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ABSTRACT

The Upper Tombigbee River Valley and the Black Prairie, two adjacent physiographic regions located in northeast Mississippi, are defined archaeologically by the existence of multiple single-mound sites with associated farmsteads or small habitation sites. This thesis is an analysis of mound-construction data and the ceramic assemblage excavated in 2017 from the Butler Mound Site (22LO500), a single-mound site located in Lowndes County, Mississippi. The purpose of this thesis is to determine when construction of the Butler Mound occurred using mound-construction data, ceramic analysis and radiocarbon dating. This thesis also seeks to understand how Butler, and neighboring sites, relate to one another spatially and temporally to further define Mississippian settlement patterning in northeast Mississippi and to contribute to the developing regional culture-chronology.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

For half a millennium prior to European Contact, Native populations in the Southeast negotiated ever-changing social and political relationships that defined their everyday life within the Mississippian world. The central political organization of the Mississippian period (A.D. 1000-1600) is identified as the chiefdom, often demarcated in the Southeast by platform mounds, in a system of civic-ceremonial centers surrounded by smaller habitation sites that dot the floodplains across the region at various scales of size and political organization (Anderson 1996:232; Hally 1993). Scholarship has focused on understanding the political organization of chiefdoms by examining how they were arranged on the landscape (Anderson 1990, 1994, 1996; Blitz 1993a, 1999; Hally 1987, 1993, 1996; Livingood 2012, 2015). Neo-evolutionary views of chiefdom development have based chiefdom complexity on the size and scale of Mississippian sites using a classificatory system of simple, complex and paramount chiefdoms based on the number of subordinate communities controlled by chiefly centers (Blitz 1999:578, Steponaitis 1978, 1986). The motivation for this settlement organization on the landscape was assumed to be for the effective flow of tribute, or the mobilization of material goods and labor controlled by chiefly elites, from subordinate communities into the political center of the chiefdom (Blitz 2010:4; Emerson 1997; Steponaitis 1986; Welch 1991). Recent scholarship has focused on Mississippian political organization and community development as processes that are historically contingent on temporal affiliation, location (e.g. King and Meyers 2002; Warner 2018) and continually developing relationships (e.g. Blitz 2009; Cobb 2003), shedding light on human agency (e.g. Barrett 2001; Dobres and Robb 2000; Joyce and Lopiparo 2005; Pauketat
and Alt 2005) and the ability for individuals and groups to actively shape and negotiate their own sociopolitical relationships (e.g. Pauketat 2000).

Because chiefdom development varied widely across the Southeast, questions of political organization and settlement patterning must be addressed on the regional level before being interpreted into the larger narrative of Mississippian political organization. Archaeologists are attempting to address these various sociopolitical relationships and systems of settlement patterning in northeast Mississippi. Two neighboring regions, the Upper Tombigbee River Valley and the Black Prairie, show evidence of Mississippian settlements. However, a large portion of these sites have yet to be extensively investigated. Recent scholarship has focused on establishing a chronology for the sites in northeast Mississippi as archaeologists focus on mound-construction (Palmer 2007), ceramic chronology (Lieb 2004; Smith 2017), calibrated radiocarbon dating (Peacock and Hogue 2005), site occupation (Boudreaux et. al. 2018; Cobb 2016), and settlement patterning (Clark 2017).

Establishing a chronology of mound construction for northeast Mississippi is essential to understanding the political landscape of the Upper Tombigbee and Black Prairie regions during the Mississippian period. Hally (1996:93) argued that mound building began when a chiefdom was founded and ceased when the chiefdom was abandoned. Platform mound-construction involved piling new layers of earth on top of burned summit structures at 25 and 50-year intervals over a period of 70 to 100 years (Hally 1993:145, 1996:112 and 124). Scholarship of mound-building has explored how the adding of new earthen layers could be representative of communal ceremonies of renewal/purification (Hudson 1976; Knight 1986, 1989; Swanton 1928) or evidence of chiefly succession (Anderson 1989; Hally 1987, 1996).
There are different techniques used by archaeologists to develop chronologies for site occupation. These methods include ceramic analysis and radiocarbon dating. A temporal framework for mound-construction can be developed by using the ceramic assemblage excavated from mound units during archaeological investigation. A ceramic chronology has been developed for the Upper Tombigbee region (Blitz 1993a; Mann 1983; Peebles and Mann 1981) and a working chronology is in progress for the Black Prairie region (Atkinson 1979; Jennings 1941; Johnson et al. 2008; Lieb 2004; Rafferty 1995; Smith 2017). Ceramics were created with specific features that were used during short periods of time and can be directly linked to regional culture chronologies. Examples of these features include various types of surface decoration (e.g., notching, painting, incising). Steponaitis (1983:47-48) referred to these features as modes. Some modes are secondary shape features, or simple kinds of appliqué elaborations added onto a basic vessel shape (e.g., notched rims, nodes, tapered handles) (Steponaitis 1983:49, 70-74). Due to their short duration of use, these modes are chronologically sensitive. Those that come from specific mound-building contexts in mound units directly relate that episode of mound-building to a specific time period. The dating of mound-building episodes is supported both by ceramic analysis and radiocarbon dates, usually obtained from charred wood, that come from the same contexts.

Determining which sites were occupied sequentially or contemporaneously across the landscape can help us examine how populations at each site were organizing themselves based on their relationships with neighboring populations. Various settlement studies of Mississippian chiefdoms discussed in this thesis have focused on identifying the rise and fall of complex chiefdoms through chiefdom cycling (Anderson 1990, 1994, 1996), territorial spacing between polities (Hally 1993; Livingood 2012, 2015), and the fission-fusion of decentralized political
units into larger political formations (Blitz 1993a, 1999). Changes in settlement patterning reflect changing sociopolitical relationships due to various factors such as warfare and alliance building. These approaches to settlement patterning all attempt to understand the changing sociopolitical landscape by determining how neighboring populations were organized in relation to one another.

The Butler Mound Site (22Lo500) provides an opportunity to further examine settlement patterning in northeast Mississippi. Butler is located in Lowndes County, Mississippi. It is a Mississippian, single-mound site located on a high bluff (7-m) on the west bank of the Tombigbee River (Boudreaux et al. 2017:3). Butler is located in the Upper Tombigbee region. The site consists of a platform mound (ca. 3-m) with a potential occupation area northwest of the mound (Boudreaux et al. 2017:3). Archaeological investigations have been conducted at the site by the University of Mississippi, University of Florida, South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, and Chickasaw Nation. Based on platform mound reconstruction, combined with ceramic analysis and radiocarbon dates obtained from mound and off-mound contexts, the Butler Mound site was occupied between the Early and Late Mississippian periods (A.D. 1200-1540) with the last mound-construction activities and site occupation dating to the Late Mississippian period (A.D. 1450-1540).

This thesis will place the Butler Mound within the culture-historical framework established for the Upper Tombigbee region (Blitz 1993a). This thesis also will relate Butler spatially and temporarily to other nearby single-mound sites and farmsteads. Knowing these temporal and spatial relationships will allow for an examination of how and why populations were moving through northeast Mississippi during the Late Mississippian period, providing the
An opportunity for further research on the political organization of chiefdoms in the Upper Tombigbee and Black Prairie regions.

An overview of the Mississippian period is provided in Chapter 2, in which characteristics of Mississippian life, theories of settlement patterning, and characteristics of platform mounds are discussed. An overview of the culture-historical context of northeast Mississippi, including the Upper Tombigbee River Valley and the Black Prairie, is provided in Chapter 3. Field investigations at Butler are described in Chapter 4. The results of the investigations – including mound-construction stages, the ceramic analysis, and radiocarbon dates – are discussed in Chapter 5. A larger discussion that relates Butler spatially and temporally to other sites in northeast Mississippi also is presented in Chapter 5. Chapter 6 summarizes the findings of this study and recommends future work at the site.
CHAPTER II: BACKGROUND AND LITERATURE REVIEW

This thesis contributes to a larger body of scholarship that explores how Mississippian chiefdoms in northeast Mississippi were organized socio-politically. A background understanding of traditional definitions of the Mississippian period is provided to set the stage for a discussion on Mississippian chiefdom settlement patterning, including how various theories of settlement patterning relate to Mississippian political organization. The temporal and functional history of platform mounds in the Southeast also is addressed in this chapter. Platform mound-construction stages, combined with radiocarbon dating and ceramic chronology, are necessary for understanding the occupational history of Butler. Furthermore, knowing the occupational history of Butler provides an understanding for how it relates spatially and temporally to other sites in northeast Mississippi.

Mississippian Period (A.D. 1000-1600)

The Mississippian period was a time of regional change in the Southeast that encompassed shifting political and social relationships across the landscape. Mississippian life likely arose in the American Bottom near St. Louis and spread outward throughout the Southeast. Conditions for the Mississippian emergence likely included both the spread of ideas and people through migration (Anderson and Sassaman 2012:159; Smith 1984), as well as independent creation through interaction, competition, and the adoption of new subsistence forms (Anderson and Sassaman 2012:159; Milner 2004; Muller 1997; Smith 1978, 1990). The Mississippian period is traditionally identified by the appearance of intensive maize agriculture, centralized
political organization, monumental architecture, changing settlement patterns and social

The dominant type of political organization during the Mississippi period was the
chiefdom, frequently described as a nonstate, ranked society that exhibited a range of sizes and
Chiefdoms were located along the major river valleys and tributaries of the Southeast. The fertile
soils of the floodplains provided conditions necessary for crop growth and an environment where
wild plants and wildlife thrived. There were two social ranks within the chiefdom including the
ruling elite lineages, considered to be descendants of supernatural beings, and the nonelite
lineages (Ethridge 2010:12).

Mississippian chiefdoms have traditionally been typified into simple and complex
classifications (Steponaitis 1978). Chiefdom size and complexity is measured by the number of
subordinate communities under the political control of the chiefly center (Anderson 1996:232;
Blitz 1999:578). Simple chiefdoms are small, autonomous political units with one level of
decision-making above the household level controlled by a chief. Complex chiefdoms have at
least two decision-making levels above the household level (Blitz 1999:578). In the simple-
complex model, chiefdom size and power are measured by the spatial arrangement of chiefdoms
on the landscape (Steponaitis 1986). A single platform mound marks a simple chiefdom, and a
complex chiefdom is identified by a multiple-mound, primary center surrounded by affiliated
single-mound, secondary centers (Hally 1993; Steponaitis 1978). Some archaeologists argue for
a third tier in the chiefdom hierarchy classified as the paramount chiefdom. Paramount
chiefdoms exercised control over large areas and subordinate chiefs, such as the paramount
chiefdom of Coosa (Hudson et al. 1985). Other archaeologists argue that there is no significant
archaeological evidence for paramount chiefdoms (Hally et al. 1990:133) and that paramount chiefdoms likely were a network of decentralized, allied groups across a region that banded together against the threat of warfare (Blitz 1999:15-16; Blitz and Lorenz 2006).

