cult or cult complex, integrated with and fundamentally dependent upon a horticultural base…This integration probably took place in the Middle Mississippi Basin….Local variations in the complex are explicable in terms of the previous ceremonial life and basic economies of the subareas under consideration (Waring and Holder 1977: 29).

While continued archaeological research has revealed the complexity of the SECC as it

Figure 3-1: Map of the extent of the Southeastern Ceremonial Complex and its major centers. (after Howard 1968:viii).
was manifested by different cultural groups, Waring & Holder’s basic findings have stood for close to seventy years.

The Southeastern Ceremonial Complex first arose in Cahokia, IL circa AD 900, although its origins have been tentatively traced back to the Havana Hopewell culture in eastern Illinois (Reilly & Garber 2007). The Cahokia site is located near East St. Louis, Illinois and covers almost 16 km along the Mississippi river. After two hundred years of occupation, Cahokia was abandoned. The collapse of Cahokia was followed by a diaspora of cult belief that spread throughout the Southeast and was symbolized in sacred copper plates. About the same time, the ceremonial centers of Moundville, AL and Etowah, GA arose (Knight 1997; Hall 2004). At both of these sites, copper plates were recovered that were made in the Cahokia art style known as the Late Braden (Brown 2007b).

My research for this paper focuses on the ceremonial centers of Etowah, Georgia and Lake Jackson, Florida. The Etowah site is located on the Etowah River in the northwestern corner of the state of Georgia near the town of Cartersville. Etowah is still considered one of the most important ceremonial hubs in the SECC. Research at the site has been extensive and has provided some of the best chronological controls in Mississippian Period archaeology (King 2003). On the other hand, the Lake Jackson site is located on the southeastern periphery of the SECC. The Lake Jackson site was an important regional ceremonial center that later became the capital of the Apalachee tribe (Scarry 1984; Payne 1994), but it is small in scale and scope when compared to Etowah.

Etowah and Lake Jackson shared a trade relationship that involved goods restricted to elite usage (King 2003). This paper will analyze the burial assemblages
from the elite burials in Mound C at Etowah and Mound 3 at Lake Jackson. I will attempt to look at artifact patterns as a function of time and trade at both sites. A comparison of the data between the two sites will help clarify our understanding of the relationship between these two chiefdoms.

In Chapter 2, I will outline the theory and methods that establish the framework for my research. I will focus both on general archaeological theory such as mortuary analysis and theories that pertain to the study and interpretation of the SECC. I will also go into detail on the method of iconographic interpretation.

In Chapter 3, I will discuss the Etowah site. I will summarize the history of excavations performed on Mound C. I will then look at the artifact assemblage recovered from its roughly 400 burials. Using the data that is collated in the Brain & Phillips catalogue (1996), I will chart the artifacts according to the more recent dates provided by Adam King (2007). I will show how a distinctive iconographic shift occurred at the division between the Early and Late Wilbanks phases (circa AD 1325) and relate this change to an increase in warfare.

Chapter 4 will focus on the Lake Jackson site. Similar to Chapter 3, I will summarize the history of excavations at the site. I will also describe the mortuary assemblage from Mound 3 at Lake Jackson. Although there is much less data from the Lake Jackson site, I will perform a similar analysis of the burial assemblage over time. By realigning the burial phases described by Jones (1991) to the stratigraphy of the mound, I will show that Lake Jackson adopted a new ideology as its relationship with Etowah expanded. This shift is marked by a change in the burial assemblage that I believe is also related to the Etowah site.
Chapter 5 will conclude this paper by summarizing a few of the similarities and differences between Etowah and Lake Jackson. I will explore how elites displayed their power, how they buried their dead, and how the differences between a periphery and centralized location affected the two cultures.

Most of my research is based on charts of the data from each burial assemblage. I have included these charts in Appendices A and B in order to aid the reader in understanding and seeing the iconographic shifts. I also want to note at the outset that my research relies exclusively on the work and excavations done by others. By reexamining previous data and findings I hope to expand our knowledge of the relationship that Etowah and Lake Jackson shared. I do not intend in any way to overturn earlier researchers’ conclusions; instead I hope to use my research to build upon the foundations that they have laid.
The interpretation of archaeological data is a rigorous process that functions under paradigms defined by the archaeologists themselves. The use of a cohesive group of methods and theories prevents the researcher from making wild assumptions based on speculation. This paper focuses heavily on theories that will be used to analyze the burial assemblages from Mound C at Etowah, Georgia, and Mound 3 at Lake Jackson, Florida. I am relying solely on data and work done by others, and hope to build upon the foundations that they have established. In applying the various theories and methods outlined below to the archaeological data, I will create a more concise picture of the trade relationships and the shared ideology that linked the two sites.

Theories relevant to this paper are divided into archaeological theory and iconographic theory. Archaeological theory, which provides the basis of my research paradigm, will be used to outline methods for studying mortuary remains, trade, and warfare. These theories will be applied to the interpretation of the sociopolitical climate
in the region. The second set of theories involves iconographic study and interpretation. I will begin with a broad overview of the methods used in iconographic study, but most of these theories will pertain specifically to the Southeastern Ceremonial Complex (SECC). I will then move into a discussion of the Cult-Bringer mythology and its application to the interpretation of SECC goods as synthesized by James Brown (2007b), an acknowledged expert in Mississippian iconography. The Cult-Bringer plays a crucial role in the introduction of the symbolic system used by the elites at the Etowah and Lake Jackson sites used to charter their social status and power. I will also outline research surrounding the important deity known as the Birdman. I will describe the known avatars of this deity and how these avatars affect the role and maintenance of elite status.

The methodology section will outline the process by which I applied these theories to the burial assemblages from Mound C at Etowah and Mound 3 at Lake Jackson. I will discuss the processes I used for gathering, organizing, and analyzing my data at each site. I will explain my method of analysis at each site. I will also outline a method for comparing to two sites together in order to identify patterns that could help explain a part of the relationship between Etowah and Lake Jackson.

Archaeological Theory

Mortuary Analysis

Mortuary analysis has been a part of archaeology since its inception as a discipline. C. J. Thomsen—who first classified artifacts by stone, bronze, and iron—recognized as early as 1836 that burials are closed systems (Thomsen 1969), so providing no disturbance, all artifacts found in a single burial can be confidently grouped together.
Unfortunately, establishing links among artifact types is only the first step in the interpretation of meaning.

Several attempts were made throughout the twentieth century to create a theoretical method for examining burials. Burials of individuals with extremely elevated social status were easily identifiable based on the large amounts of precious goods in the tomb. However, the general consensus by archaeologists was that small degrees of social organization were not discernable from the burial practices of a society (Brown 1981). Lewis Binford (1971), arguably one of the most influential anthropological theorists of the twentieth century, used ethnographic analogy to produce a method of burial analysis. He studied burial practices in over 300 living societies with varying levels of social complexity and identified three areas of mortuary practices that aid in the interpretation of fine degrees of stratification. First, he focused on the time and effort expended in the treatment of the body. He found that typically longer and more complex preparations were common to all stratified societies, despite the varied methods of preparation. The second area Binford identified was the type of the burial facility utilized, with complex burial structures indicating more complex levels of social stratification. Finally, his ethnographic research verified the established archaeological concept that burial furniture, or goods placed with a body, has a direct relationship to the status of an individual. In an egalitarian society, burial methods are similar for all individuals, but burials containing a variety of grave goods that vary in quality are indicative of stratified society.

Lewis Binford’s (1971) model was adopted and expanded upon by archaeologists Robert Chapman and Klavs Randsborg (1981). They focused exclusively on elite burials and were able to modify Binford’s mortuary facility criterion. Chapman and Randsborg
argued that the amount of energy expended in creating the burial facility could be linked directly to the status of an individual regardless of the shape of the mortuary facility. They went on to demonstrate that the segregation of formal burial areas is usually associated with social groups who had control over the rights and use of restricted resources (Chapman & Randsborg 1981:17). In other words, groups that remain segregated from the general population after death had privileged access to goods during their lifetime. As I will demonstrate later, this idea plays a crucial role in the analysis of the elite burial assemblages at the archaeology sites of Etowah and Lake Jackson.

James Brown (1981) applies the methods developed by Binford (1971) and by Chapman & Randsborg (1981) to analyze societies with less distinct social stratification. First, Brown argues that all mortuary practices found in a single society must be studied to avoid the creation of false social groups. Stratification of society becomes evident when all types of burial procedures found within a culture are compared. Although burial furniture may be present in all levels of society, Brown’s comparative method can help determine social stratification by identifying changes in the volume of grave goods. Brown also examines the quality of materials used for each artifact, because elite authority in many societies is displayed through the use of specific goods not available to everyone in the society.

*Trade in Chiefdoms*

In chiefdoms, elite power is demonstrated through access to rare or restricted goods and is often manifested through direct control over the production and exchange networks by which these goods travel. This control ensures that artisans are crafting goods solely for ritual use by the elite class. Often a separate trade network is established
to facilitate the exchange of items restricted to the elite class. These trade relationships of elite artifacts are referred to as Prestige Goods Networks (King 2003).

Original chiefdom models argued that the control of trade by the elite class reduced internal social stresses through the balanced redistribution of goods (see Sahlins 1958; Service 1962; or Fried 1967). However, in a much cited study on the archaeological identification of chiefdoms, Christopher Peebles & Susan Kus (1977) argue that chiefdoms do not necessarily function along reciprocal lines. Instead, chiefs reward or purchase loyalty by providing lesser elites with access to specialized goods that are not available to society at large. Using an ethno-historical approach, Peebles and Kus demonstrate that Hawaiian chiefs would often provide their closest family and trusted allies with control over areas that had the means to produce prestige goods. The chiefs would then redistribute these specialized goods, which were produced under the supervision of their allies, to rival elites as a means of buying their support.

Goods that are reserved to the elite class are considered to be imbued with sacred power. While there are no cultural universals behind the selection of ritual goods, Mary Helms (1993) has identified a correlation between geographic distance and the source of goods that possess supernatural powers. Using a wide variety of ethnographic and archaeological evidence, Helms showed that many cultures applied the structure of their society to the physical and supernatural worlds. The areas closest to the culture center of a society were considered to be the most ordered, but the “normal” world faded as the distance from the center increased. Traditional societies often viewed the geographic boundary between the known and unknown areas of the earth to be equivalent to a
supernatural boundary. Items that were imported from outside this boundary were considered to be imbued with supernatural power.

