

**ARCHAEOLOGICAL EXCAVATIONS AT  
SCULL SHOALS MOUNDS (9GE4)  
1983 and 1985**

**BY  
MARK WILLIAMS**

LAMAR Institute Publication 1  
LAMAR Institute  
1992

## INTRODUCTORY NOTE AND ABSTRACT

This report is an edited combination of two separate reports on the Scull Shoals site by the author. The first, published in 1984, was on the 1983 excavations at the site, and the second, originally published in 1986, was on the 1985 excavations there. This combined edition corrects a few publishing errors in the original versions and places them into a convenient single volume. The substance has not been changed or updated by this reissuing of the original two volumes, but short sections of the reports have been deleted when redundant or unnecessary and others have been moved to facilitate their integration into the single report.

Under a Volunteer Agreement with the Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forest, the University of Georgia undertook six weeks of excavation followed by two weeks of analysis during the summer of 1983 at the Scull Shoals mound site in Greene County, Georgia. The work was performed as a University of Georgia archaeological field school. The existence of this site has been known for over 100 years through the early reports of Charles C. Jones. The 1983 season's work was designed to record basic information on the site. A site map with surface contours and detailed contour maps of the two mounds were made. Mound A is about 11 meters high, while Mound B is 3 meters high. Post hole tests were made over the entire bottom around the mounds to define the limits of the village. The mapping and post hole testing were hampered by the very thick vegetation in this preserved section of the Oconee National Forest, as well as by 1 meter of upland sandy-red alluvium that has buried the site during the last 150 years. Six excavation squares, each 2 by 2 meters in size, were excavated in the village to determine its chronological placement. Analysis of artifacts from these excavation units suggests that the site was first occupied in the Late Etowah period and was occupied through the Savannah and Lamar periods. No Early Mississippian, Woodland, or Archaic materials were found in tests that reached 3.5 meters deep. No excavations were made on the mounds, and no features other than a few post molds were found in the village. It appears that extensive cotton farming from about 1800 until 1880 severely damaged the village midden at this site, which is the most northerly of the mound sites thought to be associated with the Oconee Province.

The 1985 excavations at the Scull Shoals mound site (9Ge4) consisted of three weeks of excavations confined entirely to the two mounds at the site. Two excavation units were placed in each. In the smaller Mound B, these units cleaned and expanded large potholes in the summit and northern side. These excavations showed that most of the four or five stages in Mound B were built in the Late Etowah to Savannah period of about A. D. 1250. Only the upper stages were built during the Lamar period. This mound had no garbage included and artifacts were almost absent. Unlike Mound B, much garbage was found on Mound A. One shallow unit on its summit produced large quantities of animal bone and pottery. The major excavation on Mound A consisted of a deep square placed in a garbage dump area on the northeastern edge of this large mound. This unit produced a well stratified series of Lamar period garbage dumps and a very rich pre-mound midden of the Late Etowah / Savannah period. The data from these excavations allow us to refine further the Lamar period chronology of the upper Oconee area of Georgia. More insights into the period of expansion of the Oconee Province and the role of Scull Shoals in this socio-political system are now possible.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introductory Note and Abstract .....	ii
List of Figures .....	iv
List of Tables .....	v
List of Plates .....	vi
Introduction and Acknowledgements .....	1
Background .....	5
Oconee River Valley.....	5
Scull Shoals .....	5
Goals and Methods .....	10
Maps.....	12
The Village .....	12
Mound B .....	15
Mound A.....	17
Village Limits .....	19
Village Excavations .....	20
Excavation Unit 1 (1983).....	21
Excavation Unit 2 (1983).....	24
Excavation Unit 3 (1983).....	27
Excavation Units 4 and 5 (1983) .....	31
Excavation Unit 6 (1983).....	34
Village Artifacts and 1983 Chronology.....	37
Summary 1983 .....	48
The 1985 Excavations.....	49
Mound B Excavations.....	50
Excavation Unit 1 (1985).....	50
Excavation Unit 2 (1985).....	61
Mound A Excavations.....	68
Excavation Unit 3 (1985).....	68
Excavation Unit 4 (1985).....	70
Mound Artifacts (1985) .....	78
Ceramics .....	78
Lithics .....	113
Miscellaneous .....	121
Scull Shoals and the Oconee Province.....	126
1985 Chronology .....	126
Scull Shoals Phase .....	128
Iron Horse Phase.....	128
Implications .....	129
Summary and Recommendations .....	130
References Cited .....	131
Appendix 1: Provenience and Lot Number Catalog .....	134
Appendix 2: Stamped Sherd Design Codes .....	144