*Mississippian Settlement Patterning*

The simple and complex chiefdom typology initially was proposed by Wright (1984), but it was expanded by Anderson (1990, 1994, 1996) to address the emergence, collapse and re-emergence of complex chiefdoms across the Southeast throughout the Mississippian period. Anderson (1990) explained that complex chiefdoms would appear briefly in specific regions and eventually return to a simpler arrangement as an inherent condition of kin-based political formation. The multiple-mound, primary center is linked in administrative hierarchy to single-mound, secondary centers, and eventually the complex chiefdom collapses back into a series of small centers that were not hierarchically linked.

The hierarchical political organization of complex chiefdoms is linked to the theory of chiefdom political economy, or the flow of tribute from secondary centers to the chiefly elites at the primary center (Blitz 2010:4; Emerson 1997; Steponaitis 1986; Welch 1991). Objections to the simple-complex chiefdom cycling model focus on new perspectives of political organization that do not focus on chiefly elites serving managerial roles in the production and organization of tribute (Blitz 2009). Other archaeological studies also have focused on Mississippian sites that do not fit the simple-complex settlement model (e.g. King and Meyers 2002). Frontier settlements interacted with other Mississippian groups in various ways, proving that not all Mississippian sociopolitical relationships or settlement patterns can be pigeonholed into Mississippian chiefdom types (King and Meyers 2002; Warner 2018).
Agency approaches (e.g. Barrett 2001; Dobres and Robb 2000; Joyce and Lopiparo 2005; Pauketat 2000; Pauketat and Alt 2005) showed that humans actively played a part in shaping the social structures of their lives. Pauketat (2000:122-124) argued that people who participated in activities that perpetuated their own social stratification (e.g., mound building, craft specialization, etc.) saw a benefit in doing so and were willing to accept changes if they were reconciled with tradition. Other criticisms of the simple-complex chiefdom classification model include objections to the historic accounts of sixteenth-century chiefdoms encountered by Europeans. European descriptions of Mississippian polities relate Mississippian political organization to Western political order and ignore sociopolitical relationships that were not recognized in Western society (Blitz 1993a:7; Galloway 1995:110-111; Lankford 1981:53-54; Muller 1997:56-61; Swanton 1979:647, 650-652).

Blitz (1993a:11-16; 1999) interpreted European accounts to offer alternative explanations for the political organization of chiefdoms. He first examined Hally’s (1993) investigation of the territorial size of Mississippian chiefdoms. Hally (1993) conducted a study of Southeastern settlement patterning in north Georgia to identify polities on the landscape. Habitation and mound-construction data combined with existing ceramic chronologies and radiocarbon dates were used to date the sites (Hally 1993:148-149). Investigations showed that contemporaneous, secondary mound centers were located no more than 18-km away from the primary center of a chiefdom (Hally 1993; Livingood 2012, 2015). Furthermore, these secondary centers were approximately a half-day walk from the primary center (Livingood 2012:183-184). Primary centers of neighboring polities were separated by at least 33-km of buffer zones (Hally 1993; Livingood 2015:245). Although these exact measurements cannot be directly applied to other regions due to differences in physiography, they provide a way to observe settlement patterning
trends within a region among neighboring groups. Blitz (1999:582) identified two distinct types of chiefdoms that did not fit the typical primary-secondary site distribution in Hally’s territorial measurements. These distributions included contemporaneously grouped, single-mound sites no less than 20-km apart and isolated, multiple-mound sites with two or more mounds spaced more than 20-km from the nearest contemporary mound center. The absence of the hierarchical pattern of mound centers in these examples suggested that mound-center arrangements could be based on other sociopolitical relationships apart from the regional political economy (Blitz 1999:577).

The basic political unit in the eighteenth-century Southeast was the okla (Choctaw) or talwa (Muskogee) polity (Blitz 1999:583). The words okla and talwa are defined as “town” and refer to a group of people that shared a civic-ceremonial center. Eighteenth-century civic-ceremonial centers favored the design of the square ground surrounded by town houses (Blitz 1999:583; Howard 1968; Hudson 1976:221-222; Knight 1989; Swanton 1928; Waring 1968). Because of this shared importance of community organization around the civic-ceremonial center, the eighteenth-century okla-talwa were organized in the same format as the simple chiefdom (Hudson 1976:210-211). Both the okla-talwa polity and the simple chiefdom have a settlement distribution of domestic and public organization units (Blitz 1993a:12).

Historic okla-talwas would shift between autonomous, isolated units and clustered political entities of different sizes (Blitz 1999:11-13). Okla-talwas would fission into senior-junior groupings during periods of internal stress to break away from a larger settlement. Groups would vote with their feet if unhappy with the existing political organization, breaking off to form their own groups. Chiefdom fissioning likely was the social mechanism that propelled Mississippian populations to move across the landscape and establish new chiefdoms (Blitz 1999:584). Okla-talwas would also fuse into larger confederacies to settle an area together
during times of stress (Blitz 1999:584). Early historical accounts documented similar fusion movements of simple chiefdoms into larger political unions (Hudson 1976:233). Blitz (1999:589) argued that through the fission-fusion process, Mississippian polities acted in the same way as the *okla-talwas*, alternating between dispersed and concentrated regional power centers without establishing a hierarchical administration. Blitz (1999:589) also argued that the organizing force in most Mississippian polities was not the flow of tribute, but a compromise between the desire for autonomy and the need for mutual security.

Mississippian Platform Mounds

The platform mound was the political capital of the Mississippian chiefdom (Hally 1993:143). Mound building dates back to the Middle Archaic period around 5,000 years ago (Anderson and Sassaman 2012:74). Platform mounds appear in the Southeast during the Middle Woodland period (100 B.C.-A.D. 500). Archaeologists believe that Middle Woodland platform mounds were ritual centers where populations gathered for feasting and mortuary rituals (Knight 2001). Lack of structural evidence on mound summits suggests that the activities on top of the mound were open to the community to observe, potentially serving as a form of social integration (Lindauer and Blitz 1997:173, 180). The Late Woodland period (A.D. 500-1000) saw the first civic-ceremonial centers at platform mound sites, with some sites still serving as vacant centers and some housing residential populations (Anderson and Sassaman 2012:127-128). Platform mounds were later co-opted by political leaders during the Late Woodland period to serve as seats and symbols of political authority during the Mississippian period where ceremonies, feasting, and craft specialization could still be held (Anderson and Sassaman 2012:168; Blitz 1993a:49-52; Blitz 1993b; Lindauer and Blitz 1977:175,193). These mounds
continued to be built into the early Historic period until they were replaced by town squares with four surrounding public buildings (Anderson and Sassaman 2012:185; Hahn 2004:20-21; Schroedl 2000; Waselkov 1993).

Great care was given to the construction of platform mounds, including the selection of certain types of fills during construction that were specifically colored, mixed and cleaned (Pursell 2004; Sherwood and Kidder 2011). Individuals who had access to the top of the platform mound had special social status within the community (Hally 1993, 1996). Spanish, French and English accounts from the sixteenth though eighteenth-centuries identify mounds as elite, chiefly residences and temple/charnel structures (Blitz 1993a:70). Abandonment at mound sites is sometimes recognized by changing site function (Cobb 2003:78). Mound sites were slowly abandoned by the residential population to function as mortuary centers often still inhabited by elites who maintained the site (Pauketat 1997).

Many mounds were built on top of ground-level structures that preceded the initial mound-construction stage (Hally 1996:93). Mounds went through many construction stages with each new stage appearing as a mantle of earth being placed onto the existing mound summit, and usually a structure was erected on the new summit surface (Hally 1996:94). Hally (1993, 1996) examined the duration of these societies by determining the episodes of construction stages at mounds centers. He discovered that major periods of construction tended to occur in 25 and 50-year intervals, with mound-building rarely lasting longer than a century or two (Hally 1993:145, 1996:112, 124). Based on a study in northern Georgia, Hally (1996:112) argued that mounds generally were used for relatively short periods of no more than 75 to 100 years.

Some archaeologists have argued that mound-construction was a part of communal ceremonies, such as the world renewal element of the Green Corn ceremony (Hudson 1976;
Knight 1986; Swanton 1928). Knight (1986:678; 1989) argued that mounds were symbols of the earth, and the periodic mound-construction represented a cycle of renewal to cover older surfaces that were no longer healthy, working to also reconstitute those individuals or lineages who lived on top of the mound (Anderson 1989; Hally 1987, 1996:95). Hally (1996:96) argued that the addition of a new mantle to the already existing mound represented the relationship between the new chief and his predecessors, reinforcing the relationship between past and present at the mound. Hally (1996:97) also argued that the platform mound and its summit structures were integral to the chief’s role as a leader and continued to legitimize the chief’s claim to office. The mounds were built around plazas that were the center of games, ceremonies and communal feasting (Anderson and Sassaman 2012:172). Mounds towered over these plazas, allowing elites who resided on the summit to look down upon the plaza and the resident population (Cobb 2013:69).

**Conclusion**

This chapter has reviewed key features of the Mississippian period, including chiefdom political organization, settlement patterning, and platform mounds. The Butler Mound Site provides an opportunity to contribute to the larger body of scholarship on settlement patterning, and thus political organization, by investigating the varying settlement patterns among neighboring sites in northeast Mississippi. A chronology of platform mound-construction at Butler, and eventually platform mounds that have not been investigated at neighboring sites, must be established to reveal when and how these mound sites were occupied. Once it is understood which mound sites were sequential and which were contemporaneous, inferences may be drawn as to which, if any, contemporaneous mound centers were part of a political unit.
based on spatial distribution on the landscape. Ultimately, the unique processes of development and the sociopolitical relationships amongst populations in northeast Mississippi can be investigated once a chronology of site occupation is established. These investigations will support the argument that the chiefdoms in northeast Mississippi, and in other regions across the Southeast, were a product of unique historical contingencies.
CHAPTER III. ARCHAEOLOGY OF NORTHEAST MISSISSIPPI

The Mississippian period is characterized in the study area by the existence of various mound sites. These mound sites were surrounded by small settlements or farmsteads (Blitz 1993a:49-51). There have been a number of Mississippian settlements documented along the Tombigbee drainage, specifically in the upper-central area, via research in the development of the Natchez Trace Parkway (Bohannon 1972; Jennings 1941), the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway (Atkinson et al. 1980; Jenkins and Krause 1986; O’Hear et al. 1981; Peebles 1983b; Solis and Walling 1982), and various research and cultural resource management projects by Mississippi State University (Hogue 2003, 2007; Hogue et al. 1995; Peacock and Hogue 2005; Peacock and Miller 1990; Peacock and Rafferty 1996; Rafferty 1994, 1995a, 1995b, 1996) and the University of Mississippi (Boudreaux et al. 2017, 2018; Johnson 1991, 1996a, 1996b, 1997, 2000; Johnson et al. 1991; Johnson et al. 2008; Johnson and Sparks 1986, Lieb 2004). Butler is one of nine mound sites to have been investigated in this area. However, archaeological investigations have been small-scale so far (Blitz 1993a; Rucker 1974). In this chapter, a review of the culture-history of the Upper Tombigbee and Black Prairie regions is provided to highlight Mississippian components at these investigated sites. This discussion includes information about radiocarbon dates and ceramic assemblages.