Many researchers have noted the existence of long distance trade networks throughout the SECC. These trade networks functioned as paths along which rare goods—such as copper, marine shell, galena, and mica—were distributed over hundreds of kilometers (Larson 1971; Brown 1975; Brain & Phillips 1996; Hally 2007). In a detailed discussion of these trade networks, Brown, Kerber, & Winters (1990) argue that chiefs monopolize access to rare goods by controlling traders and trade routes. Under elite supervision, rare goods are crafted into ritual items, which can be consumed locally or reinserted into the Prestige Goods Network. Adam King, an expert on the Etowah site, has shown that Etowah was strategically located over a gulf coast trade route that originated near Lake Jackson. The domination of this route gave elites from Etowah exclusive access to the control and spread of ritual goods throughout the region (2003; see Fig. 2-1).

Warfare in the SECC

Adam King (2003) writes that chiefly power based upon trade is inherently unstable, resulting inevitably in warfare. However, without a battlefield, clearly identifying warfare in the archaeological record is difficult. Most often, the evidence for warfare in a society is circumstantial, but several researchers have provided methods by which it can be inferred.

Robert Carneiro, a former curator of South American ethnology at the American Museum of Natural History, has argued that warfare is a necessary condition for the
societies in the form of raids and attacks on neighboring villages in order to obtain portable resources. In raid based warfare, there is no effort to obtain land or subjugate conquered peoples. Carneiro claims that environmental circumscription is the catalyst that shifts the goals of warfare to the possession of land and renewable resources. This new goal becomes the sufficient condition for the evolution of social complexity. In
other words, villages go to war to obtain neighboring lands as their own resources becomes limited by population growth or drought. In order to more efficiently exploit this new land, conquered populations are subjugated and forced to pay tribute in the form of food or labor. Carneiro’s model claims that social infrastructure will increase in complexity in order to handle the new revenue, land, and workforce obtained by war.

Carneiro (1970) moves beyond environmental circumscription to argue that any form of limitation can play a role in increasing the control of a ruling class. Since both Northern Georgia and the Florida Panhandle contain vast amounts of arable land and reliable, the Etowah and Lake Jackson polities would likely have experienced social circumscription. As mentioned previously, research by Brown, Kerber, & Winters (1990) showed that elites in many societies held exclusive rights to the production and distribution of ritual goods. The Etowah site is located near copper deposits that provided the raw materials for much of their elite regalia, and the Lake Jackson site is located on the Gulf Coast with exclusive access to the *Busycon* shell used for gorgets and pendants (see Fig 2-2). The control of these resources could have limited the availability of these goods for elites in other chiefdoms, forcing trade negotiations. Severely limited trade would have increased social circumscription and led to warfare.

The cybernetic model of chiefdoms theorized by Peebles and Kus (1977) demonstrates that chiefdoms have widespread organized methods for alleviating the least predictable problems that affect society. For example, if rainfall is sporadic, then societies will establish multiple methods of food collection to prepare for unexpected losses. Likewise, Peebles and Kus state if warfare is the least predictable occurrence in society, chiefdoms can be identified through the existence of elaborate defense
mechanisms. Since Etowah and Lake Jackson have been established as a chiefdom level society through several other lines of research (Larson 1971; Scarry 1984; Scarry 1990b; King 2003), the model can be reversed to look for evidence of warfare. If warfare occurred in either polity, it can be identified by evidence of an organized method of that site’s elites to prevent its more devastating effects.

**Iconography in the SECC**

*Iconographic Study*

A systematic method for iconographic study was first laid down by the prominent European art historian, Erwin Panofsky (1939). He divided artistic analysis into three major divisions: natural, iconography, and iconology. Natural analysis is the systematic foundation of iconography that involves the identification of the basic elements in an artistic work. Elements are the simplest form of artistic expression and include points and lines, which combine to form motifs or recurring patterns in the artwork. The natural

---

Figure 4-2: On the left is a Hightower anthropomorphic style gorget. These gorgets were carved on the inside wall of a *Busycon sp.* shell, commonly called a whelk (*source* Dye 2004:194).
level of analysis is based solely upon observation and does not rely upon cultural knowledge. The second level in Panofsky’s, iconography, involves linking motifs to themes, which are the conventional meanings of an artistic representation. Cultural knowledge is necessary for iconographic interpretation. A modern example is an interpretation of waving as a gesture of greeting in the U.S. Iconology is the third level in Panofsky’s hierarchy and requires an intuitive understanding behind the symbolic representation. The ability of an outside researcher successfully performing iconological interpretation is heavily debated because of the massive amount of subtle cultural traits and patterns inherent in any symbolic representation. Building upon the previous hand waving example, the identification of the greeter’s social class based on their gesture would be an iconological interpretation.

A major problem in archaeological iconographic interpretation is the spread of motifs. In an analysis of Middle American art work, Harvard professor of Mesoamerican archaeology, Tatiana Proskouriakoff (1955), notes that the visual expression of meaning is rigidly bound inside a particular culture. However, the boundaries of a culture are generally porous and allow motifs to spread through trade and diffusion. Local cultures then begin to reproduce the foreign motifs but apply local interpretations to their style and meaning. The identification of individual culture groups is necessary in order to correctly interpret motifs.

Jon Muller (2007), an archaeology professor from Southern Illinios University-Carbondale, uses the Panofskian method to interpret the artwork in the Southeastern Ceremonial Complex. He then argues that iconographic interpretation must occur as a part of the overall interpretation of a cultural assemblage. In Muller’s opinion, SECC
artwork should be linked to carbon 14 dating. Researchers should understand that these
dates signify the final usage of the art, and not the time of its creation. Once absolute
dates are determined, iconography can be used to establish relative sequences of motif
evolution over time and space. These series would also allow researchers to identify
hierlooming that occurred over successive generations before being interred in a burial.

*The Cult Bringer*

The relationship between the Muskhogean myth of the Cult-Bringer and the
copper plates common throughout the Southeastern Ceremonial Complex was first
identified by Antonio Waring (1977). Citing ethnographic sources, Waring writes that
the Natchez and many other tribes claim direct descent from a supernatural known as the
Cult-Bringer. In many of the myths, this being was linked directly to brass and copper
plates that were imbued with supernatural power. Brass plates originate during historic
times, but copper plates have been found at many prehistoric sites in the southeast
including Etowah and Lake Jackson. Ethnographic sources demonstrate that their use as
elite regalia extended well into historic times (see Fig. 2-3).

F. Kent Reilly, III (2007) and James Brown (2004, 2007a) have built upon the
ideas presented by Waring that link the Cult-Bringer directly to the spread of the
Southeastern Ceremonial Complex. Brown claims the Muskhogean cult-bringer was an
anthropomorphic supernatural who introduced a new religion symbolized by these copper
plates. After living with the people and imparting his wisdom, the individual died.
Brown argues that the copper plates found throughout the Southeast demonstrate the
spread of the Cult-Bringer religion and form the basis of the SECC.
These plates were produced in the Late Braden style at Cahokia, Illinois, and were part of a unique method of ritualized exchange. Their appearance in various centers throughout the Mississippian world is highly selective. Brown claims, “[These copper plates] suggest the appearance of a specific cult, because these precious objects contain too much power to be treated as objects of ordinary trade” (2004: 119). Almost all of these plates contain images of raptor birds or anthropomorphic beings clad in raptor regalia, and ethnographic sources demonstrate they were often placed in leather and cloth bundles (Waring 1977).

Ritual bundling was practiced throughout North America. A recent work by Mesoamerican art historians F. Kent Reilly, III and Julia Guernsey (2006) summarizes the uses of sacred bundles in Mesoamerica. Bundles function as a means of concealing
the sacred power of the objects they contained and can only be opened as part of a ceremony. Bundles are an integral part of mortuary practices by establishing ancestor worship and lineage continuity. Bundles in Mesoamerica were also directly linked to the establishment of political authority and power. Although the geographic and temporal distance between Mesoamerica and the southeastern United States prevents a direct application of these Mesoamerican concepts, similarities have been recorded in ethnographic research among tribes indigenous to the southeast. Among the Osage, each clan had a corporately owned bundle whose power determined the status of the clan (see LaFlesche 1999). Creek tribes were known from historic sources to bundle the copper plates used in their rituals and ceremonies (Waring 1977). As I will show later, the copper plates recovered from the Lake Jackson site contain preserved remnants of cloth that demonstrate that the ritual bundling of sacred objects originated in prehistoric times.

*The Birdman in Myth and Archaeology*

George Keyes (1994) has shown that there is a link between myths and elite power. Myths underscore the supernatural basis used by the ruling class to charter their elite social positions and associated ceremonies. He concludes, “If mythology links the creation of ceremony to the elite, the position of the elite is further justified” (Keyes 1994: 112). James Brown (2007a) used Keyes’ model to synthesize certain aspects of Native American mythology to the iconography of the pre-historic copper plates. Using myths from the Siouxan speaking Osage and Winnebago, Brown has linked the Birdman to three specific avatars. The birdman can be known as Red Horn, He-Who-Wears-Human-Heads-as-Earrings, and He-Who-Is-Hit-in-the-Face-with-Deer-Lungs. Brown
then links the Siouxan Red-Horn to the Muskhocean deity, Morning Star. This linkage is based upon the similarities in the powers ascribed to both supernaturals.

Red Horn is a metaphorical name given to the Birdman (Brown 2007a:93). This name typically refers to the birdman in his most human-like appearance and is symbolized by a long braid that was dyed red. Ethnographic sources show that the elites in many Native American tribes in the southeast would often use dyed braids or forelocks to demonstrate social status and achievements. The ritual braid and forelock are also seen on the copper plates recovered from both Lake Jackson and Etowah. In the Winnebago and Osage myths, the Red-Horn avatar is associated with warfare and physical prowess.

He-Who-Wears-Human-Heads-as-Earrings is the name given to the birdman by the gods (Brown 2007a:94). This avatar is symbolized by small, long nosed god maskettes found throughout the southeast and date to the 12th and 13th centuries. Their use as earrings is seen on the 12th century statue from Craig’s Mound at Spiro, OK known as “The Seated Warrior” whose earrings are in the shape of faces. He-Who-Wears-Human-Heads-as-Earrings is an avatar of the Birdman that is specifically linked to fertility.

He-Who-Is-Hit-in-the-Face-with-Deer-Lungs is the most sacred avatar of Morning Star (Brown 2007a:95). In this persona, the birdman is associated with the themes of death and rebirth. In the Winnebago myth, Red Horn is able to transform into an arrow, which many Native American tribes liken to the soul’s flight into the afterlife. This avatar is symbolized in the bi-lobed arrow motif seen in the headdress ornaments represented on copper plates and gorgets throughout the SECC (see Fig 2-4).
Brown (2007a) writes that mythological stories are not enough to ensure the maintenance of elite power, so the reproduction of Birdman symbols as elite paraphernalia is highly significant. He argues that elite power must be visible in the form of ritual icons that display the social charter myths as a reminder of the origin of elite power. This same imagery must act as a medium that maintains exclusive access to the supernatural realm. Generally, the power of an individual leader can be measured by his success in limiting all forms of access to the supernatural. Brown claims an effective method for increasing power is by claiming direct descent from a godhead (64). He has long argued that the ritual items found in elite burials throughout the Mississippian world represent an embodiment of the sacred (Brown 1985, Brown 1997).