## FIGURES

1 - Site Location .....	2
2 - Site Map, Jones Original.....	7
3 - Site Map, Jones 1878 .....	8
4 - Site Map.....	14
5 - Mound B Contour Map.....	16
6 - Mound A Contour Map.....	18
7 - Excavation Unit 1 (1983), Eastern Profile.....	23
8 - Excavation Unit 2 (1983), Eastern Profile.....	25
9 - Excavation Unit 2 (1983), Floor Plan .....	26
10 - Excavation Unit 3 (1983), Eastern Profile.....	29
11 - Excavation Units 4 and 5 (1983), Western Profile.....	32
12 - Excavation Units 4 and 5 (1983), Floor Plan .....	33
13 - Excavation Unit 6 (1983), Eastern Profile.....	36
14 - Mound B Excavation Units 1 and 2 (1985).....	52
15 - Excavation Unit 1A (1985), Northern Profile .....	55
16 - Excavation Unit 1A (1985), Eastern Profile.....	56
17 - Excavation Unit 1A (1985), Western Profile .....	57
18 - Excavation Unit 1B (1985), Southern Profile .....	58
19 - Excavation Unit 1B (1985), Eastern Profile.....	59
20 - Excavation Unit 1B (1985), Western Profile.....	60
21 - Excavation Unit 2 (1985), Western Profile .....	63
22 - Mound A Excavation Units 3 and 4 (1985).....	69
23 - Excavation Unit 4 (1985), Southern Profile .....	76
24 - Excavation Unit 4 (1985), Western Profile .....	77

## TABLES

1 - Ceramics, Excavation Unit 1 (1983).....	38
2 - Ceramics, Excavation Unit 2 (1983).....	39
3 - Ceramics, Excavation Unit 3 (1983).....	40
4 - Ceramics, Excavation Unit 4 (1983).....	41
5 - Ceramics, Excavation Unit 5 (1983).....	42
6 - Ceramics, Excavation Unit 6 (1983).....	43
7 - Ceramics, Village Excavation Units (1983), Summary.....	44
8 - Ceramics, Excavation Unit 6 (1983), Rim Sherds.....	45
9 - Ceramics, Excavation Unit 4 (1985), by Lots.....	79
10 - Ceramics, Excavation Unit 4 (1985), by Levels.....	82
11 - Ceramics, Excavation Unit 4 (1985), by Grouped Levels.....	88
12 - Ceramics, Excavation Unit 4 (1985), Rim Sherds by Levels.....	91
13 - Ceramics, Excavation Unit 4 (1985), Rim Sherds by Levels, Simplified.....	92
14 - Ceramics, Excavation Unit 4 (1985), Designs by Lots.....	94
15 - Ceramics, Excavation Unit 4 (1985), Designs by Levels.....	98
16 - Ceramics, Excavation Unit 4 (1985), Number of Incised Lines by Levels.....	99
17 - Ceramics, Excavation Unit 3 (1985), by Lots.....	101
18 - Ceramics, Excavation Unit 3 (1985), Rim Sherds.....	103
19 - Ceramics, Excavation Unit 3 (1985), Number of Incised Lines.....	103
20 - Ceramics, Excavation Unit 1 (1985), by Lots.....	105
21 - Ceramics, Excavation Unit 2 (1985), by Lots.....	107
22 - Ceramics, Excavation Unit 2 (1985), by Levels.....	109
23 - Ceramics, Excavation Unit 2 (1985), Rim Sherds by Lots.....	110
24 - Ceramics, Excavation Unit 2 (1985), Rim Sherds by Levels.....	110
25 - Ceramics, Excavation Unit 2 (1985), Designs by Lots.....	111
26 - Lithics, Excavation Unit 4 (1985), by Lots.....	114
27 - Lithics, Excavation Unit 4 (1985), by Levels.....	117
28 - Lithics, Excavation Unit 4 (1985), Material by Levels.....	118
29 - Lithics, Excavation Unit 3 (1985), by Lots.....	119
30 - Lithics, Excavation Unit 1 (1985), by Lots.....	120
31 - Lithics, Excavation Unit 2 (1985), by Lots.....	120
32 - Pipe Fragments, Excavation Unit 4 (1985), by Levels.....	121
33 - Pottery Disks, Excavation Unit 4 (1985), by Levels.....	123