Culture-historical approaches to archaeological research originated from Franz Boas’s salvage ethnography which focused on salvaging indigenous cultures before they were acculturated into Western society (Moberg 2013:148). Culture-historical methods approached culture as a gradual, slow change through time as people migrated through space (Ford 1954).
Culture-history focuses on the appearance of co-occurring clusters of cultural categories that show up together across space and time (Willey and Phillips 1958). Methods for this type of analysis list traits and observations of artifacts to place them into classificatory types (Flannery 1967; Phillips et al. 1951). By placing ceramic artifacts into types based on specific stylistic markers, the analyst can identify chronological markers on the pottery. These chronological markers are linked to certain periods of time, sites and populations where these types were produced. The pottery types generally found in northeast Mississippi are plain wares with shell-tempered pottery that were in use over long periods of time. Because shell-tempered pottery was used throughout the entire Mississippian period, distinct chronological features on pottery (e.g., nodes, handles, incising) used for shorter durations are linked to a more concise temporal range. These attributes are referred to as secondary features in the following discussion based on Steponaitis’s (1983:70-74) description of secondary shape features.

Northeast Mississippi includes two major physiographic regions: the Upper Tombigbee River Valley, located in western Alabama and eastern Mississippi, and the Black Prairie, extending from western Tennessee to central Alabama (Blitz 1993a:31, 33). The Tombigbee River divides the two physiographic zones. The Upper Tombigbee River Valley, also defined as the Fault Line Hills, is composed of Mesozoic and Cenozoic sedimentary deposits, and the Black Prairie is composed of dark fertile soils of Selma Chalk deposit (Blitz 1993a:33). The meander-belt zone of the river floodplain creates alluvial soils that flood regularly. The landscape consists of a variety of shapes caused by the horizontal movement of the river including swamps, horseshoe bends and terraces, all creating a variety of diverse biotic environments between each site (Blitz 1993a:33).
Clark (2017) investigated locations of sites in the Upper Tombigbee and Black Prairie regions to track settlement patterning changes through the Mississippian and Historic periods. Clark (2017:59) identified several patterns including three possible clusters of Mississippian polities during the Early to Middle Mississippian and Late Mississippian to Contact periods. The eastern cluster in her study consists of sites in the Upper Tombigbee region and the western cluster consists of sites in the Black Prairie. Clark (2017:59) argued that the eastern cluster was abandoned by the start of the Historic period while the western cluster persisted around the present-day area of Starkville through the Late Mississippian and Historic periods. Despite the large-scale changes and abandonment of settlements in northeast Mississippi, those settlements in the Black Prairie continued to be occupied. Clark (2017:59) concluded that this is evidence of a continuation of native life in the face of European contact. Establishing site occupation at Butler adds to Clark’s investigations of settlement patterning in northeast Mississippi.

Following is a review of the culture chronologies of northeast Mississippi, including the Upper Tombigbee River Valley and the Black Prairie, that have been developed thus far. Phase sequences have been developed for northeast Mississippi including the Summerville I-IV phase sequence at Lubbub Creek (Blitz 1993a:93; Peebles 1983a; Peebles and Mann 1981) and the limited Tibbee Creek-Lyon’s Bluff-Sorrells phase sequence at Lyon’s Bluff (Jenkins 1982; Marshall 1977). A phase sequence for Moundville also is included as both of the phase sequences developed for northeast Mississippi were heavily influenced by Steponaitis’s (1983) ceramic sequence developed for Moundville. These culture chronologies have created a way to temporally relate certain artifacts, specifically ceramics, to a distinct time period. Using these culture chronologies, in combination with other methods (e.g., mound reconstruction, radiocarbon dating) allows the archaeologist to successfully date occupations at each site. These
culture chronologies will be used to create a chronology for the Butler occupation, specifically relating certain chronologically distinguishing ceramic secondary features to specific phases.

*Moundville Ceramic Chronology*

Moundville was occupied from A.D. 1250 to 1400 and consisted of at least 20 mounds (Steponaitis 1986:390). Moundville is located more than 40-km away from Butler, but it is important because many of the widely distributed ceramic types in the Moundville ceramic sequence appear in the Upper Tombigbee and Black Prairie ceramic sequences. Because of this, the temporal phases that are representative of the Mississippian period at Moundville are reviewed here. Furthermore, the ceramic analysis reviewed in Chapter 4 identifies secondary features in the Butler assemblage that are diagnostic of specific phases at Moundville and in the Upper Tombigbee region. These Moundville phases are then related to the corresponding Upper Tombigbee and Black Prairie phases (Table 3.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date A.D.</th>
<th>Black Warrior River Valley</th>
<th>Central Tombigbee River Valley</th>
<th>Black Prairie</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>Alabama River Incised</td>
<td>Summerville IV</td>
<td>Sorells Phase</td>
<td>Early Historic Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td>Moundville III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Late Mississippian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td>Moundville II</td>
<td>Summerville II/III</td>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Mississippian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>Moundville I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Early Mississippian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summerville I</td>
<td>Tibbee Creek Phase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>West Jefferson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Miller III</td>
<td>Early Mississippian/Late Woodland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1. Culture chronologies for northeast Mississippi (after Blitz 1993a:34; Jenkins 1982:123).
The West Jefferson phase (A.D. 900-1050) represents the Late Woodland (A.D. 600-1000) to Early Mississippian period (A.D. 1000-1200) transition at Moundville. The ceramic complex of the West Jefferson phase is almost entirely grog-tempered and undecorated (Steponaitis 1983:126). Some Mulberry Creek Cord-Marked, Alligator Incised and Benson Punctate types are included. Later in the phase, shell-tempered ceramic types, Mississippi Plain and Moundville Incised, are identified in the assemblage (Steponaitis 1983:126). Common vessel forms are jars with two parallel-sided handles and simple bowls (Steponaitis 1983:126).

The Moundville I phase (A.D. 1050-1250) represents the Early Mississippian period (A.D. 1000-1200) at Moundville. At this time, most vessels are shell tempered (Steponaitis 1983:126). Most of the pottery remains undecorated and decorated bowls and bottles are classified as Carthage Incised and Moundville Engraved (Steponaitis 1983:126-127). Most unburnished, decorated jars are Moundville Incised (Steponaitis 1983:127). Common vessel forms are two-handled jars and simple bowls similar to those in the West Jefferson complex, along with new vessel forms such as the restricted bowl, the flaring-rim bowl, the slender ovoid bottle and the sub-globular bottle with a pedestal base (Steponaitis 1983:126).

The Moundville II phase (A.D. 1250-1400) represents the Middle Mississippian (A.D. 1200-1450) period at Moundville. Plain types still include Mississippi Plain and Bell Plain, with decorated types in the complex including Moundville Engraved, Carthage Incised and Moundville Incised, the last of which sharply declines towards the end of the phase (Steponaitis 1983:127). Bowl shapes found in the Moundville I phase continue into Moundville II. Jars are generally similar to those in the Moundville I phase with some having the addition of four handles instead of only two. Common secondary features include indentions and beaded rims.
The Moundville III phase (A.D. 1400-1550) represents the Late Mississippian period (A.D. 1450-1600) at Moundville. Plain ceramic types include Mississippi Plain and Bell Plain, and decorated types include Moundville Engraved and Carthage Incised (Steponaitis 1983:127). Late in the phase, red-and-white painted vessels begin to appear (Steponaitis 1983:127). Unburnished jars are undecorated and appear to have four handles gradually increasing to eight or more per vessel by the end of the phase (Steponaitis 1983:127). Handles also tend to be more strap-like and tapered near the bottom in comparison to handles in the Moundville II phase (Steponaitis 1983:127). Single nodes are often found either on the handles or just below the lip of the vessel (Steponaitis 1983:123). Beaded rims on bowls continue from the Moundville II phase with increased frequency (Steponaitis 1983:127).

The Alabama River phase (A.D. 1550-1700) is a transition period between the Late Mississippian period (A.D. 1450-1600) into the Early Historic period. Common undecorated varieties continue to be Bell Plain and Mississippi Plain (Steponaitis 1983:127). Decorated types include Alabama River Incised, Barton Incised, Carthage Incised and Moundville Engraved. Red-and-white painted decorations are still present from the Moundville III phase. Secondary features on vessels include standard jars with four, eight, or more than 10 handles per vessel that are eventually replaced towards the end of the phase by applique neck fillets or vertical pinched-up ridges of clay (Steponaitis 1983:127).

Although the sites reviewed in this study are located on the Moundville periphery, there has been little evidence of major influence from the populations at Moundville. Based on territorial measurements (Hally 1993; Livingood 2012, 2015), a 30-40-km distance probably marks the effective size of the Moundville polity. Butler is not within this distance from Moundville. Because of this, no major Moundville influence should be seen in the archeology of
Butler (Blitz 1993a:181-182). Furthermore, this lack of interaction may point to the reason why sites in northeast Mississippi remained relatively small in size and population. Small sites such as the ones along the Tombigbee may have been placed at a disadvantage for regional exchange and competition for nonlocal items if most of the exchange was occurring at Moundville (Blitz 1993a:182; Steponaitis 1991:225).