All of these themes would provide the elites with a strong power base. In taking on the identity of Morning Star, they would show that they were able to protect their people from invasion. They would also be socially sanctioned to go forth to fight battles to gain honor and power in the name of the people. They would have a monopoly on the afterlife and would exert a strong control over their people by embodying the power of reincarnation.

Methodology
The Lake Jackson and Etowah sites clearly fall under the broad banner of the Southeastern Ceremonial Complex. However, they are also distinct cultures that are separated by several hundred miles. As I review the data, it appears to me that the Etowah complex spread northward through Eastern Tennessee, and the Lake Jackson complex spread westward along the Gulf Coast (Payne 1994a, 1994b). The theories in this chapter will be applied to the elite mortuaries at each site to define the adaptation of the SECC in each culture. I hope to add to the understanding of the relationship between the Etowah and Lake Jackson polities.

I will begin by analyzing the artifacts at Etowah followed by a separate analysis of the artifact assemblage at Lake Jackson. My analyses will begin with a summary of the history of each site. Using data from the various excavations, I will chart the elite burial goods in a chronological format and look for temporal patterns in the use of both local and non-local goods as ritual regalia. I will apply the various theories for identifying warfare to see if there is a correlation between warfare and ritual regalia.

I will then compare the two sites beginning with a simple chronological comparison between each site using established radio carbon dates. Once I present a side-by-side chronology, I will have a basis from which to compare the burial goods. I will examine the similarities in the use of local and non-local materials at the two sites before proceeding to an iconographic comparison of the elite regalia. In doing so, I will demonstrate a clearer picture of how Etowah and Lake Jackson interacted in the prehistoric period.
Chapter 3: The Etowah Site

The Etowah site, near Cartersville, GA, was the capital of a Mississippian period chiefdom. The site consists of several constructed mounds that functioned in a variety of ways. Mound C at Etowah was the mortuary mound, where elites would be interred after their deaths. The data for this chapter comes from the artifacts recovered from that mound. Mound C at Etowah was thoroughly destroyed by a series of excavations and has since been completely rebuilt. Each excavation unearthed multiple graves that contained individuals who were richly adorned with copper, shell, and stone artifacts. I will relate these artifacts to the history of the Etowah site and show how an elite cult was imported that used warfare and mythical symbols to establish the position of the new elites. I will then explore the circumstantial evidence for warfare at Etowah. Using the burial data from Brain & Phillips (1996) and the grave seriation developed by King (2004, 2007), I have identified a clear shift in elite mortuary goods. I will combine this data with other evidence for conflict by arguing that as warfare increased at Etowah, long distance trade networks began to be circumscribed. While regional trade continued, Etowah’s elites
were forced to abandon locally produced shell gorgets as symbols of power. Instead, they began to produce sociotechnic weapons to symbolize strength and power in warfare.

**Site Geography**

Etowah is located in northwest Georgia on the Etowah River and was first occupied circa AD1000. In its final form, it is comprised of six earthen mounds labeled A – F and was surrounded by a moat and a wall (see Fig. 3-1). Mound A is the largest of the earthen constructions at 19 m in height. King (2003) hypothesizes that this mound was likely used as the chiefly residence. Mounds B is the next largest in size. Mound B

![Figure 3-1: The Wilbanks phase Etowah site (circa AD1375) at its greatest known extent of mound construction (source King 2003:282).](image-url)
had a series of structures on it and was likely used as a location for ceremonial activity. While A and B were likely residential mounds, Mound C was clearly a mortuary mound associated with the elite dead and may have had a charnel house on it. Due to the poor standards of excavation at the turn of the 20th Century and the total destruction of the mound, we will forever be uncertain about the nature of its structures (Larson 1971; King 2003). The Etowah River runs along the south side of the complex. An examination of the map reveals at least two borrow pits on the northern edge of the site that were the source of earth used in mound construction. These pits were connected by a ditch or moat, on the inside edge of which was a palisade wall (Larson 1971; King 2007).

The dating of the building of Etowah, and specifically Mound C, has been hotly contested in recent years. Some scholars such as Larson (1971) and Brain & Phillips (1996) have maintained that it was constructed in the late 15th to early 16th centuries. However, they have come under heavy criticism for the lack of solid archaeological techniques in stating their hypotheses. Most scholars (Brown 2007b; King 2007; Marceaux & Dye 2007; Hally 2007) now maintain that Mound C was built entirely within the Wilbanks phase.

Etowah was first occupied around AD1000 by an egalitarian chiefdom (King 2003). King has divided the site into several temporal phases (see Table 3-1). While hard evidence is lacking, it is likely that the construction of Mound A began during the Early Etowah phase. The construction of Mound C began with two dense midden pits filled with potsherds and animal bones. There were also at least two structures, which in connection with the midden pits, are indicative of communal feasting and sacred space.
This evidence has led King (2003) to believe that at its earliest, Etowah was a simple chiefdom based upon a corporate structure. King says,

These data suggest that the organization of the chiefdom centered at Etowah had the following as important principles: group rather than individual decision making, little or no use of prestige goods to symbolize individual social status, and an emphasis on solidarity building at the apparent expense of aggrandizing individuals. These organizational characteristics are consistent with a chiefdom whose structure is based on what Blanton and colleagues have called the corporate political–economic strategy (King 2003:290 citations omitted).

King (2007) later noted that this Etowah Period phase chiefdom lacks representational art, other than general cosmological themes such as the cross in circle (130). After nearly one hundred years of occupation, the site was briefly abandoned for unknown reasons.

Starting in the Early Wilbanks phase around AD1250, the site was suddenly reoccupied on a large scale. The majority of construction at the site occurred at this time.
Mound A reached its maximum size; a plaza was installed at its base; and Mound C was founded as an elite burial structure (King 2004). The iconography from this period also shows dramatic changes. There is an introduction of Hixon and Hightower gorgets, which carry symbols and motifs connected to the cosmos and the supernatural (Lankford 2004, 2007; Marceaux & Dye 2007).

Around the beginning of the Late Wilbanks phase in AD1325, a bastion wall was built around the edge of the ditch that surrounded the site. The function of this wall is unknown; however, it has been speculated that the wall was defensive or perhaps used to isolate sacred space similar to the wall at Cahokia (Larson 1971; King 2004; Brown 2004). The Late Wilbanks phase of Etowah came to an end in AD1375, when the site was abruptly abandoned. The wall was destroyed by fire at the same time, and Mound C appears to have been deserted.

Excavations at Etowah

The first archaeologist to excavate at Etowah was John P. Rogan, an employee of the Smithsonian Institute (Thomas 1894). Lacking the archaeological methods and controls of today, he tested various mounds in search of burials and grave artifacts (King 2003). As a result, most stratigraphy was ignored and went unrecorded. Rogan reported evidence of a structure on Mound B, but his most important excavations were those at Mound C. There he found several graves...
containing shell beads, carved gorgets, and the spectacular set of copper plates known
today as the Rogan plates (see Figs. 3-2). He reached the burials at a depth of
approximately 3 m, so he ceased digging, presuming that he had reached ground level.

Warren K. Moorehead (1979) was the next excavator to explore Mound C. He
began work in 1925 and continued over the next two seasons. Today his methods are
considered unsystematic, and because he used an unusual numbering system, his records
pose problems for modern archaeologists (King 2007). Moorehead’s field notes,
publications, and catalogue data often contradict each other. Many of the artifacts he
described cannot currently be located (Brain & Phillips 1996; King 2007). Like Rogan
before him, Moorehead also focused extensively on elaborate burials and often ignored or
neglected simple ones. After removing the entire summit of the mound and excavating
its southeast flank to ground level, he had identified a total of 110 new graves. He found
stone celts, copper badges, shell gorgets, and repoussé copper plates similar to those
recovered by Rogan.

Lewis H. Larson was charged by the Georgia Historical Commission to
recommence excavations at Mound C in order to discover its original dimensions (Larson
1971, 1989). Most archaeologists believed that Moorehead had discovered the vast
majority of the burials in Mound C. However, in a series of excavations from 1954 to
1962, Larson discovered an additional 244 burials (King 2007). He used careful
stratigraphic controls and provided a detailed composite of the burials that ringed the
mound. Larson also recognized that the mound was built in phases, and the burials were
interred in an earlier group and a latter group that ringed the mound (Larson 1971).
Despite his excellent work, the inconsistent and vague records left by Rogan and
Moorehead have made it nearly impossible to link the data from the three different excavations (Larson 1971).

Brain & Phillips (1996) created a composite map of the burials at Mound C based on their analysis of the different mortuary practices used (see Fig. 3-3). King (2004) makes the further step to link the Rogan and Moorehead burials with Larson’s “pre-final mantle” group since the majority of their burials were in stone-lined tombs or pits. Larson’s “final mantle” group was comprised of either pit burials or log-lined tombs (Larson 1971, King 2004).

The Elite Status of Mound C

There is no debate today regarding the paramount chiefdom status of the Wilbanks phase Etowah polity. Mound C burials show distinct effort expenditure in two of the three areas outlined by Lewis Binford (1971) and James Brown (1981) and mentioned in Chapter 2. The size of the mound itself shows extensive effort was required in its construction. As Chapman & Randsborg (1981) have argued, the amount of energy expended on a burial correlates to the status of that individual. Mound C was built in seven different stages (see Fig. 3-4), indicative of

Figure 5-3: Burial map showing a hypothetical overlay of the Rogan, Moorehead, and Larson excavations (source Brain & Phillips 1996: 166).
ritual reburial (Knight 1986). Elites were able to muster the workforce necessary for repeated reconstructions of the mound. Finally, Mound C was surrounded by a wall during each phase of its construction, further indicating its status as sacred space.

Elites were likely buried in the center of the Mound C during its initial three stages. The node on the north face of the mound in stage 4 was specially constructed to cover a high elite burial (Larson burial 57; see Fig 3-5). King (2007) believes that this marks a shift in the burial of the highest elites in the summit of the mound (such as Rogan “A”) to the periphery of the mound. The lack of burials found in the first 3 m of the summit is circumstantial evidence supporting King’s claim. He states, “While such deeply placed burials are not unheard of...creating the complex arrangements of human remains, burial artifacts, and limestone slabs would have been made excessively difficult at such depths” (King 2007: 123). This shift in burial location becomes one of the primary marks of the division between the Early and Late Wilbanks phases.

Etowah, the Cult-Bringer, and the Southeastern Ceremonial Complex

The Etowah polity in the Wilbanks phase is unique because it appeared to form very rapidly. Based on archaeological evidence, the area was reoccupied and intensive mound construction began immediately in connection with new iconographic forms seen in their mortuary practices circa AD 1250 (King 2003, 2004, 2007). This sudden change in local practices marks the

Figure 3-4: Construction stages of Mound C (source King 2004: 156)
beginning of the Early Wilbanks phase. Elite status became associated with the Birdman imagery crafted on locally produced gorgets and imported copper plates. As previously mentioned (see Chapter 2), copper plates symbolize the introduction of a new religion by the culture hero known as the cult-bringer (Brown 2004, 2007a; King 2007). The construction of mound platforms, the rapid shift to elite burials, and the internment of copper plates in the earliest of these burials (Rogan A-F) indicate a marked shift in the organization of the social and political nature of their society.

The Rogan plates have been hypothesized as originating in the area of Cahokia, IL (see Fig. 2-2). Brown (2007a, 2007b) identifies the plate from Rogan burial “A” as part of the corpus of artwork known as the “Greater Braden Style”. Other plates found by Moorehead are in a slightly different style, indicating local reproduction. The presence of both heirloomed and new copper plates in the assemblages of Mound C points to a rapid adoption of the iconography with local reproduction. The Rogan plates have elicited a great deal of discussion in the analysis of their themes (Moorehead 1979; Strong 1989; Dye 2004). The current interpretation links this figure to the mythical hero Morning Star or Red Horn, based largely on the work by Brown (see Brown 2007a, 2007b).

These copper plates have strong ties to the Cult-Bringer Mythology, which was summarized in Chapter 2. According to Waring (1977), these sacred plates were carried wrapped as a sacred bundle. In the two Rogan plates, the birdman has an elaborate headdress with a prominent bi-lobed arrow. In front of the headdress, near the forehead, is a rectangular object with rounded edges and woven cross-hatches. This has been
recently linked to a sacred bundle (Reilly 2007). The presence of the sacred bundle is a direct indication of the Cult-bringer role that this mythical figure played.

Burials during the Early Wilbanks phase also include shell gorgets. The most common style at Etowah was the Hightower Anthropomorphic style. Brain & Phillips (1996) subdivided the Hightower style (their “Big Toco”) into four subtypes: Buddha, headsman, Morning Star, and mortal combat (44). Many researchers (King 2007; Brown

---

Figure 3-5: This image shows the three different systems used to make excavation maps. Rogan’s map dates to the 1890s, Moorehead’s Map to the 1920s, and Larson’s map to the 1950s.
2007a; Marceaux & Dye 2007) reject their new nomenclature for these gorgets but find their sub-divisions useful. Marceaux & Dye perform a closer analysis of the headsman and Morning Star themed gorgets. They believe that this style is local to the southern Appalachians in eastern Tennessee or northern Georgia (2007:169). Their findings agree with others that this style is likely a local reproduction of themes derived from the Rogan Plates (see Brown 2007a, 2007b; King 2007; Larson 1971). The use of Birdman symbols as elite paraphernalia demonstrates that elite status was based on the religious ideology imported by the cult-bringer. Their regalia are a physical link to supernatural power. At Etowah, locally manufactured goods soon replaced manufactured goods imported from other areas, but the power of the symbols and motifs was not diminished (see Helms 1993).

**Elite Artifacts at Etowah**

Etowah clearly was an active participant in a Prestige Goods Economy fueled by long-distance trade (see Chapter 2). The elite burials in Mound C show a wide variety of both locally produced and imported goods (see Fig. 3-5). Stone celts were locally produced and were found in several burials including Moorehead burial 35 and Larson burials 135 and 204 (Larson 1971). Locally produced Hightower gorgets were found with Rogan burial “g” (possibly), Moorehead burials 13, 37, and 137 (Brain & Phillips 1996). Imported items included the Braden style Rogan plates mentioned early and mica that possibly originated in North Carolina. By taking on the role of Morning Star, the newly formed elites in the Etowah chiefdom were able to quickly consolidate control and join the Prestige Goods Economy that seemed to be flowing out of Cahokia (Penney 1985; Brown et al. 1990; Brown 2007a, 2007b).
As previously mentioned, I chronologically charted the burials in Brain & Phillips (1996) according to King’s dating (2003). I focused primarily on stone and copper artifacts, and I excluded burial information regarding ceramics because of other studies already completed in that area (see King 1997). Several patterns emerged that I want to note (see Appendix A).

Headdresses (see Larson 1959) do not appear very common (Brown 1975; Scarry 2007). Using Larson (1971) and Brain & Phillips (1996) as my data sources, I count 15 identifiable headdresses from the roughly 360 burials recovered from Mound C. Based on Larson’s claim that “in all but one instance, the sheet-copper symbol badges found in Mound C were associated directly with the skulls of the individuals in the graves” (1959: 110), there is a possibility that the limited data in Brain & Phillips does not reveal all the headdress burials. I have also extrapolated the possible occurrence of seven more headdresses based upon Moorehead’s notes (Brain & Phillips 1996; Moorehead 1979). However, the sparse data and lack of provenance mean that while other headdresses may have occurred, they were either not identified or not noticed.

**Warfare in the Late Wilbanks Phase**

Warfare was endemic to northern Georgia in the Late Wilbanks phase (Dye 2004; King 2003, 2007). By the beginning of the 14th century, most major mound centers in northern Georgia had been abandoned indicating some form of widespread social unrest. The archaeological evidence for the destruction of Etowah by warfare is indicated by three main factors: the destruction of Mound C, the construction of a palisade, and the creation of a plaza at the base of Mound A.
The final burials in Mound C, Larson burials 1 and 15, strongly suggest a desecration of the temple by conquerors. King explains that, “one of the greatest injuries an invading army could inflict was to ransack the temple containing the sacred remains of the chiefly ancestors” (King 2003: 295). The tomb for burial 15 appeared hastily constructed with the mortuary goods in “complete disarray” (Larson 1971: 65) according to the published reports. Two marble statues unique to Etowah were dumped into the pit on top of one another so that an arm was broken off one of them (Larson 1971; King 2003). These statues may have been representations of the ruling elites’ ancestors (Knight 1986). Ear spools and shell beads were mingled with disarticulated human bones. These objects appear to have been flung down the ramp leading up to the mound summit. This is distinct evidence of the desecration of the building on the summit of Mound C.

Around the transition from the Early to Late Wilbanks phase, the two borrow pits used for mound construction were connected with a ditch that ringed the site (see Fig 3-1). Then a bastion wall was constructed on the inside of the ditch. Both of these projects were done during the Late Wilbanks phase (King 2007). Increased warfare and raids would be an obvious reason why the Etowah polity’s elites would have mandated the building of these labor intensive structures (Peebles and Kus 1977).

A raised clay plaza was also installed in front of Mound A during this time which would have been the center of community rituals. Dye (2004) argues that there is a link between warfare regalia, ritual, and the power of the elite status. Warfare art is a clear representation of the warriors’ prowess in battle and serves as a physical reminder of their battle deeds. Elites would have been accorded battle honors in elaborate ceremonies that took place in public plazas, which were the “lynchpin of their chiefly and priestly
authority” (Dye 2004:198). Since the plaza was built concurrent with the palisade, I believe this structure is a further indication of an increase in the frequency of warfare.

After examining the mortuary data, I believe I can add a fourth piece of evidence to the data for warfare. Several scholars have noted the transition in mortuary practices from the early to the Late Wilbanks phases (Larson 1971; King 2007). Most burials in all phases were simple pits. However, some burials received special treatment. Burials from the pre-final mantle group (construction stages 1-3) were lined with stone slabs. Final mantle burials were wood-lined or reed-lined burials. While Binford (1971) and Brown (1975) have warned that shifts in mortuary practices may have little intrinsic meaning other than a change in tastes, I believe that the model present by Peebles & Kus (1977) could help explain this shift. Elites strove to maintain their status by setting apart distinct burial types. As warfare increased, using stone was too costly. Wood was locally abundant and was already being harvested for the construction of the palisade. The shift from stone to wood may have been a pragmatic shift to prevent burial ceremonies from being delayed by warfare or raids.

**Iconographic Evidence for Warfare**

King (2003) recognizes that the destabilization of any wide geographic region likely has many causes, but he feels that a Prestige Goods Economy was the catalyst for their demise. He writes that chiefdoms founded on trade economics are inherently unstable, because they are unable to avoid entering into regional conflicts over control and distribution of goods. Robert Carneiro’s (1970) theory on circumscription also supports this premise (see Chapter 2). The same desire for material wealth that stimulates expansion and craft specialization also motivates their political rivals to attack
these elites in order to gain access to their resources. King concludes, “The same strategic location that brought people back to Etowah during the Early Wilbanks phase may have been the reason it was attacked and suddenly collapsed. Other leaders in the region… may have attempted to gain control of the flow of SECC goods by forcibly removing Etowah from the network” (King 2003: 296). Using this premise and combining it with the existing evidence for warfare, I examined my data for obvious iconographic patterns that would support this hypothesis.

As warfare increased throughout the Late Wilbanks phase, I believe an iconographic shift occurred from shell gorgets to sociotechnic weapons. The decline in shell gorgets occurs at the dividing point between the Early and Late Wilbanks phases, circa AD 1325. Only two of the thirty-plus gorgets were found in Larson’s final mantle burial (Brain & Phillips 1996; King 2007). One of these gorgets was found in Burial 57, which is the first of the Late Wilbanks burials in mound construction stage 4. Only one shell gorget appears to have been buried during Stages 5 to 7 of mound construction. The act of heirlooming could account for this unusually late gorget.

An alternative hypothesis has been presented to explain the decline of gorget usage by Brain & Phillips (1996). These researchers place their temporal model at the arrival of the Spanish in the area circa AD 1540. They suggest that the decline in gorget usage was due to both the disruption caused by the European conquest and the availability of the gorgets to non-elites. Most researchers disagree with Brain and Phillip’s temporal model (see Brown 2007a; King 2007; Hally 2007). Hally (2007) argues that elites either ceded or lost exclusive control over the gorgets no earlier than the beginning of the 14th century. Since gorgets were being used by the average populace,
elites were no longer interred with them as signs of power. Knight (1997 as quoted in Hally 2007: 220) notes that non-elites seemed to gain access to shell gorgets, but only at the beginning of the 15th century after the decline of Etowah. Elites ultimately lost control of the exclusive right to shell gorgets, suggesting a powerful ideological change.