*Culture-History of the Upper Tombigbee River Valley*

The Early Mississippian period (A.D. 1000-1200) in the Upper Tombigbee region is classified as Summerville I (A.D. 1000-1200), and it overlaps with the Moundville I phase (A.D. 1050-1250) in the Black Warrior River Valley (Blitz 1993a:41; Peebles 1983b). All Summerville I ceramics are shell-tempered. Mississippi Plain and Moundville Incised make up over 90 percent of the ceramic assemblage (Blitz 1993a:40). Secondary features in this phase include small loop handles as well as strap handles decorated with two central nodes (Blitz 1993a:40; Peebles and Man 1983). Lithic technology in this phase is simple and consists of arrow points and microdrills utilized in shell bead production (Blitz 1993a:40; Ensor 1991). Other Summerville I artifacts include various groundstone artifacts, a copper plate embossed with a falcon image and a copper arrow shaped cutout (Blitz 1993a:40). Paleoethnobotanical and faunal remains show a reliance on maize, hickory nuts and deer for subsistence (Blitz 1993a:42). Floodplain areas might have been altered during this time due to maize cultivation, increasing the habitats favored by deer and other open-habitat flora and fauna (Blitz 1993a:42; Caddell 1983; Scott 1983). Summerville I settlement consisted of a local center with a platform mound and village area surrounded by nearby dispersed small settlements or farmsteads (Blitz 1993a:44).
The Middle Mississippian period (A.D. 1200-1450) in the Upper Tombigbee River Valley is represented by the Summerville II-III phases (A.D. 1200-1450). It overlaps with the Moundville II phase (A.D. 1250-1400) in the Black Warrior River Valley (Blitz 1993a:49; Peebles 1983b). All varieties of Moundville Engraved are present in the Summerville II-III phases. Secondary features include terraced rectangular vessels, restricted bowls, notched lip treatments and jars with multiple strap handles (Blitz 1993a:51; Peebles 1983b; Peebles and Mann 1983). Lithic artifacts are similar to those of the Summerville I phase. Floral and faunal remains show similar subsistence patterns as the Summerville I phase. Settlement patterns during the Summerville II-III phases show site abandonment in the area and cycles of palisade building (Blitz 1993a:50).

The Late Mississippian period (A.D. 1450-1600) in the Upper Tombigbee region is represented by the Summerville IV phase (A.D. 1450/1500-ca. 1600) and overlaps with the Moundville III and Alabama River phases (A.D. 1400-1700) in the Alabama River Valley (Blitz 1993a:51; Peebles 1983b). The end of the Summerville IV phase remains undefined. Although many dispersed sites have been found, limited surface collections yielded mostly plain shell-tempered pottery that do not provide a chronological distinction due to the long duration of its use. Alabama River Applique is the characteristic ceramic type of this phase, and plain shell-tempered types continue to be present (Blitz 1993a:51). Moundville Engraved is no longer produced during this time. Diagnostic attributes continue to be multiple strap handles on jars with an increasing number per vessel. Other secondary features include punctation, vertical incision from the lip and painted decorative treatments (Blitz 1993a:51). Lithic technology during this time is similar to previous phases with little to no changes (Blitz 1993a:51).
Culture-History of the Black Prairie

Understanding the chronological sequence of the Black Prairie region has been difficult due to the lack of archaeological investigations and artifact collections from the region. Also, currently recognized diagnostic pottery types in the area are mostly plainwares that were in use over long periods of time. Rafferty (1995:182) pointed out that plain pottery tempered with mussel shell can span 500 years or more. A major focus in this region has been on the Starkville Archaeological Complex, a cluster of Contact-era sites associated with European metal (Atkinson 1979; Smith 2017:ii). Field investigations and ceramic seriations from sites located within the Starkville Archaeological Complex are ongoing (e.g. Smith 2017).

Archaeologists have worked to identify common ceramic types used in northeast Mississippi in an effort to create a chronology for Late Mississippian through Historic period occupation. Johnson (2000:85-101) argued that strong connections recognized in ceramic styles between the Historic Chickasaw and Late Mississippian assemblages suggest that populations living in Mississippian polities in the region were ancestors of the Chickasaw. Atkinson (1979:63) identified a switch from use of live shell-temper in Mississippian ceramic contexts to a use of fossil shell-temper in Chickasaw ceramic contexts. Jennings (1941:176-178) reported six types of historic Chickasaw ceramics at several archaeological sites in Tupelo. These included Wilson Plain, Wilson Roughened, Oktibbeha Plain, Fatherland Incised and Ridge Plain. Sand-temper later replaced the fossil shell-temper in historic Chickasaw ceramics (Johnson et al. 2008:10). Jennings (1941) later identified fine sand-tempered wares as Ridge Plain. Historic Chickasaw assemblage vessel shapes include bottles, bowls, jars, miniature vessels and plates (Lieb 2004:2.26-2.31). Secondary features that are chronologically distinctive in the assemblage are punctated or notched applique fillets below the lip on Oktibbeha Plain jars, strap handles,
tapered strap handles, incised or modeled strap handles, vestigial strap handles and lugs (Lieb 2004:2.23). A large portion of historic Chickasaw ceramics are undecorated (Jennings 1941:174).

A chronological sequence consisting of four phases was developed for the Lyon’s Bluff site (22Ok520) in the southern Black Prairie. These phases, in chronological order, are Tibbee Creek, Lyon’s Bluff, Sorrels and Mhoon (Marshall 1977, 1986a). Marshall (1977) originally suggested these phases existed between ca. A.D. 1100-1650. He later suggested an occupation prior to A.D. 1100 that extended later than A.D. 1556 (Marshall 1986b). These temporal phases have not been explored since Marshall’s work in the 1970’s and 1980’s. New calibrated radiocarbon dates have been obtained from various contexts at Lyon’s Bluff that may lead to the further development of temporal phases at the site (Peacock and Hogue 2005).

Northeast Mississippi Sites

The single-mound and small habitation sites in the Upper Tombigbee River Valley and the Black Prairie discussed in this section have been the subject of archaeological investigations conducted over the last four decades. A brief discussion of investigations at each site, as well as a general site description, is given. Furthermore, any chronologically diagnostic ceramic artifacts or radiocarbon dates from site contexts are described. Those sites in the Upper Tombigbee River Valley are first described, followed by sites located on the boundaries of and within the Black Prairie. The locations of each site are shown in Figure 3.1. Radiocarbon dates obtained from the sites have been calibrated within two standard deviations using the Oxcal calibration software v4.3.2 (Ramsey 2009, 2017; Reimer et al. 2013) (Table 3.2).
Yarborough (22Cl814) is located on the left bank of Tibbee Creek in Clay County on a natural levee about 4-km upstream from the Tibbee Creek site (Blitz 1993a:65). Archaeological investigations were conducted at the site in 1981 by the University of Alabama (Solis and Walling 1982:iii). Yarborough represents a Late Mississippian, small habitation site that was occupied as a single-household farmstead possibly more than once (Blitz 1993a:65-66). A radiocarbon date obtained from a potential structure is indicative of an occupation during the fifteenth century between A.D. 1425-1640 (Solis and Walling 1982:170). Various different types of ceramics were obtained from the site. These include Bell Plain, Mississippi Plain and Alabama River Incised (Solis and Walling 1982:79-116).

Tibbee Creek (22Lo600) is a small habitation site located on Tibbee Creek upstream from where it meets the Tombigbee River in Lowndes County. The site was investigated by Mississippi State University in 1976 (O’Hear et al. 1981). A radiocarbon date obtained from Structure 2 indicates that site occupation occurred between A.D. 905-1190 (O’Hear et al. 1981:105). The ceramic assemblage further supports this Early Mississippian occupation at the site with types that include Mississippi Plain, Moundville Incised, Carthage Incised and Hemphill Engraved (O’Hear et al. 1981:153-176).

Kellogg (22Cl527) is a multi-component site in Clay County investigated by Mississippi State University in 1978 (Atkinson et al. 1980:ix). Three Mississippian structures were identified at the site as well as 32 Mississippian pit features distributed around the structures (Blitz 1993a:64; Rucker 1974:196). A radiocarbon date obtained from a post-hole within a potential structure indicates that site occupation was between A.D. 1050-1395 (Atkinson et al. 1980:233). Mississippian ceramic types recovered from the site include Mississippi Plain and Moundville Incised (Atkinson et al. 1980:112).
Chowder Springs Mound A (22Lo554) is one of two platform mounds located 900-m from the left bank of the Tombigbee River investigated by Rucker in 1974 during an archaeological survey for the Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway construction (Rucker 1974:55, 80). Ceramics obtained from shovel testing on the mound yielded cordmarked, grog-tempered sherds, plain grog-tempered sherds and shell-tempered sherds (Rucker 1974:81). There were no radiocarbon dates obtained from the investigations, but Rucker (1974:81) suggested that the mound was Mississippian based on the presence of shell-tempered sherds.

Figure 3.1. Map of northeast sites discussed in text in case study (triangles indicate mound sites) (courtesy of the Center for Archaeological Research, University of Mississippi).
Chowder Springs Mound B (22Lo555) is a platform mound situated 100-m north of Chowder Springs Mound A. It also was investigated by Rucker in 1974 (Rucker 1974:55, 82). One shovel test on the mound yielded ceramic types that included Mulberry Creek Cordmarked, Roper Plain, Tishomingo Cordmarked, Tishomingo Plain and Mississippi Plain (Rucker 1974:82). Although no radiocarbon dates were obtained during investigations, Rucker (1974:82) suggested the mound was contemporaneous with Chowder Springs Mound A and was likely occupied during the Late Woodland/Early Mississippian periods based on the presence of ceramic types from both the Late Woodland and Early Mississippian periods.

The Coleman Mound (22Lo507) is a platform mound in a level area on the west bank of the Tombigbee River (Rucker 1974:80-82). The mound was investigated by Rucker in 1974 during an archaeological survey for the Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway construction (Rucker 1974:55). Only two sherds were recovered from field investigations and are typed as Mississippi Plain (Rucker 1974:55). Rucker (1974:55) suggested that the mound dated to the Mississippi period based on the presence of Mississippian sherds. Radiocarbon dating of a hearth date the site between A.D. 1250-1400 (Rucker 1974:56).

Lubbub Creek (1Pi33 and 85) is a single-mound site located in Alabama in the Tombigbee River flood plain (Blitz 1993a:53). The site was first investigated by C.B. Moore.
(1901) who identified that the mound was 3.5-m high. Ned. J. Jenkins later held extensive investigations at the site in 1977, and the University of Michigan, under the direction of Christopher S. Peebles, conducted further investigations in 1978 (Blitz 1993a:53). Lubub Creek was occupied between A.D. 1000-1600 and contained an estimated population of 100 people (Blitz 1993a:56; Peebles 1983b:399-401). Blitz (1993a) estimated mound-construction at the site occurred between A.D. 1250-1600. Radiocarbon dates obtained from a pre-mound surface place the start of mound construction sometime after A.D. 890-1250 (Blitz 1993a:Table 3). Mississippi Plain sherds comprise 94 percent of the ceramic assemblage (Blitz 1993a:Table 10). Other types include Alabama River Applique, Barton Incised, Bell Plain, Carthage Incised, Mound Place Incised, Moundville Engraved, Moundville Incised and Parkin Punctate (Blitz 1993a:Table 10).

Evidence of a bastioned palisade surrounding the residential space dates to the Summerville I phase (A.D. 1000-1200) (Blitz 1993a:118). The palisade was removed during the Summerville II-III phase (A.D. 1200-1450) and the site was again fortified with the addition of a 1-m deep ditch surrounding the site during the Summerville IV phase (A.D. 1450/1500-cal.1600) (Blitz 1993a:118). However, it should be noted that only five inner palisade lines were investigated, and their full orientation could not be determined (Blitz 1993a:118). Furthermore, the palisade encompassed not only a very small residential population (less than 100 people), but a vast empty area containing no houses, features or midden (Blitz 1993a:118). Blitz (1993a:122) argued that the residential population relied on help from surrounding farmsteads to build the fortifications and ditch.