My belief is that the use of shell gorgets underwent a fundamental ideological shift from elites to non-elites because of the destruction of Etowah. As stated earlier (see Chapter 2), Keyes (1994) mentions that myths are used to charter elite status. He says, “Legitimizing ideologies of the elite vanish when the elite vanish. The stories may persist, but stripped of the special context and details that made them what they were…motifs appear to resist the ravages of time like granite building blocks. But the castles and towers these blocks are used to build may tumble and be rearranged into humbler—or perhaps merely different—structures” (Keyes 1994: 114, emphasis in original).

The use of gorgets in burials was a cultural motif that reemerged at Etowah in the Brewster phase (AD 1475 - AD 1550). The importance of gorgets remained in people’s minds, but the Birdman imagery as an elite charter was lost (see Langford 2007; Marceaux & Dye 2007; Hally 2007). The Hightower anthropomorphic gorgets show clear Birdman images that have warfare and individualistic themes. Later gorgets like the Citico, Lick Creek, and Spaghetti styles seem to have lost the imagery of a Birdman supernatural. They have reverted to either a highly stylized form of supernatural twins,
seen on Spaghetti style gorgets, or to broader cosmological styles that would appeal to the population at large (Hally 2007).

Since the shift of gorgets to non-elites seems to occur later than the iconographic shift at Etowah, we must turn elsewhere for an explanation. Returning to my analysis of the grave assemblages, Table 3-2 summarizes the data of various burial goods separated by the Early and Late Wilbanks phases. I noticed that overall, there is an increase in sociotechnic weapons interred with elites that is most marked by an increase in copper and stone axes. The same patterns tend to be seen with copper pendants and mica as well. Stone, copper, and mica were all goods that were local to the region, while shell had to be imported from the gulf coast. As the source of shell disappeared, elites began to manufacture goods from local materials.

This analysis also indicates a shift from engraved images of the birdman, to sociotechnic weapons that were associated with his image. In their analysis of Hightower anthropomorphic gorgets and Duck River sword-form flint bifaces, Marceaux & Dye (2007) noted the similarities between the gorget imagery and the sociotechnic weapons. Birdman gorgets often depict the supernatural being holding either long sword-like objects or falcon claw knives. Gorgets found at other sites depict the Birdman holding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3-2: Artifact Patterning Across the Wilbanks Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copper Axes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Wilbanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Wilbanks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
axes or maces. All of these objects have been found at Etowah, constructed from chert, copper, or local stone.

My research has shown that elites chose to shift to more explicit warfare imagery rather than inscribing images of the Birdman on stone gorgets or creating new copper plates. They produced sociotechnic tools as a visible image of their prowess in battle that derived from their supernatural links to the Birdman. Marceaux & Dye (2007) analyze the “uniform” of elites and note that it is predominately males who are buried with sociotechnic weapons and copper weaponry badges, while women were buried with shell beads (2007:182). They conclude that “throughout the Wilbanks phases, warfare-related activities and associated rituals played a crucial role in the achievement and maintenance of social status. Institutionalized ascribed and achieved social ranking was a critical component of Etowah’s social and political structure” (2007:182 – 183; sic). Elites struggled to maintain their power and adapted their ideology accordingly.

I believe that elites were forced into an iconographic shift for two reasons. First, warfare was limiting or completely preventing the importation of marine shell to Etowah. The elites at Etowah during the Wilbanks phase were obliged to begin producing ritual regalia from local resources such as copper or stone (Larson 1971, 1989); they were also forced to place heavier emphasis on imported goods such as mica that came from other regions. As I have discussed, this pragmatic approach is supported by the theoretical models of Peebles & Kus (1977) who demonstrate the ability of chiefdoms to protect their power when threatened by forces beyond their control. The second reason for this ideological shift is theorized by Brown (2007a). He argues that elite power is intimately connected to their regalia and it has a recursive effect. As warfare in the north Georgia
region increased, I believe that images of the birdman and the cosmos incised on the
gorgets were not sufficient to embody and maintain the power of Etowah’s elites. Instead,
they began to display sociotechnic weapons in order to make the link between
supernatural power and warfare more explicit.
Chapter 4: The Lake Jackson Site

The Lake Jackson site is a Mississippian period mound complex located in the Florida Panhandle northwest of Tallahassee. The site is positioned on the western shore of the McGinnis Arm on Lake Jackson and covers approximately 19 hectares (47 acres) (see Fig 4-1). Mound 1 is located at the far northern extreme of the site, 250 meters from Mound 2. There is evidence of a plaza between the two mounds (Jones 1994). The southern mound grouping consists of Mounds 2-7, which are located in a tight cluster. Mound 2 is the largest mound and measures 11 meters high and 85 m by 95 m at the base. Mounds 3, 5, 6, and 7 are south of Mound 2 and were separated from it by a creek that has since been diverted. Mound 3 provided the data used in this chapter and will be the primary focus of this article. Mound 3 has now been completely destroyed by excavation, but it was located directly south of Mound 2. At the time of excavation, it was 5 meters high and measured 44 m by 48 m.
Figure 4-1: This is the general layout of the Lake Jackson Florida site at its greatest known extent, circa AD 1400 (source Payne 1994:231).
This chapter will begin with the history of the Lake Jackson site, followed by a summary of the Fort Walton culture to which Lake Jackson belonged. I will then summarize excavations that have occurred at the site, focusing primarily on the salvage excavation performed from 1975-1976 by B. Calvin Jones from the Florida Historical Commission. I will then summarize the conclusions made by Jones (1982; 1994) before offering a revision of his statistical division of the burials into three distinct groupings. I retained the concept of three burial phases, but I used stratigraphy instead of statistics to separate the groups. My first burial group marks the establishment of Mound 3 by elites from the Fort Walton culture in order to participate in the *Busycon* shell trade with Etowah. The second group is marked by the adoption and display of the Cult-Bringer mythology, a concept discussed in Chapter 2. My final group is marked by a subtle shift in burial goods that I believe developed from broadened trade routes that opened after the demise of the Etowah polity. To support this hypothesis, I will focus on the construction episodes of Mound 3, the types of artifacts found in each burial phase, and the emergence and disappearance of Birdman iconography at Lake Jackson.

**The Fort Walton Culture**

The Fort Walton Culture was first defined by Gordon R. Willey and R. B. Woodbury in 1942 and was based exclusively on ceramic typology. Willey and Woodbury noted the introduction of ceramics that were related to Southeastern Ceremonial Complex (SECC) representations from central Alabama. These were markedly different from the ceramics in the phase that predated the Fort Walton culture. Although Willey and Woodbury lacked absolute dating techniques, they correctly placed
the Fort Walton culture as the final prehistoric culture in the Florida Panhandle just before European contact.

In 1949, Gordon Willey expanded his definition of the Fort Walton culture (1998). His definition remained rooted in the ceramic typologies that he had developed, but he added traits identified from settlement patterns, local economy, and societal organization. He used the construction of temple mounds as evidence for increased social stratification. Willey noted that intensive agriculture was practiced and coincided with a general migration from coastal sites to inland locations. At the time of Willey’s publications, the lack of research in the area prevented him from fixing an inland boundary for the Fort Walton culture (1998:454). While Willey’s traits adequately corresponded to social conditions in this Fort Walton culture, he did not identify any diagnostic cultural traits beyond his previously identified ceramic types (Scarry 1984).

Though many archaeologists had attempted to adjust Willey’s culture definition, newer descriptions still relied heavily on his ceramic analysis. Also, these descriptions treated Fort Walton as an independent development and did not relate it to other Mississippian cultures. John F. Scarry addressed these shortcomings in his doctoral dissertation for Case Western University (1984). He defined the Fort Walton culture as a combination of different societies that practiced intensive maize cultivation, exploited large land and marine animals, had a hierarchical society, settled in river valleys, and participated in long distance trade networks of ritual goods from that displayed SECC symbols and motifs. In his dissertation, he uses radiometric dates from multiple sites to place the Fort Walton culture between A.D. 900/1000 and A.D. 1650. Scarry’s research showed that the beginning of Fort Walton culture coincided with Mississippian cultural
emergence throughout the SECC. The culture persisted until it was disrupted by European incursion in the 17th century.

Scarry (1984) identifies the Fort Walton culture as originating in the Apalachicola and Chattahoochee river valleys in Southern Alabama and the far western portion of the Florida panhandle. These sites developed from pre-existing woodland era cultures and adapted intensive maize agriculture as populations grew and expanded. They received SECC influences via central Alabama societies and adapted them into their own indigenous cultures. Fort Walton then expanded eastward along the Gulf Coast until it covered the majority of the Florida panhandle.

The Lake Jackson phase, typified by the Lake Jackson site, is located on the eastern extreme of this expansion (see Fig 4-1). Scarry writes that “it is a classic Fort Walton manifestation in the sense that it had centers with pyramidal mounds and a ceramic assemblage which includes all of the types defined by Willey as the Fort Walton Complex” (1984:381). Although the number of excavations performed in the area remains limited, test excavations have identified a number of sites linked to the Lake Jackson phase. In his dissertation, Scarry dates the Lake Jackson phase from A.D. 1150/1200 to A.D. 1400/1450. Unfortunately, few excavations have provided radiometric data, so his dates for the Lake Jackson site are based upon only two dates recovered from Mound 3 at that site.

Claudine Payne (1994) further refined the temporal sequence at the Lake Jackson site in her dissertation for the University of Florida. She felt that the temporal divisions of an early and late Lake Jackson phase envisioned by Scarry (1984) did not allow for accurate study of the shifts in population at the site. In her dissertation, Payne divides the
Lake Jackson culture into three phases with the second phase being subdivided into early and late (see Table 4-1). She then places the construction of Mound 3 at the beginning of the Late Lake Jackson II phase (A.D. 1250 to A.D. 1400). The mound was in use through the Lake Jackson III phase with the final mantle being constructed toward the end of the 15th century (Payne 1994:270).

**The Lake Jackson Site**

Lake Jackson was the principal city for the Lake Jackson culture and maintained its position as a capital until historic times (Payne 1994). Contrary to the prototypical SECC capital site of Etowah, Lake Jackson has many idiosyncrasies that deviate from the typical pattern for Mississippian capitals. Unlike earlier Fort Walton sites, the Lake Jackson site was not occupied by a previous culture. It is located on the southeastern fringe of the SECC, being bordered to the east and south by non-Mississippian Floridian cultures (Payne 1994:273). Instead of being associated directly with a river valley, it is located in fertile hill country. The earliest researchers at the Lake Jackson site (Willey 1942; Griffin 1950) noted that there was a lack of ceramics prior to the Fort Walton occupation. Researchers were expecting to find earlier occupations as late as the 1980s (see Scarry 1984). However, the extensive auger testing that formed the basis of the dissertation by Payne (1994) turned up thousands of pottery sherds, none of which pre-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 1500-1650</td>
<td>Apalachee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 1400-1500</td>
<td>Lake Jackson III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 1250–1400</td>
<td>Late Lake Jackson II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 1150–1250</td>
<td>Early Lake Jackson II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 1000–1150*</td>
<td>Lake Jackson I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. &lt;1000</td>
<td>Unoccupied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scarry (1984) places the earliest occupation beginning around A.D. 1100 based on the one radiocarbon date from that period. The revision by Payne is based on ceramic seriation and not new radiometric data. Source: Payne (1994:261)*
dated the Fort Walton occupation. Most researchers now agree that Lake Jackson was founded suddenly after the beginning of the Fort Walton culture.

Figure 4-2: Map showing location of farmsteads and mound centers in the Lake Jackson polity (Source Brose & Percy 1978:101)

The environs of the Lake Jackson site also show a pattern that is not found in other Fort Walton sites. The area has a continuous and regular scatter of small farmsteads that surround single mound centers (see Fig 4-2). Major mound complexes are found next to lakes and are associated with large villages. This implies that planning and organization occurred before people migrated to the region (Brose and Percy 1978). In the model developed by Peebles & Kus (1977), this move and infrastructure planning
is indicative of Mississippian chiefdoms. Moving eastward from the original Fort Walton cultural area placed Lake Jackson in a direct trade relationship with Etowah.

**History of Excavations**

Formal excavations at Lake Jackson have occurred primarily in the village areas and have avoided the mounds themselves. The first excavator at Lake Jackson was Gordon R. Willey who dug two 3 m by 3 m test pits on the north and south side of Mound 2 as part of a large scale survey project by the National Parks Service. Both pits produced a large number of potsherds, though Willey does not list any other artifacts that were found (Willey & Woodbury 1942).

Extensive excavations at the Lake Jackson site were performed in 1947 by John W. Griffin for the Florida Parks Service. The excavations focused on the village area north and west of Mound 2 (see Fig 4-3) with the goal of ascertaining the size and nature of the Lake Jackson site. Although Griffin avoided excavating the mounds themselves, he cleared a profile from a looter’s trench that had been dug into the top two meters on the south side of Mound 2. His excavation showed that the mound was built in multiple distinct stages using various colors of soil. Griffin also cleared the summit of Mound 4 in order to identify whether buildings had been placed upon it. After clearing the summit, he found an extremely hard packed red clay mantle with seven possible post hole in it. He was not able to determine the shape of the structure and was not willing to

![Figure 4-3: This map shows the locations of Griffins excavations in 1947 (source Griffin 1950:100).](image-url)
excavate deeper due to the hardness of the clay (1950:101).

The only major mound excavation at the Lake Jackson site was performed on Mound 3 by B. Calvin Jones from 1975 to 1976 (Jones 1982). At the time, Mound 3 was on private property owned by Mr. Sam Crowder, who had tried for years to sell the mound to the state of Florida as an extension of Lake Jackson State park. However, after nearly twenty years, Mr. Crowder had decided to remove the mound in order to expand his machine shop. Dr. Jones was made aware of the destruction of the mound when a new homeowner brought him a copper axe head that he had found in his front yard. Although Florida had no laws to preserve Native American burials on private land, Mr. Crowder allowed Dr. Jones and two associates to excavate the mound, provided they did so quickly (Jones 1982:7).

When the excavations began, an estimated forty percent of the mound had already been removed and sold as fill dirt (Jones 1991, 1994). Rather than using a grid pattern to excavate from the top of the mound downward, Jones decided to begin with the exposed profile of the wall and move laterally from east to west. He used a back hoe to shave the profile a few inches at a time. Jones and his excavators paid close attention to the wall profile in order to identify burials. When a burial area was identified, scraping was stopped, and a square excavation unit was begun from the top of the mound to maintain accurate archaeological provenance (Jones 1982, 1991, 1994). Though Jones laments the data lost during the quick excavation, he identified and excavated 15 distinct burials. In his analysis, he also was able to synthesize data from 7 other burials excavated by an avocational archaeologist named Conrad Kidd. I will be using Jones’s notation style; burial numbers with the suffix “K” denote burials excavated by Mr. Kidd. Those
excavated by Jones and his colleagues are numbered sequentially in the order they were located.

**Mound 3 and Its Burials**

Mound 3 construction began during the Late Lake Jackson II phase (ca. A.D. 1250). Overall, the mound had a total of 12 floors. They are numbered from the most recent temporally to the most ancient. The mound was constructed directly atop a midden pit filled with burned organic refuse and a cache of 35 worked stone projectile points. This pit was then capped with a yellowish-red clay layer and labeled as floor 12 by Jones. On top of Floor 12, a copper headdress ornamentation belonging to the Cemochechobee style was found (Jones 1982). The Floor 12 cap is not raised above ground level, but multiple post holes were found around it (Jones 1994). Although no distinct pattern of posts was identified due to the speed of the excavation, I believe it is an indication of sacred space.

As previously mentioned, Jones separated the burial into an initial group of floors 8-12, a middle group of floors 2-7, and a final group in floor 1 (1982, 1991, 1994). He based his separation on the apparent decrease in burial frequency in floors two through seven. Floor 2 and 3 only produced one burial each, and there was a third burial found in association with floors four through seven. Its exact location was lost due to the continuing destruction of the mound by Mr. Crowder. Table 4-2 lists each floor, the depth of the cap that tops it, and the number of associated burials. As the table shows, most of the floors were capped by regular amounts of fill dirt. However, floor 11 and floor 2 were capped by an unusually large amount of fill. The cap above floor 11 reached 112 cm at its thickest, and the cap above floor 2 was 132 cm. Finally, post holes indicate that
each floor had a structure on it that was burned before the mound was recapped (Jones 1982).

All but one of the burials followed the same method of body preparation (Jones 1982). Burial 12 in floor 10 was a cremation that was not found with any artifacts. The rest of the bodies appear to have been wrapped in cloth. Individuals that were buried with copper plates had these plates placed over their torso or abdomen on top of the cloth wrapping. The bodies were then wrapped in leather, followed by cane or reed matting. Finally, they were placed into pits dug into the floor of the mound. The pits were topped with split logs, most of which had evidence of a fire that was burned on top of them. Burial 6 from floor 11 provides circumstantial evidence that these char spots could have been a corn offering. The split logs that this burial were themselves topped with a large mass of charred corn. While charring was located on many other graves, the burnt item was not identified. Bundling sacred objects was a common practice throughout North America. Broadening the research by Reilly and Guernsey (2006), I believe these bodies were clearly being ceremonially bundled before being interred (see Chapter 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floor Number</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Top</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depth (cm)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burials</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Height (cm)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This burial was somewhere between floors 4 and 7 but the exact association was lost due to mound destruction.

Source: adapted from Jones (1991:6a)
The burials in Mound 3 at Lake Jackson contained a wide variety of artifacts (see Appendix B). All burials but numbers 8 and 12 were interred with large amounts of shell and pearl beads from necklaces, bracelets, and anklets. Burial number 12 was a cremation burial, and burial 8 was mostly removed by Mr. Crowder prior to excavation. Copper artifacts formed the majority of the high status goods in Mound 3 with 14 copper plates, 11 copper axes, and numerous copper headdress ornaments being recovered (Jones 1991, 1994; Scarry 2007). Stone artifacts were rare, although several celts—or stone axe heads—were recovered. Other artifacts include local materials such as shell drinking cups and pottery vessels. Non-local materials include mica, graphite pigment, red ocher, and shaped stone discoidals.

The copper plates can be divided into three broad categories. The first category consists of birdman representations, the second category has repoussé or cut-out hawks on them, and the final style contains plain circular or ovate discs. The first birdman plate, interred with burial 7 in floor 9 (see Fig 4-4), belongs to the Late Braden style. There is little doubt that this style originated at Cahokia (Brown 2007a, 2007b). There are several motifs that differentiate this representation of the birdman from the copper plates found at Etowah. On his head he is bearing an ogee motif. Instead of the raptor beak common to the birdman representations, the figure on this plate has a curled snout which is found on certain gorgets from Missouri (Brain & Phillips 1996). There is another Birdman plate in the Late Braden style, and a final plate that Jones (1982) dubbed the “Elder Hawkman” that is done in a local style (see Fig 4-4).
Figure 4-4: These are two of the copper plates found at Lake Jackson. On the Left is a Late Braden Style birdman with an ogee motif on his headdress. On the right is the locally produced “Elder Hawkman” (source Jones 1982).

Shell gorgets were uncommon in the burials in Mound 3 with only three found. They were found associated with Floor 1 in burial numbers 2K, 4K, and 5K. All three of them are in the Spaghetti style, which had a core area in Eastern Tennesse, and date to the
Early Lamar phase, circa A.D. 1375-A.D. 1525 (Wheeler 2001; Hally 2007). Similar gorgets have been found in central Alabama, at Etowah, GA, and eastwards into North Carolina. Like many elite artifacts, these gorgets likely spread along elite interaction networks (Hally 2007).

**Division of Burials**

As mentioned earlier, Jones (1982) initially divided the burials into early and late stages. After reviewing the data, I believe that the three phases laid out by Jones (1991) rely too heavily on the lack of burials in floors 4-7. His methodology would be sound if he had identified all burials in the mound with certainty. However, by his own estimate, almost half of the mound had been destroyed prior to his arrival. His research and interviews with the landowner revealed at least two other burials had been removed and could not be assigned to a level. Furthermore, the axe head found in the fill dirt from a homeowner’s yard may have come from yet another unidentified burial. The recapping of the mound in levels 4-7, without the introduction of a burial, does not fit the general pattern of other known Mississippian capitals (Payne 1994). Although the Lake Jackson site was occupied by a distinct culture, their burials seem to follow the broader patterns of the SECC.

Based on my analysis of the data in Jones’ publications, I have created a slightly different division of the burials. Using the stratigraphy recorded by Jones (1982), I noticed that the recapping of each mound was fairly consistent with a new floor being placed on average 42 cm above the previous floor (see Jones 1982, Table 1). However, as mentioned previously, the caps above floors 11 and 2 were over a meter thick. Excluding these two caps gives an average thickness of 26 cm for each of the ten
remaining floors. Rather than a recapping of the mound, I believe these two thick levels indicate a ritual closure of the mounds beneath them. I realigned the three phases postulated by Jones to coincide with these stratigraphic breaks. This realignment immediately revealed patterns in the use and depositing of artifacts (see Appendix B). Based on the types of artifacts found in each burial phase, I will refer to the phases as Mound Establishment, Cult-Bringer, and Post-Etowah.