Lyon’s Bluff (22Ok520) is a palisaded, single-mound and village site located in the Black Prairie in northeastern Oktibbeha County (Peacock and Hogue 2005:46). The site was first excavated by Moreau Chambers in the mid-1930s, and additional investigations were conducted
in the 1960s and 1970s by Richard Marshall (Blitz 1993a:53-56; Peacock and Hogue 2005:46; Peebles 1983b). Mississippi State University conducted field investigations during 2001 and 2003, and both Mississippi State University (Rafferty et al. 2003) and the University of Mississippi (Peacock and Reynolds 2001) conducted gradiometry surveys at the site. Peacock and Hogue (2005:53) later calibrated radiocarbon dates from cobs of maize in a potential smudge pit. This date places an episode of occupation at Lyon’s bluff sometime between A.D. 1450-1635. Ceramics obtained from the site include Nodena Red and White, Carthage Incised, Parkin Punctated, and Moundville Engraved (Peacock and Hogue 2005:52). Lack of European artifacts suggests that the major occupation at Lyon’s Bluff occurred prior to Spanish contact (Peacock and Hogue 2005:53). It should be noted that the 2001 and 2003 field investigations, combined with the gradiometer survey, located a potential palisade (Peacock and Hogue 2005:55). No temporal affiliation has been given to the palisade.

Stark Farm (22O778) is a Late Mississippian through Contact period site on the western boundary of the Black Prairie near present day Starkville (Boudreaux et a. 2017:6). The site appears to have been occupied during the time of Spanish Contact (Boudreaux et al. 2017:6). Field investigations were conducted at the site by the University of Florida, University of Mississippi, and Chickasaw Nation during the summers of 2015 and 2016 (Boudreaux et al. 2017; Cobb et al. 2016:93-98). Radiocarbon dates from the 2015 excavations of a large, midden-filled basin date Stark Farm to the Late Mississippian through Early Contact periods (Cobb et al. 2016:87). The ceramic assemblage from Stark Farm included Addis Plain, Alabama River Incised, Alabama River Applique, Barton Incised, Bell Plain, Mississippi Plain, Nodena Red on White, Oktibbeha Plain, Parkin Punctated, Ridge Plain, Tishomingo Cordmarked, Wilson Plain
and Wilson Roughened (Smith 2017:65). There was also a small presence of unclassified mixed temper and unclassified painted sherd (Smith 2017:65).

The Curry Mound (22OK578) is a single-mound site in Oktibbeha County on the border of the Black Prairie. The site was investigated by Nicole Palmer in 2005. Palmer (2007:74-75,79) concluded that mound-construction at the site consisted of three main episodes between A.D. 1280-1410 based on radiocarbon dating and ceramic analysis (Palmer 2007:93). A wall trench and two post-holes suggest evidence of a structure on the mound (ca. A.D. 1300) (Palmer 2007:70). Two radiocarbon dates were obtained from mound units dating to A.D. 1300-1440 (Palmer 2007:74). The Curry Mound yielded a ceramic assemblage that supports this Mississippian occupation. Types include: Mississippi Plain, burnished black-filmed, and several varieties of engraving and incising (Palmer 2007:86).

Conclusion

The culture chronologies and archaeological sites reviewed in this chapter are essential to interpreting how Butler fits within the northeast Mississippi culture-historical context. Understanding the temporal affiliations of each site creates a chronology of settlement patterning for the Upper Tombigbee River Valley and Black Prairie. As more sites continue to be investigated in northeast Mississippi, the culture chronologies for these two regions will continue to expand. Knowing when Butler was occupied provides one more piece to this chronology. The following chapter addresses the field investigations conducted to retrieve the data necessary for temporally relating Butler to neighboring sites in northeast Mississippi.
CHAPTER IV: FIELD INVESTIGATIONS

Two small-scale investigations have been conducted at Butler, with one archaeological field season producing the vast majority of the data used in this thesis. Excavations were first conducted at Butler by the University of Florida in 2016 (Cobb 2016). Additional excavations were conducted in the summer of 2017 by the University of Mississippi (Boudreaux et al. 2018). These excavations explored both mound and off-mound contexts (Figure 4.2). The 2017 investigations yielded the data needed to conduct the ceramic analysis and mound reconstruction for this thesis. This chapter briefly reviews investigations prior to 2017 and reviews the field investigations used during the 2017 investigations. Reviewing the field investigations used at Butler is essential to understanding how site occupation was reconstructed in Chapter 5.

Figure 4.2. Locations of 2017 field investigations (filled yellow boxes indicate locations of test units and hollow yellow boxes are benchmark locations).
Butler Mound was first mentioned in 1880 (Love 1880:284) as a mound existing near Columbus. C.B. Moore, a wealthy amateur archaeologist, was refused permission to excavate on the mound in 1899 by the landowner (Moore 1901:502). However, Moore did develop a detailed map of sites, including Butler Mound, along the Tombigbee River that has assisted in assessing the density of Mississippian occupation in the region (Cobb 2016:4).

In June of 2016, Dr. Charles Cobb and students from the University of Florida conducted archaeological investigations at Butler to determine the integrity of the upper layers of the mound after multiple, contemporary houses had been placed on its surface since the nineteenth century (Figure 4.3). They also wanted to obtain remains for radiocarbon dating for specific mound contexts (Cobb 2016:1). Cobb (2016:14) concluded the mound had minor disturbances.

Figure 4.3. Modern house on top of mound (courtesy of CAR).
In December 2016 and January 2017, a gradiometer survey of the open areas around the mound was conducted (Boudreaux et al. 2017). The goal of the survey was to identify and further understand any structures that existed on the site apart from the mound (Boudreaux et al. 2018:9). The gradiometer survey covered a total area of 3.4 hectares (8.5 acres) and revealed anomalies that included an approximately 8-x-8-m square anomaly that was a potential structure (Boudreaux et al. 2017:9). A second anomaly within this square anomaly revealed a potential central hearth, and another square anomaly around 8-x-8-m in size also was found (Boudreaux et al. 2017:9). Around 20 anomalies located in the far eastern portion of the survey area seemed to indicate human construction due to their even spacing (Boudreaux et al. 2017:9). A linear anomaly with two right angles located to the southeast of the mound may be a historic feature (Boudreaux et al. 2017:9).

In Spring 2017, the site was investigated by metal detectorists from the South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology (Boudreaux et al. 2018:28). Metal detecting techniques were employed to determine if Butler was occupied later than the Mississippian period. Furthermore, Spanish metal would have provided evidence that local residents were in contact with Spanish explorers that moved through the area in the sixteenth century. No Contact period, Spanish metal was recovered by the team of metal detectorists (Boudreaux et al. 2018:28).

In Summer 2017, investigations at the Butler Mound site involved archaeologists from the Universities of Mississippi and Florida working with archaeologists from Chickasaw Nation. An important part of this project was working with the Chickasaw Explorers, a program that provides members of Chickasaw Nation who are enrolled in college the opportunity to travel for
two weeks to the Chickasaw homeland in Mississippi where they participate in archaeological fieldwork (Boudreaux et al. 2018:4).

*Mound-Unit Investigations*

Auger investigations were conducted to get a better understanding of the entire mound, specifically where units were not placed. A team of three augured the perimeter of the mound summit using a split-core auger. A split-core auger takes a small column of soil to determine potential locations of archaeological features or artifacts. A total of 25 split-core auger tests were conducted to 125 cmbs from the top of the mound. The base of the mound was systematically tested using post-hole diggers to identify the locations of midden deposits that might have been tossed downslope. The post-hole digger tests were conducted to a depth of 80 cmbs (Boudreaux et al. 2018:16). Based on these initial investigations, two excavation units were placed north of the house on the mound’s summit (1047E|1015N and 1055.5E|1015.5N), and one was placed south of the house at the mound’s base (1049.5E|970.5N).

Field methods developed by Jim Knight (2010:75) at Moundville for documenting and dating major mound-construction stages were used to determine when the Butler Mound had been built and used (Figure 4.5). This method involved excavating units in two parts: a reference trench and a control trench. The reference trench is 1-m wide and excavated by arbitrary levels, and the control trench is 1-m wide and excavated entirely by reference to strata revealed by the reference trench (Knight 2010:75). This approach allows a more accurate identification of slope middens between layers of mound fill corresponding to each major level of summit activity (Knight 2010:75). Units were placed at the summit and base of the mound so that materials from the beginning and end of its construction sequence could be recovered.
The two units on the mound’s summit (1047E|1015N and 1055.5E|1015.5N) were placed to investigate a layer of daub and charcoal found at 80 cmbs during split-core auger testing (Boudreaux et al. 2018:11). Unit 1047E|1015N was excavated as an exploratory trench using 50-cm, arbitrary levels, to a total depth of 120 to 135 cmbs (Boudreaux et al. 2018:16). Another adjacent 1-x-2-m unit to the north was placed (1048E|1015N) and was excavated by following the exposed stratigraphy (Boudreaux et al. 2018:16). Very few artifacts and features were found within the mound-summit units. A post-hole filled with charcoal and daub around 110 cmbs was discovered at the bottom of unit 1048E|1015N. This is the only feature discovered (Boudreaux et al. 2018:16). A bucket auger test was conducted to a depth of 497 cmbs below the surface of the mound in unit 1048E|1015N to better understand mound-construction stages. The bucket auger was placed at the base of the unit near the southwest corner.

Unit 1049.5E|970.5N was placed at the base of the south side of the mound based on potential midden deposits found while conducting tests with the post-hole digger (Boudreaux et al. 2018:16). This unit also was excavated as a 1-x-2-m exploratory and adjacent control trench to a depth of 120 cmbs where pre-mound deposits were discovered (Boudreaux et al. 2018:16). Unfortunately, the burial of an infant was found in pre-mound deposits in the unit at the base of the mound, and the decision was made to fill in this unit immediately. As a result, dates for the earliest stages of mound-construction at Butler were not obtained (Boudreaux et al. 2018:16).

However, it is important to note that part of a pre-mound structure was encountered at the base of this unit, and this structure is similar to at least two Early Mississippian public buildings in the region (Boudreaux et al. 2018:16). A portion of a wall trench structure was visible in the pre-mound deposits at Butler and was oriented approximately 45° east of north, or northeast-southwest, which is different than the north-south oriented mound (Boudreaux et al.
The portion of wall trench that was visible terminated without abutting a perpendicular wall trench, and this suggests that it may have been part of a three-sided building or that it may have been part of a portico in front of a building (Boudreaux et al. 2018:16). The pre-mound structure at Butler is similar to other Early Mississippian (AD 1000-1200) public buildings at nearby sites in the region (Boudreaux et al. 2018:16).

**Off-Mound Unit Investigations**

Non-mound portions of the site also were investigated to learn more about overall site structure. An anomaly shown by the gradiometer survey pointed to a possible wall-trench structure (Boudreaux et al. 2018:19). Three 2-x-2-m units were placed in the field west of the mound north of a two-track road (Boudreaux et al. 2018:19). Units 820E|1051N, E823|1057N, and 815E|1060N were excavated to a depth of 30-60 cmbs but no features were discovered (Boudreaux et al. 2018:19). Although charcoal and small amounts of daub were found in all three units, few artifacts were recovered below the plowzone level (0-20 cmbs) (Boudreaux et al. 2018:19). The area was also augured (n=10) with a split-core auger, but no features or deposits were encountered (Boudreaux et al. 2018:19).

Six additional units (891E|1003N, 891E|1005N, 893E|1003N, 893E|1005N, 883E|1007N and 885E|1007N) were placed to the east of the mound just south of the two-track road (Boudreaux et al. 2018:19). Prior to opening units, the area was split-core augured (n=90) and shovel-tested (n=7) to better determine where units should be placed based on the gradiometer survey (Boudreaux et al. 2018:19). Units 891E|1003N, 891E|1005N, 893E|1003N, and 893E|1005N were excavated in three levels to a total depth of 55 cmbs (Boudreaux et al. 2018:19).
At 30 cmbs in units 891E|1005N and 893E|1005N, a large amorphous feature with significant amounts of daub and charcoal was discovered (Figure 4.6) (Boudreaux et al. 2018:19). Several large sections of burned timber were found within and beneath the layer of daub, which is consistent with this being part of a structure that burned and collapsed (Boudreaux et al. 2018:19). This feature was designated Feature 1. Additional artifacts found within Feature 1 included a significant quantity of large pieces of daub with impressions of cane or twigs, a greenstone celt and a broken jar (Boudreaux et al. 2018:19).

Two, 2-x2-m units 883E|1007N and 885E|1007N were excavated in two levels to a total depth of 45 cmbs (Boudreaux et al. 2018:19). Level 1 (0-25 cmbs) was a plowzone that contained a significant quantity of artifacts including pottery and daub with a long, linear, fired
clay feature that likely is a part of a structure towards the base of Level 1 (Figure 4.7) (Boudreaux et al. 2018:19). Level 2 (25-45 cmbs) contained a significantly lower density of artifacts (Boudreaux et al. 2018:19).

**Conclusion**

This chapter has reviewed archaeological investigations at Butler. Field investigations yielded mound-construction data that were used in determining how many construction episodes occurred at Butler Mound. Investigations also provided a ceramic assemblage that was used to date the occupation of mound and off-mound contexts. Furthermore, radiocarbon dates were obtained during the 2017 field season that are used in conjunction with the mound-construction data and the ceramic analysis. These three forms of data are used together in Chapter 5 to determine when the Butler mound was built and used.

Figure 4.5. Feature 1 in units 891E|1005N, 893E|1005N (Boudreaux et al. 2018:Figure 3.16).
Figure 4.6. Linear, fired-clay feature in unit 885E|1007N (Boudreaux et al. 2018:Figure 3.19).
CHAPTER V: DATING THE BUTLER MOUND SITE

This chapter discusses mound-construction episodes at the Butler Mound. Multiple pieces of archaeological evidence were examined to bring together an overall understanding of the chronological sequence at Butler. The results of the ceramic analysis, combined with radiocarbon dates, highlight specific chronological markers that date the off-mound contexts. The mound and pre-mound contexts are dated by combining unit profile drawings, split-core auger testing, bucket-auger testing, and radiocarbon dates. By dating both the mound and off-mound contexts, the chronological sequence of occupation examined at Butler is determined to be Late Mississippian (A.D. 1450-1600). In the discussion section of this chapter, Butler is related temporally and spatially to the sites reviewed in Chapter 3. Potential sociopolitical relationships are discussed for the sites in northeast Mississippi.

Ceramic Analysis

The ceramic assemblages from mound and off-mound contexts were analyzed and classified into types based on ceramic characteristics that have been established for the region (Blitz 1993a; Peacock 1983a) to determine site occupation. For this analysis, ceramics from the post-hole digger tests at the base of the mound are considered to be separate from mound contexts. Attributes examined were temper, temper size, and surface treatment. The use of shell, grit or grog tempers or the combination of different tempers within the same vessel have been related to different chronological periods in northeast Mississippi. Live shell-temper is the most frequently used tempering agent, and live-shell tempered ceramics dominate the ceramic
assemblage from Butler. Distinguishing between types can also depend on the size of the temper. For example, a distinguishing feature between Mississippi Plain and Bell Plain types is temper size. Bell Plain shell-temper is less than 2 mm and Mississippi Plain is greater than 2 mm (Mann 1983:41). Because live shell-tempering was used over a long period of time in northeast Mississippi, other ceramic attributes, referred to as secondary features, related to more specific phases are identified in the ceramic assemblage to narrow down a more precise temporal affiliation.

The Butler assemblage contained 672 sherds greater than 0.5 inches. It was determined that sherds smaller than 0.5 inches would be excluded from analysis as they are too small to confidently classify into types and to identify some attributes. Tempering agents present in the assemblage included grog, sand and shell (Table 5.3). Most of these sherds were plain shell-tempered. An overwhelming 77.4 percent of the ceramic assemblage was Mississippi Plain, and another 12.9 percent was Bell Plain (Table 5.4), both of which are types largely represented throughout the entire Mississippian period in the Upper Tombigbee region (Blitz 1993a:39-52). Chronologically sensitive secondary features represented in the assemblage include nodes on tapered handles on jars, nodes present at and below the lip on vessels and incising (Table 5.5). Three handles with a single node were found in Level 3 of unit 893E|1005N (Figures 5.8-5.10). One sherd with a single node located 5 mm below the lip also was found in Level 3 of unit 893E|1005N (Figure 5.11). An additional sherd with a single node located 5 mm below the lip was found in Level 1 of unit 883E|1007N (Figure 5.12). A sherd with two nodes located 5 mm below the lip was found in Level 1 of unit 885E|1007N (Figure 5.13). An additional sherd with two nodes on the rim was found in Level 1 of unit 891E|1005N (Figure 5.14).
### Table 5.3. Butler ceramic assemblage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mound</th>
<th>Off-Mound</th>
<th>Post-Holes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ct</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Ct</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grog</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baytown Plain</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulberry Creek Cordmarked</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sand</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furr's Cordmarked</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Incised</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shell</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Plain</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell Plain</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama River Incised</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Incised</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.4. Mississippian ceramic assemblage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mound</th>
<th>Off-Mound</th>
<th>Post-Holes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ct</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Ct</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Plain</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell Plain</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama River Incised</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified Incising</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>148</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.5. Secondary features from off-mound contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Feature</th>
<th>893E</th>
<th>1005N</th>
<th>891E</th>
<th>1005N</th>
<th>883E</th>
<th>1007N</th>
<th>885E</th>
<th>1007N</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ct</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Ct</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Ct</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Ct</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Ct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapered handle w/ node</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Node below rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two nodes below rim</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two nodes on rim</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5.7. Handle with a single node from Level 3 of unit 893E|1005N.

Figure 5.8. Handle with a single node from Level 3 of unit 893E|1005N.
Figure 5.9. Handle with a single node from Level 3 of unit 893E|1005N.

Figure 5.10. Sherd with a single node located below the lip from Level 3 of unit 893E|1005N.
Figure 5.1. Sherd with a single node located below the lip from Level 1 of unit 883E|1007N.

Figure 5.2. Sherd with two nodes located 5 mm below the lip from Level 1 of unit 885E|1007N.
Figure 5.13. Sherd with two nodes on the rim from Level 1 of unit 891E|1005N.

Jars with handles are dated to the Summerville II-III phases (A.D. 1200-1450) with an increasing number of handles on vessels in the Summerville IV phase (A.D. 1450/1500-ca.1600) (Blitz 1993a:51). Blitz’s (1993a) ceramic chronology was influenced by Steponaitis’s (1983) ceramic sequence for Moundville. Steponaitis (1983:127) related Mississippian shell-tempered handles that are more strap-like and tapered near the bottom to the Moundville III phase (A.D. 1400-1550). Nodes are commonly found on these handles, usually centered on the front of the handle and slightly below the lip of the vessel (Steponaitis 1983:123). Multiple nodes below or on the lip of Mississippi Plain vessels are related to Moundville III phase (A.D. 1400-1550) contexts (Steponaitis 1983:208).

Decorated pottery from Butler included a single example of Alabama River Incised found in Level 3 of unit 815E|1060N (Figure 5.15). Blitz (1993a:186) related Alabama River Incised to
the Summerville IV phase (A.D. 1450/1500-ca.1600). Steponaitis (1983:127) related Alabama River Incised to the Alabama River phase (A.D. 1550-1700). Based on these chronological markers, the off-mound contexts appear to date between the Late Summerville II-III (A.D. 1200-1450) and Late Summerville IV (A.D. 1450/1500-ca.1600) phases. Ceramics with distinct chronological markers were present only in off-mound contexts at Butler, most likely due to limited field investigations and a relatively small ceramic assemblage.

![Figure 5.14. Alabama River Incised sherd from Level 3 of unit 815E|1060N.](image)

_Mound Stratigraphy and Construction Episodes_

The profile drawings of mound excavation units were combined with the results of split-core auger testing and bucket-auger testing of mound contexts to reconstruct mound-construction episodes. Mound-construction episodes are represented by layers of earth that are different in color and soil texture. Once a mound-construction episode was completed, a structure was
sometimes erected on the summit of the mound and burned before beginning a new mound-construction episode (Hally 1993:148). Because of this, any evidence of a structure (e.g., daub concentrations, charcoal, post-holes, wall trenches) in the mound stratigraphy is used to separate mound-construction episodes.

A profile drawing of the east wall of unit 1047E|1015N originally showed eight layers of variations of brown, clayey soil (Figure 5.16). Because the soil coloration of layers 1-6 are all variations of brown, and the soil texture of each layer is clay, layers 1-6 in both mound units were combined into Zone 1 from 0-100 cmbs (Figure 5.17). Layer 1 likely represents the last fill stages of the mound where was rapidly placed onto preexisting layers. Layers 7-8 were combined into Zone 2 from 100-134 cmbs based on the presence of charcoal and daub (Figure 5.16). A post-hole filled with charcoal and daub also was discovered in layer 7 at 110 cmbs. As mentioned previously, the presence of daub, charcoal and a post-hole are all evidence for a potential structure that would have been built between mound-construction episodes. A profile drawing of the east wall of unit 1055.5E|1015.5N originally showed six layers of variations of brown, clayey soil (Figure 5.18). Because the soil coloration of layers 1-6 are all variations of brown, and the soil texture of each layers is clay, layers 1-6 were also combined into Zone 1 from 0-100 cmbs (Figure 5.19).