The Mound Establishment phase began around A.D. 1250 during the Late Lake Jackson II phase (Payne 1994). This phase consists of floors 11 and 12, as well as the pre-floor midden pit (see Fig 4-5). There is only one human burial, number 6, associated

Figure 4-5: This map shows the location of most of the 23 burials recovered from Mound 3 (source Jones 1982:27).
with this phase. Floor 12 was placed over a midden pit filled with faunal and ceramic remains that was capped with a thin clay cover. The creation of a ritual mound on top of a feasting site has been noted at other SECC locations such as Etowah (Larson 1971). Floor 11 was placed 40 cm above floor 12. The burial associated with this floor had pearl necklaces, bracelets, and anklets but lacked any other burial furniture. However, the body was prepared as a sacred bundle and an offering of burnt corn was placed on the split logs that covered the tomb. Combined with the ritual offering of stone artifacts under floor 12, I believe that this burial was part of the mound dedication.

The Cult-Bringer burial phase begins with floor 10 which was placed over more than a meter of fill dirt. This phase consists of floors 2-10 and includes 12 known burials. During this phase, evidence of long distance trade first appears in the burial record. Burial 2 in floor 10 was interred with two spatulate celts similar to those found at Etowah and pieces of mica which would have originated in the Appalachian Mountains. This individual was also buried with several local artifacts including strands of pearl beads and a *Busycon* shell drinking cup.

Based on the quantity of artifacts in each burial, long-distance trade seems to increase throughout this stage. From floor 10 through floor 2, local goods tend to diminish. Bracelets, necklaces, and anklets of solid pearl beads are replaced by strands of mixed shell and pearl. No *Busycon* shell drinking cups were found after burial 2 in floor 10, and only one *Busycon* columnella pendant was found with Burial 16 in floors 4-7. Non-local materials become increasingly more common as well. Several individuals were interred with graphite pigment, mica, or red ochre. Burials in floors 10, 8, and 3 had stone celts. Floors 9, 8, 4-7, and 2 all have Birdman or Hawk repoussé copper plates.
The burials in the last two floors of this phase also had several copper headdress pendants in the shape of key-sided maces or arrowheads. The final burial in this group, burial 10 from floor 2, included the Birdman plate that Jones dubbed the “Elder Hawkman” (1982:17). After the Cult-bringer burial phase, no other explicit birdman imagery appears in the burial record.

The final burial phase, which I have dubbed Post-Etowah, is very different from the previous phases. Again this phase begins with a ritual burial of the previous mound under 1.3 meters of fill. In the previous phases, no more than three burials were identified for each floor. This last phase has nine burials. Copper goods become the predominant type of burial artifact. All the burials except number 5K contained at least one copper axe. Three of the burials had headdresses adorned with copper pendants. Copper plates continued to be placed on the torso of the individuals, but their form shifted from repoussée to copper cutouts of hawks. Plain copper discs that were circular or ovate appear to replace the Birdman images. These plain copper discs were worn into historic times by the Apalachee and other Native American groups in Florida. This post-Etowah phase also sees the reemergence of local goods in burials. Several burials contained *Busycon* shell drinking cups, ceramic bowls, and pipes. Non-local goods such as mica continue to be interred with individuals in this final stage.

**Analysis**

The sudden appearance of the Lake Jackson site with organized urban and rural locations indicates that the move into the area was made for a specific reason. My belief is that the site was established over an existing trade corridor. *Busycon* shell was imported from the Lake Jackson area to the Mississippian polities that existed in the
central portion of the eastern United States. By rapidly establishing a large chiefdom capital, the elites of Lake Jackson could ensure their participation in a Prestige Goods Trade Network.

With the rise of the Etowah polity around 1250 A.D. in northern Georgia, the trade routes to the interior bottlenecked. The elites at Lake Jackson were forced to rely on goods flowing from Etowah in order to establish and display ritual power. All of the goods found in the Cult-Bringer burial phase are identical to those found at Etowah. Some researchers believe that the celts at the Etowah and Lake Jackson sites were made in the same workshop (Jones 1994; Scarry 2007). At the same time that these ritual goods were passing between Etowah and Lake Jackson, esoteric knowledge was also being exchanged. The copper plates associated with the Cult-Bringer mythology arrived shortly after the establishment of Mound 3. Upon the arrival of the cult-bringer, the artifact assemblage indicates that the elites at Lake Jackson completely abandoned marine goods (with the exception of shell beads) for non-local goods. The cult-bringer mythology was likely adapted into the existing belief system of the ruling class at Lake Jackson.

My research has shown that Mound 3 likely functioned as a cosmological model for the establishment of the Cult-Bringer ideology at Lake Jackson. As the myth states (see Chapter 2), the Cult-Bringer appeared in the form of a human individual who had to die to activate the cult (Waring 1977). Burial 2 in floor 10 contains an elite individual who was interred with a shark’s tooth knife and several shark teeth sewn on his mantle. He had two spatulate celts that are nearly identical to those found at Etowah. Although this individual is not buried with any copper plates, he or she immediately precedes the
copper plate burials and may have played a role in the foundation of the cult at Lake Jackson.

After the establishment of the Cult-Bringer ideology, the elites at Lake Jackson continued to symbolize the cult with the sacred copper plates. Repoussé copper plates were found associated with individuals up to floor 2. It is possible that the death of the bearer of the copper plate caused a new cap to be placed over the mound, although the existence of only one burial in floors 4-7 poses similar problems to Jones’ conclusions. I believe that only one individual per generation controlled the use of the copper plates because none of the burials intruded upon one another (Jones 1991, 1994). The position of previous burials was remembered or recorded preventing intrusion on more ancient burials.

Toward the end of the Cult-Bringer burial phase, imported repoussé plates are replaced by local reproductions. The only locally made Birdman plate shows distinctive differences from the Late Braden style plates discussed previously (see Fig 4-4). The Elder Hawkman is frontal facing rather than in profile. He lacks many of the distinctive avatar markers that usually identify the birdman including the bi-lobed arrow, the beaded forelock, or the curled snout.

Based on the chronology suggested by the one radiometric date recovered from floor 1 in Mound 3, the last level seems to occur toward the close of the 14th century at the earliest (Jones 1982; Scarry 1984; Payne 1994). This corresponds with the demise of the Wilbanks phase Etowah polity in A.D. 1375 (King 2007). The fall of Etowah clearly allowed the elites at Lake Jackson to expand their prestige goods network further into eastern Tennessee. Although sociotechnic axes become the primary form of ritual regalia
found in elite burials, the Lake Jackson site has no other known indicators of warfare. No wall has been found surrounding the site, and the method of burial preparation seems constant. Scarry (1984) and Payne (1994) indicate that Lake Jackson was continuously occupied until historic times when it was the capital of the Apalachee chiefdom.

The three gorgets found in the final burials of Mound 3 are in the spaghetti style that displays anthropomorphic beings either singly or in pairs. These beings have been linked to the hero-twin mythologies that occur in the SECC (Wheeler 2001; Scarry 2007). Data is currently too sparse to draw conclusions from this subtle shift in burial practices (Binford 1971; Brown 1981). However, the introduction of gorgets, the shift to sociotechnic axes, and the change in mortuary practices may indicate the introduction of a new kin group at Lake Jackson, but further research is necessary to secure this hypothesis.

**Conclusion**

The Lake Jackson site near Tallahassee Florida arose suddenly circa A.D. 1100 as a well planned ceremonial center and village. Many researchers have already established Lake Jackson’s participation in a prestige goods network that flowed first through Etowah, Georgia, and then throughout the area of the SECC. By realigning the burial phases in Mound 3 to correspond with stratigraphic changes in the mounds, an iconographic pattern appears in the artifacts that confirms strong ties to Etowah. The burial phases also indicate that long distance trade through Lake Jackson was limited to the Etowah polity, and the elites at Lake Jackson gradually aligned their ideology to match that of their trading partner. With Etowah’s demise, the cult-bringer ideology
vanishes and seems to be superseded by an ideology centered on ceremonial copper axes and the hero twins.

Unlike Etowah, the Lake Jackson site is one of the least understood ceremonial centers in the southeast. Although I have based my conclusions upon solid research, there remain more unexplored questions than there are answers. Currently, Mound 3 is assumed to be an elite burial mound based on similarities to all other Mississippian sites, but no village burials have been excavated to confirm that the Mound 3 assemblage is distinct from the burials of non-elites (Brown 1981). Furthermore, like Jones (1982, 1991), my conclusions are based upon a painfully small assemblage of artifacts. While the patterns I have identified seem clear, they may be more indicative of a lack of information than an ideological burial agenda. Hopefully, with more remote sensing and excavations, the ties between Etowah and Lake Jackson can be fully clarified.
Chapter 5: Comparisons and Conclusions

Throughout my analyses of the sites of Etowah and Lake Jackson, I have alluded to the trade of prestige goods. In order to better clarify how that relationship functioned as it is represented in the elite mortuaries, I intend to conclude this paper with a discussion of the similarities and differences between the Etowah and Lake Jackson polities. I will focus on similarities and differences in the expression of the Southeastern Ceremonial Complex at the different sites. I will discuss the display of elite power through burials and ritual regalia, the choice of material goods, and the effect of the prestige goods trade on the continuity of each site.

The primary similarity between the Etowah and Lake Jackson sites relies on their overlapping time frames. In Table 5-1, I have created a side by side comparison of the chronology of each site. The Etowah site had been previously occupied but had been abandoned prior to the Early Wilbanks phase (King 2007). Table 5-1 shows that the mound building phase at Etowah began suddenly and likely indicates the arrival of a new
Lake Jackson was established in a previously unoccupied location about one hundred and fifty years before Etowah, according to Claudine Payne (1994). However, Payne says that construction began on Mound 3 roughly the same time that construction began at Etowah. The Wilbanks Phase Etowah polity was destroyed circa AD 1375 and Mound C ceased to be used after this date. On the other hand, the use of Mound 3 persisted at Lake Jackson although a change in elite artifacts occurs circa AD 1400.

John Scarry (2007) has listed several of the similarities and distinctions in the ritual goods from Etowah and Lake Jackson. He writes that both sites shared use of copper plates with Birdman imagery as prestige goods, although the plates from the two sites have several iconographic differences. The regalia worn by the elites at both sites consisted of distinctive feather crowns adorned with copper ornaments. Scarry notes that the key-sided mace ornaments from Lake Jackson burial K9 are nearly identical to those from Moorehead’s burial 6a at Etowah. All the elite individuals buried at either site were adorned with necklaces, bracelets, and anklets made from shell and pearl beads.
Scarry (2007) cites several distinctions between the Etowah and Lake Jackson cultures that he attributes to the larger artifact assemblage found at Etowah. Several elites at Etowah were buried with chipped flint swords or maces that are also represented on several Hightower style shell gorgets. With the exception of the burial cache below floor 12, no worked flint was reported in the Lake Jackson assemblage. The elite paraphernalia worn at the two sites had subtle differences. Several elites at Etowah were buried with bi-lobed arrow ornaments as part of their headdresses. While the birdman representations from the Lake Jackson repoussé plates are depicted with bi-lobed arrows, none of these seem to have been reproduced as regalia at that site.