Split-core auger testing was conducted along the summit of the mound (Figure 5.20). Rows T-L of the split-core auger testing were conducted in the same area as the three mound-summit units. Similar soil descriptions are seen from 0-100 cmbs and coincide with soil descriptions of layers 1-6 in units 1047E|1015N and 1055.5E|1015.5N (Figure 5.21). Charcoal and daub appear at 100 cmbs, and they continue until the end of the testing at 125 cmbs. This is
supporting evidence that Zone 1 extends from 0-100 cmbs and Zone 2 begins at 100 cmbs and continues below the depth of excavations.

Because the units placed on top of the mound did not reach the pre-mound surface, a bucket-auger test was excavated in the southwest corner of the bottom of unit 1048E|1015N to better understand mound-construction episodes and to locate the pre-mound surface. Six distinct Zones (3-8) were determined from the bucket auger results (Figure 5.21). Because the bucket auger was placed in the southwest corner of the unit, the profile drawing of the east wall of unit 1047E|1015N, which is also the west wall of unit 1048E|1015N, is used to develop a full visual representation of Zones 1-8.

Zones 1-8 are representative of different construction episodes (Figure 5.23). Zone 8 represents the pre-mound, pre-cultural layer at 396-497 cmbs. Zone 7 represents evidence of the first structure on the pre-mound surface at 347-396 cmbs. Zone 6 marks the first construction episode of the mound at 260-347 cmbs. Zone 5 represents the second mound-construction episode at 160-260 cmbs. Zone 4 marks the evidence for a second structure built at 148-160 cmbs. Zone 3 reveals a small mound-construction episode at 134-148 cmbs. Zone 2 represents the evidence for a third structure built on the mound at 100-134 cmbs. Zone 1 marks the final construction episode on the Butler mound at 0-100 cmbs. It should be noted that any evidence of a fourth and final structure on top of the mound may have been erased by construction of a modern house and years of modern activity on top of the mound.
Figure 5.15. Profile drawing of east wall of unit
Zone 1 (Z1): 10YR 3/4, dark yellowish brown, sandy clay, some daub and charcoal
Zone 2 (Z2): 10YR 4/3, brown, clay, large daub and large charcoal

Figure 5.16. Profile drawing of east wall of unit 1047E|1015N showing interpretive zones.
Figure 5.17. Profile drawing of south wall of unit 1055.5E|1015.5N.

Layer 1: 10YR 6/3, pale brown, sandy silty
Layer 2: 10YR 6/6, brownish yellow, sandy
Layer 3: 10YR 3/3, dark brown, sandy clay
   organic material
Layer 4: 7.5 YR 4/3, brown, mottled with 7.5YR 4/6
   strong brown, sandy clay
Layer 5: 7.5YR 3/2, dark brown mottled
   with 7.5YR 5/6, strong brown, clay
Figure 5.18. Profile drawing of south wall of unit 1055.5E|1015.5N showing interpretive zones.

Z1

Zone 1 (Z1): 7.5YR 4/3, brown, mottled with 7.5YR 4/6, strong brown, sandy clay
Figure 5.19. Split-core auger test locations on the summit of the mound.
Figure 5.2. Rows T-L of split-core auger tests.

Zone 1 (Z1): 10YR 3/4, brown, homogenous silty clay
Zone 2 (Z2): 10YR 3/3, dark brown, charcoal and daub flecking
Zone 3 (Z3): 10YR 3/4, brown, homogenous silty clay
Figure 5.21. Zones 3-8 of bucket auger testing in the southwest corner of unit 1047E|1015N showing interpretive zones.

Zone 3 (Z3): Dark brown sandy loam, daub at bottom of zone
Zone 4 (Z4): Burned daub and charcoal in “burn zone”
Zone 5 (Z5): dark brown, homogenous clayey loam
Zone 6 (Z6): dark brown/yellowish, dryer silty loam
Zone 7 (Z7): brown/grayish, very dry silt
Zone 8 (Z8): 10YR 3/4 brown, very silty loam
Radiocarbon Dates

Five radiocarbon dates were obtained from Butler. Four of those dates were obtained from mound contexts and one date was obtained from an off-mound context. The first radiocarbon date (Beta-501630) obtained from charcoal in Zone 1 of unit 1048E|1015N yielded a calibrated 2-sigma date of A.D. 1425-1620. A second radiocarbon date (Beta-444236) came from charcoal found 60 cmbs, or Zone 1, within a tree tip on the north side of the mound (Cobb 2016:13). The radiocarbon date yielded a calibrated 2-sigma date of A.D. 1435-1615, which is consistent with the first date (Beta-501630) retrieved from Zone 1. The third radiocarbon date (Beta-501628), obtained from charcoal in Zone 2 of unit 1048E|1015N, yielded a calibrated 2-sigma date of A.D. 1305-1420. The fourth radiocarbon date (Beta-501631), obtained from charcoal in Zone 4 of unit 1048E|1015N, yielded a calibrated 2-sigma date of A.D. 1460-1635. The fifth radiocarbon date (Beta-501629) was obtained from an off-mound unit. Split cane at the base of Level 2 of unit 891E|1005N yielded a calibrated 2-sigma date of A.D. 1470-1640.

Temporal Interpretation

The radiocarbon date obtained from Zone 4 of 1048E|1015N dates evidence of the second-oldest structure from the mound contexts to A.D. 1460-1635. This date also provides an understanding that the pre-mound structure and all mound-construction episodes before Zone 4 were completed before A.D. 1460. The radiocarbon date taken from Zone 2 of 1048E|1015N should date evidence of the third structure built on the mound and represent a younger date than the radiocarbon date obtained from Zone 4 of 1048E|1015N. However, the date from Zone 2 (A.D. 1305-1420) is slightly older than the date from Zone 4. Because radiocarbon dates are based on the last Carbon-14 interaction between living organisms and the atmosphere at the time
of the organism’s death, the charcoal used for this radiocarbon date may have come from wood that was chopped down long before it was used in construction of the structure and eventually burned (Taylor 2000:1). Both radiocarbon dates obtained from Zone 1 of 1048E|1015N date the last construction episode of the mound between A.D. 1425-1620. This date range closely relates to the temporal range (A.D. 1470-1640) of the radiocarbon date obtained from the off-mound unit 891E|1005N. Furthermore, these dates are consistent with the ceramic analysis. Sherds with distinct chronological markers date the off-mound units between the Late Summerville II/III to Late Summerville IV phases (A.D. 1400-1600). This indicates that the off-mound areas were occupied sometime during the last two mound-construction stages (A.D. 1420-1620). Based on this information, and the lack of European artifacts recovered, the temporal affiliation assigned for the Butler Mound Site is the Late Mississippian period (A.D. 1450-1540). This places Butler within the Summerville IV phase (A.D. 1450/1500-ca.1600) of the Upper Tombigbee region and the Lyon’s Bluff phase (A.D. 1250-1540) of the Black Prairie region.

Discussion

Because site occupation is known for Butler to be during the Late Mississippian period, Butler can be added to the existing chronological sequence for northeast Mississippi sites in this study. The following discussion reviews which sites were contemporaneous in each period, specifically focusing on those contemporaneous with Butler occupation in the Late Mississippian period. Sites that were occupied just before or directly after Butler are also reviewed. The distance between each contemporaneous site in the Late Mississippian period is also noted in an effort to apply Hally’s (1993) territorial size measurements. Using Blitz’s (1999) fission-fusion model for Southeastern chiefdoms and Clark’s (2017) settlement patterning studies of northeast
Mississippi, a discussion of the potential sociopolitical relationships influencing populations to move across the landscape is provided in the following sections.

Tibbee Creek, Kellogg, Chowder Springs Mound A, Chowder Springs Mound B and Coleman Mound were occupied during the Early Mississippian periods based on archaeological investigations including artifact analysis and radiocarbon dating (see Chapter 3). Based on temporal affiliations of Early Mississippian period sites, these sites were abandoned before mound-construction and site occupation began at Butler. The Curry Mound also was occupied prior to the start of mound-construction and site occupation at Butler with mound-construction occurring at Curry between ca. A.D. 1280-1410 (Palmer 2007:93). Curry’s last stages of mound-construction were determined to have occurred post-A.D. 1300 (Palmer 2007:93). This last mound stage either overlaps or closely coincides with Butler’s first stages of mound-construction, determined to be sometimes prior to A.D. 1460 (radiocarbon date range of A.D. 1460-1635). Sites that were occupied contemporaneously with Butler during the Late Mississippian period in the study area include Yarborough (15-km away), Lubbub Creek (30-km away), Lyon’s Bluff (40-km away), and Stark Farm (40-km away).

The only non-mound site in the study area that is contemporaneous with Butler is Yarborough, a small farmstead determined to have been occupied during the Late Mississippian period (Solis and Walling 1982:170). Yarborough is close enough to Butler (15-km) to fit the spatial simple chiefdom model of a platform mound center with nearby associated farmsteads (Hally 1993). It is possible that Yarborough occupants used Butler Mound as a place to participate in civic-ceremonial activities. If Butler served as a vacant center, with no residential population, residents from neighboring farmsteads, such as Yarborough, might have traveled to use the site for ritual and communal activities.
A residential population may have been present at Butler based on evidence of a possible structure in off-mound contexts during investigations. The 2016 gradiometer survey conducted at Butler provided evidence of around 20 anomalies located in the far eastern portion of the survey area seemed to indicate human construction due to their even spacing (Boudreaux et al. 2017:9). The possible structure in the off-mound contexts dates to the last two mound-construction phases at Butler (A.D. 1420-1540). With no evidence of earlier structures, it is possible that previous mound-construction episodes were conducted for a mound that functioned as a vacant center with no residential population, and later mound-construction episodes were conducted for a mound that was used by both a residential and non-residential population. A change in function also occurred at Curry during its last occupation periods as the center became vacant post-A.D. 1300 (Palmer 2007:93).

Mound summits frequently were swept clean of trash and debris which resulted in a deposit of debris on the mound slopes (Knight 2010:75). No debris in the mound slope was collected from the Butler Mound because the unit placed in the slope of the mound was prematurely closed. Understanding the artifacts that were swept off of the mound summit can provide a better understanding of what the mound was used for (e.g. feasting, chiefly residence, craft production). How the residential population, if any, interacted with the populations at neighboring farmsteads and used the platform mound cannot be determined until further investigations of mound and off-mound contexts are conducted.