Scarry (2007) concludes his article by comparing mortuary practices. He focuses primarily on the distinctions in burial frequency. He says that Mound C at Etowah contained over 250 burials while Mound 3 at Lake Jackson held only 24. He further writes that all the burials at Lake Jackson were single individuals placed in isolated graves. While a few of the burials at Etowah contained multiple individuals, many of the individual burials seemed to be organized into groups. A possible hypothesis is that Mound C contains elites and their kin while Mound 3 was only available to a single chiefly line (King 2004; Scarry 2007). Although no isotope sourcing tests have been performed on the individuals from either site, this seems to be a logical conclusion. A simple ratio of the number of individuals buried per year shows an average of 4 burials per year at Etowah to 1 burial every 10 years at Lake Jackson.

My own research offers some additional comparisons to those noted by Scarry (2007). The burials at Lake Jackson seemed to have been wrapped as sacred bundles before they were interred. There is no definitive evidence of the elites at Etowah being
wrapped as sacred bundles. However, this may be due to the differences in excavation techniques that developed between Larson’s 1950 excavation at Etowah and Jones’s 1975 excavation at Lake Jackson. It may be possible to view the stone and wood lined burial chambers in Mound C as sacred bundles (Reilly, personal communication, March 2007).

The use and display of ritual regalia was different at Etowah and Lake Jackson. The copper plates found at either site were placed in different locations in the burials. The Rogan plates from Etowah were found above the individuals’ heads, imitating the regalia seen on the birdman representations (Reilly 2007). The copper plates at Lake Jackson were placed on the torsos of the buried individuals as part of the burial wrapping. Similarly, those individuals at Etowah who were buried with feather crowns had them placed immediately above their heads (Larson 1959), while the few crowns found at Lake Jackson were up to 75 cm above the individual (Jones 1982). While more research is necessary to clarify the meaning behind regalia usage, these general observations support distinctive views of regalia at Lake Jackson and Etowah.

Sociotechnic weaponry frequently appears at both Etowah and Lake Jackson (Scarry 2007). Based on my research, the sociotechnic weapons that appear at Etowah occur for two reasons. The first is a need for the elites to firmly establish their ritual authority in battle during a time of increasing warfare. My research also suggests that there was a decline in shell use at Etowah that was linked to the increase of warfare and raids. If shell became scarce the Etowah elites could have made a pragmatic shift in regalia. On the other hand, sociotechnic weapons are not consistently represented at Lake Jackson during the same time period (AD 1250-1375). A few early burials in the Cult-Bringer phase contained stone celts, similar to those from Etowah; however, Lake
Jackson lacks monolithic stone axes and worked chert “swords”. Sociotechnic copper axes appear at Lake Jackson after the demise of Etowah, circa AD 1400. Unlike Etowah, there is no corroborating evidence for warfare motivating this ideological shift.

Lake Jackson appeared to trade solely with Etowah for most of the time that Mound 3 was in use. Elites from both sites favored non-local materials for their regalia. The Early Wilbanks phase elites at Etowah preferred to use locally produced shell gorgets made on imported *Busycon* shell. These gorgets were inscribed with images of the birdman or cosmological models. The elites at Lake Jackson relied on the use of copper plates and ornaments to display elite power. Some of these plates were imported in a finished form, while others were locally produced.

Imported copper and mica dominate the artifacts from the floor 1 burials, which were constructed after the fall of the Etowah chiefdom. The increased presence of non-local goods supports the hypothesis that the Etowah elites were forcibly monopolizing the long distance trade routes in which Lake Jackson participated. After Etowah fell, I believe the Lake Jackson polity was able to expand their elite goods trade networks deeper into the Appalachians and Tennessee. They gained greater access to raw copper from which they fashioned their sociotechnic axes. During the final burial phase at Lake Jackson, shell gorgets from Tennessee also appear for the first time. It is possible that these gorgets represent the introduction of a new kin group or ideology to Lake Jackson at this time. However, more research is necessary to test this hypothesis during the Lake Jackson III phase (AD 1400-1500).

**Conclusion**
My research into the burial assemblages of Mound C at Etowah, Georgia and Mound 3 at Lake Jackson, Florida has focused on the change in ritual regalia over time. At both sites, I looked at previous research into the use of regalia. I then focused on the trade networks that were shared between the two sites and how the selection of non-local materials for use as elite regalia was affected by trade.

At Etowah, I used a chronology developed by Adam King (2007) to chart the artifacts listed in the Brain & Phillips (1996) catalogue. My research showed that Etowah experienced a clear shift from shell gorget usage with ritual imagery to using sociotechnic weapons to display and maintain elite power. I was able to link this shift temporally to the increase in warfare at the beginning of the Late Wilbanks phase (A.D. 1325) that had been established by other researchers.

The burial assemblages at Lake Jackson were reported and analyzed by B. Calvin Jones (1982, 1991, 1994). His use of modern excavation techniques, combined with a small number of burials, prevented the temporal confusion seen at Etowah. However, his statistical separation of the mound into three phases, based upon burial frequency, relies upon the assumption that he had recovered the majority of the burials in Mound 3. To correct this, I used the two unusually thick stratigraphic levels in the mound to realign these three phases postulated by Jones (1991). My method revealed a pattern in the burial of repoussé copper plates that signified the introduction of the Cult-Bringer myth. I found that my three realigned burial phases correlate to a mound establishment phase, a foreign trade phase marked by the adoption of the Cult-Bringer ideology, and a Post-Etowah phase.
After charting the burial goods temporally at both Etowah and Lake Jackson, I used comparison between the two assemblages to clarify their relationship. As had already been established, the two sites shared a long distance trade network of elite goods (Scarry 2007). My research suggests that Lake Jackson was founded in order to participate in the exchange of *Busycon* shell used for gorgets and drinking cups. With the foundation of the Wilbanks phase Etowah paramouncy, this trade route was monopolized. The control over trade led to the destruction of Etowah at the end of the Late Wilbanks phase (AD 1375). This gave the elites at Lake Jackson the opportunity to expand trade deeper into the SECC.
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Appendix A

Appendix A includes the charting of the artifacts and burials from Mound C at Etowah, GA. All of the data included here were taken from Brain and Phillips (1996). All interpretations are my own.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burial #</th>
<th>Male/Female</th>
<th>Shell Gorget</th>
<th>Columnella Pendant</th>
<th>Copper Gorget</th>
<th>Shell Cups/Bowls</th>
<th>Headless</th>
<th>Cu Bi-Lobed Arrow Pendants</th>
<th>Cu Plumes</th>
<th>Cu Bi-Hoofed Spouts</th>
<th>Cu Covered Ear Spools</th>
<th>Cu Tridents</th>
<th>Stone Axe</th>
<th>Chisel</th>
<th>Flint Scrapers</th>
<th>Core</th>
<th>Stone Palette</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>C?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M12</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M13</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M17</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M18</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X?</td>
<td>X?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M20</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M20A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M22</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X?</td>
<td>X?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M23</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M35</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M37</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M44</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M49</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M50</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M51</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M76</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M83</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M86</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-K9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-K16</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>YA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burial #</td>
<td>Male/Female</td>
<td>(Young) Adult/Child</td>
<td>Shell Gorget</td>
<td>Copper Gorget</td>
<td>Columnella Pendant</td>
<td>Shell Cups/Bowls</td>
<td>Shell Beads</td>
<td>Headress</td>
<td>Cu Blunted Arrow Pendant</td>
<td>Cu Flakes</td>
<td>Cu Plates</td>
<td>Cu Cov. Ear Spools</td>
<td>Cu Bi-Lobed Arrow Pendants</td>
<td>Cu Coils</td>
<td>Cu Plates</td>
<td>Cu Covered Ear Spools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>F?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X (6)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5*</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X (4)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (8)</td>
<td>X (Cu)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X (4)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (10)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (Cu)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X (4)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (4)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (4)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (4)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X (4)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X (4)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burial #</td>
<td>Male/Female</td>
<td>(Young) Adult/Child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stages 5-7:
- 64
- 66
- 67
- 68
- 69
- 70
- 71
- 72
- 73
- 74
- 75
- 76
- 77
- 78
- 79
- 80
- 81
- 82
- 83
- 84
- 85
- 86
- 87
- 88
- 89
- 90
- 91
- 92
- 93
- 94
- 95
- 96
- 97
- 98
- 99
- 100
- 101
- 102
- 103
- 104
- 105
- 106
- 107
- 108
- 109
- 110
- 111

Stage 7:
- 1
Appendix B

Appendix B includes the charted data from Mound 3 at Lake Jackson, FL. All the data in this chart were compiled from the publications of B. Calvin Jones (1982, 1991). All data entry and interpretations are my own.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Burial #</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Regalia</th>
<th>Burial Furniture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>Axe</td>
<td>Cache of chert arrowheads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Celt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Split Log</td>
<td>X (p)</td>
<td>Pre-mound midden w/ broken ceramics, charcoal and faunal remains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Celt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spatulate Celt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Split Log</td>
<td>X (2) X (p)</td>
<td>Shark teeth beads, Mica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shark Knife</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cremation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Covered with mass of charred corn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Split Log</td>
<td>X (ogee BM) X (s/p)</td>
<td>Graphite Pigment Cloth/Mantle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X (2) X (Rep Hawk) X (s/p)</td>
<td>Leather? cloth, leather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X (Hdancer) X (s/p)</td>
<td>Leather?, columnella pendant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X (11 key) X (s/p)</td>
<td>Feather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cane/ Split Log</td>
<td>X (2), (Elder, Hawk) X (s/p)</td>
<td>Sack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cane/ Split Log</td>
<td>X (arrow, O) X (s/p)</td>
<td>Cloth, Mica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(s/p)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Split Log</td>
<td>X (arrow, O) 5 falcon X (s/p)</td>
<td>Leather, Mica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CU*: Copper
*Shell*: Shell
*Pendant*: Pendant
*Shell Beads*: Shell Beads
*Shell Cup Vessel*: Shell Cup Vessel
*Pipe Discoidal Plates Pearl Beads*: Pipe Discoidal Plates Pearl Beads
*Misc.*: Miscellaneous

*Cache of chert arrowheads*:
- Cremochecobee CU arrowhead
- Pre-mound midden w/ broken ceramics, charcoal and faunal remains
- Covered with mass of charred corn
- Shark teeth beads, Mica
- Graphite Pigment Cloth/Mantle
- Leather? cloth, leather
- Leather?, columnella pendant?
- Feather
- Sack
- Cloth, Mica