The distance between contemporaneous platform mound sites can be measured to determine political organization on the landscape. Using Hally’s (1993) 20-km radius as a polity boundary between contemporaneous platform mound sites, it can be suggested that Butler functioned as a simple chiefdom. Butler would not have functioned as a complex chiefdom based
on the nonexistence of another contemporary platform mound within 20-km of Butler, supporting Hally’s (1996:125) argument that most polities began and ended as simple chiefdoms. Blitz’s fission-fusion model identifies two distinct types of chiefdoms that do not fit the normal defining criteria for simple and complex chiefdoms via Hally’s chiefdom measurements. These include contemporaneously grouped single mound sites no less than 20-km apart and isolated, multiple-mound sites with two or more mounds spaced more than 20-km from the nearest contemporary mound center (Blitz 1999:582). None of the sites that are contemporaneous with Butler have multiple mounds, and, although there are multiple single-mound sites in northeast Mississippi, they are all more than 20-km apart.

A potential pattern of fission-fusion can be seen in the appearance and abandonment of sites as well as the appearance of site fortifications. During the Summerville I phase (A.D. 1000-1200), bastioned palisades surrounded the residential space at Lubbub Creek (Blitz 1993a:118). The palisade was removed by the Summerville I-II phase (A.D. 1200-1400) (Blitz 1993a:118). The removal of the palisade directly coincides with the first construction stages of the Curry Mound (A.D. 1280) roughly 60-km away. By the time the construction of Curry Mound had ceased, Lubbub Creek was fortified again with a 1-m deep ditch surrounding the site during the Summerville IV phase (A.D. 1450/1500-cal.1600). Construction of the Butler Mound began (prior to A.D. 1460) around the same time as the re-fortification of Lubbub Creek. Lyon’s Bluff was also fortified but it remains unclear as to when the fortification was built (Peacock and Hogue 2005:48). However, a radiocarbon date (A.D. 1450-1635) obtained from a potential smudge pit at Lyon’s Bluff places site occupation contemporaneous with the last two construction stages of the Butler Mound and with the potential off-mound structure at Butler.
Blitz (1996:585) argued that if environmental and social conditions were not under stress, groups who contested chiefly succession at larger mound centers might fission and establish a
new center away from the natal center. Although no argument for chiefly contestation can be made based on current evidence, it appears that environmental and social conditions were comfortable enough for Lubbub Creek to take down the palisade. A possible faction of the group might have moved away to begin building the Curry Mound. This potential fissioning episode between Lubbub Creek and Curry does not apply to Butler. The first mound-construction stages at Butler coincide with the re-fortification of Lubbub Creek some 40-km away. This re-fortification represents a period where safety was a main concern, making it unlikely that a population from Lubbub Creek would have fissioned off to begin construction at Butler. Although, it should be noted that no platform mound sites have been documented to appear in northeast Mississippi after Butler mound-construction begins.

The significance of Butler’s occupation during a time when platform-mound sites in the area are becoming increasingly fortified, and no other platform mounds are being built, speaks to the sociopolitical relationships in northeast Mississippi during the Late Mississippian period. Artifacts at Butler are scarce compared to contemporaneous sites, and the construction of the mound happened rapidly, specifically in the last four stages (see Figure 5.23). The rapid construction of the mound could indicate stresses in northeast Mississippi and a need for a nearby larger center to quickly build and occupy another mound site on the Tombigbee River. Although the two largest sites that are contemporaneous with Butler are Lyon’s Bluff and Lubbub Creek, it cannot be determined at this time if either had a direct connection to Butler.

Stark Farm, a non-mound site occupied during the Late Mississippian period 40-km away from Butler, appeared during the time Butler was occupied and continued to be occupied after mound-construction ceased at Butler. Clark (2017) demonstrated that sites in the Upper Tombigbee Region began to fade out as sites in the Black Prairie continued to appear and grow.
in number. Clark (2017:60) argued that these settlement patterns could demonstrate stress and changing power structures manifested in a movement away from the floodplains of the Tombigbee River and into more defensible positions in the uplands of the Black Prairie. This led to an eventual settlement nucleation around Starkville during the Early Historic period (A.D. 1600-1650) (Clark 2017:60-61). Part of the changing power structure in northeast Mississippi was a result of Spanish contact around A.D. 1540. Although the Soto expedition moved through northeast Mississippi during the Late Mississippian period, it is not likely that Soto arrived at Butler due to the lack of European artifacts there. However, the spreading news of Soto’s movement throughout the Southeast, as well as other changing power structures and sociopolitical relationships, influenced people to abandon sites in the Upper Tombigbee region and potentially move into the Black Prairie. What can be said for certain is that Butler was abandoned, along with other single-mound sites in the Upper Tombigbee region, at the time that Clark (2017:56) argued for an expansion of sites in the Black Prairie region.

Conclusion

This chapter explored the temporal interpretation of both the mound and off-mound contexts at Butler to better understand when the mound was built and when people were actively occupying the site. Mound building at Butler began sometime before A.D. 1460 and concluded between A.D. 1425-1540. Off-mound contexts at Butler were also in use between A.D. 1400-1540. Based on this information, the Butler Mound Site was occupied during the Late Mississippian period (A.D. 1450-1540), placing Butler within the Summerville IV (A.D. 1450/1500-ca.1600) culture chronology of the Upper Tombigbee region. Contemporaneous single-mound sites near Butler were compared spatially against models for interpreting political organization in Mississippian settlement patterning. Potential sociopolitical relationships
between Butler and neighboring sites were also explored, highlighting relationships between site construction/abandonment and fortifications during certain temporal ranges. It was concluded in this chapter that Butler fits into a larger regional settlement change in the Late Mississippian period that encompasses the abandonment of the Upper Tombigbee River Valley.
CHAPTER VI: CONCLUSIONS

The goal of this thesis is to determine the occupation of the Butler Mound Site. Furthermore, this thesis investigates how Butler relates temporally and spatially to other investigated sites in northeast Mississippi to better understand the sociopolitical relationships shaping the cultural landscape of the Upper Tombigbee River Valley and the Black Prairie during the Late Mississippian period. A chronology of site occupation in northeast Mississippi must be further developed to track settlement patterns, including determining site occupation and duration for known sites that have no temporal affiliation. Archaeological evidence from sites that have been investigated and given a temporal affiliation has been used to create culture-historical chronologies for the Upper Tombigbee River Valley and the Black Prairie. Recent archaeological investigations held at Butler provided the necessary data to determine when the site was occupied and how Butler fits into the greater chronology of northeast Mississippi during the Mississippian period.

Techniques used to determine site occupation at Butler included ceramic analysis, mound reconstruction and radiocarbon dating. Chronologically sensitive secondary features were examined to get a more precise temporal range for the ceramic assemblage. Secondary features were only found in off-mound units most likely due to the small assemblage size obtained from the site and limited investigations. The ceramic assemblage contained only 672 sherds, 90.3 percent of which were Mississippi Plain or Bell Plain. Further investigations and a larger ceramic assemblage might yield additional secondary features from mound and off-mound contexts. Secondary features identified included three handles with a single node, two sherds with a single
node, one sherd with two nodes on the rim and one Alabama River Incised sherd. Based on these chronological markers, the off-mound contexts appear to date between Late Summerville II-III (A.D. 1200-1450) and Late Summerville IV (A.D. 1450/1500-ca.1600) phases.

An examination of mound-construction episodes at the Butler Mound that used mound-unit profile drawings, bucket-auger testing and split-core auger testing revealed four episodes of mound-construction and evidence for three structures. The earliest radiocarbon date was taken from the charcoal evidence of a potential second structure built on the mound. This date determined the first stage of mound-construction to have occurred prior to A.D. 1460. Two radiocarbon dates determined the last construction episode of the mound to be between A.D. 1425-1620, and a radiocarbon date obtained from the off-mound contexts date the potential residential area to between A.D. 1470-1640, aligning with the last two mound-construction stages of the site. These data place occupation of Butler during the Late Mississippian period (A.D. 1450-1540). This also directly coincides with the Summerville IV phase (A.D. 1450/1500-ca. 1600) of the culture-historical chronology developed for the Upper Tombigbee River Valley. Because a distinct culture-historical chronology has not been developed for the Black Prairie, Butler cannot be definitely placed within a cultural phase for this region. It can be generally related to the Lyon’s Bluff phase (A.D. ca. 1250-1540) of the Black Prairie region.

Dating Butler to the Late Mississippian period provides a better understanding of the chronology of site occupation for northeast Mississippi sites. Once it was known which sites were sequential or contemporaneous with Butler, the spatial and temporal relationships between Butler and neighboring sites were examined. Using measurements of the territorial size of chiefdoms (Hally 1993; Livingood 2012, 2015) it was determined that Butler represents an autonomous, simple chiefdom for several reasons. Butler has the typical site pattern of a simple
chiefdom with a platform mound and a nearby farmstead, the Yarborough site, contemporaneous with Butler occupation. It is possible that residents from Yarborough traveled to the mound center for various functions. Furthermore, the nearest platform mound sites are 30-km or more away from Butler. This matches Hally’s (1993) estimates that mound sites more than 30-km apart are part of different polities. Because Butler is not spatially related to any other contemporaneous mound center, it likely existed as a simple chiefdom during its occupation. However, it is possible that a pattern of Blitz’s (1999) fission-fusion was occurring between Butler, Curry Mound, Lubub Creek and Lyon’s Bluff during the Late Mississippian period based on periods of fortification construction and site occupation that coincide with the appearance and abandonment of both Curry and Butler. The appearance of Butler was likely in response to sociopolitical stresses within northeast Mississippi region.

It also was determined that Butler’s occupation was ceasing as sites in the Black Prairie, specifically around the Starkville area, were appearing and remaining present. This supports Clark’s (2017) argument that populations in the Upper Tombigbee region actively were choosing to relocate, likely to the Black Prairie. This movement likely represents a period of stress and changing power relations in which populations were responding by abandoning sites in the Upper Tombigbee region (Clark 2017:60-61). Although the specific sociopolitical relationships in place at Butler and surrounding sites in northeast Mississippi during the Late Mississippian period cannot be addressed until further research is conducted, it is clear that people were negotiating these relationships by voting with their feet to abandon sites in the Upper Tombigbee region during the Late Mississippian period.

Future recommendations for research at Butler include additional archaeological investigations of both mound and off-mound contexts. Mound units should be placed on the
slope of the mound to identify any refuse from the mound summit that could be used to investigate mound-summit activities. Off-mound units should be placed to expand the existing evidence of structures and to define the residential population at Butler. These investigations could reveal mound function and political organization at Butler as well as the sociopolitical relationships between populations at Butler and other neighboring sites in northeast Mississippi.
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