## PLATES

1 - Vegetation Problems at Scull Shoals .....	13
2 - Excavation Unit 1 (1983), Western Profile.....	22
3 - Excavation Unit 3 (1983), Western Profile.....	28
4 - Excavation Units 4 and 5 (1983), Western Profile .....	28
5 - Excavation Unit 6 (1983), Southern Profile .....	35
6 - Excavation Unit 1 (1985), Mound B.....	51
7 - Excavation Unit 2 (1985), Mound B.....	51
8 - Excavation Unit 3 (1985), Mound A .....	71
9 - Excavation Unit 4 (1985), Mound A .....	71
10 - Ceramics, Excavation Unit 4 (1985), Premound.....	85
11 - Ceramics, Excavation Unit 4 (1985), Premound.....	85
12 - Ceramics, Excavation Unit 4 (1985), Premound.....	86
13 - Ceramics, Excavation Unit 4 (1985), Middle Levels .....	86
14 - Ceramics, Excavation Unit 4 (1985), Upper Levels.....	87
15 - Ceramics, Excavation Unit 4 (1985), Upper Levels.....	87
16 - Ceramics, Excavation Unit 1 (1985), Mound B .....	111
17 - Ceramics, Excavation Unit 2 (1985), Mound B .....	112
18 - Bird Pipe, Excavation Unit 4 (1985) .....	122
19 - Ceramic Handles, Excavation Unit 4 (1985), Premound .....	124

## INTRODUCTION AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Scull Shoals mound site is in the extreme northwestern corner of Greene County, Georgia. The location is shown in Figure 1. The site is on the eastern bank of the Oconee River in the middle of the floodplain and is presently covered with a thick bottom land hardwood forest typical of the central Georgia Piedmont. There are two visible mounds by which the site has been known for years. This report is a description of archaeological work at the site that took place from June 17 until July 29, 1983, as the first part of a University of Georgia archaeological field school. The lab work resulting in this report was also done by the students during the first two weeks of August before the course was completed.

I first saw the Scull Shoals mound sometime in 1969 while an undergraduate at the University of Georgia. From that time to this I was captivated by the splendid isolation and setting of this multiple-mound site. The huge trees in the bottomland around the mounds are as stately and beautiful as any in central Georgia. I have not so secretly wanted to find out more about this site ever since then and when the opportunity finally presented itself I did not hesitate. For this opportunity I have many people to thank. I doubt if any of them can truly understand my depth of appreciation, however.

Without the enthusiastic cooperation of the U. S. Forest Service, this project would not have been possible. Indeed, much of the initial impetus for undertaking the project was theirs. Two individuals in particular should be mentioned as performing key roles for the Forest Service. First, Jack Wynn of the Gainesville Forest Supervisor's Office provided continual and sympathetic help in innumerable ways not only to make the project a success but to make it simpler also. His ability to help with practical matters was invaluable and I thank him for this. Further, he edited this report with a careful eye to its many original problems. Second, Kent Schneider, from the Atlanta Regional Forest Service Office, provided the initial funds to ensure the project's success and I thank him for this. John Moore, the District Ranger for the Oconee Forest, with his staff personnel made our stay in the Forest both pleasant and enjoyable with their cooperative help, particularly with regard to the safety and security of the workers and the site. I thank him and his staff for their assistance. Jim Keys, Forest Service Soil Scientist, helped with the geological study of the site, particularly with regard to analysis of the soil layers.

I thank the Hargrett Rare Book Room of the University of Georgia Libraries for permission to publish Figure 2 from their Charles Colcock Jones, Jr. Collection.

David Hally was the Principal Investigator for the 1983 project. He frequently visited the site during the summer of 1983 and provided an invaluable service as a sounding board for the work while in progress. Further, he helped guide the laboratory aspects of the work and provided essential information for the classification of the pottery based upon his wide experience with materials from all over Georgia.

The biggest thanks go to the crew. Although most of them had never worked on an archaeological site before, they performed the often tedious and certainly tiring work with unusual skill and interest. Although two of the crew could not complete the summer 1983 work due to personal reasons, I wish to include them along with the rest of the crew here. The members included: Mark Burrell, Beth Fox, Lisa Glueck, Virginia Graham, Jan Grissom, Teresa Groover, Bill Martin, Curtis Paul, Jeff Price, Bill Ramsey, Ruth Reeves, John Seawright, and Marty Walker.

I thank each for her or his contribution to the success of the project and hope that each took away fond memories and the satisfaction of a job well done.

I thank several people who volunteered their time to work on the project, even on days when the work was perhaps boring and the temperature was over 100 degrees. These dedicated people include Woody Williams of Madison, Bill and Brenda Westbrook from Hartwell, Jean Kidd, also of Hartwell, and Jim Hawkins and Kate Davis, both of Athens.

Several professional archaeologists visited the site during the 1983 season and provided helpful suggestions as well as occasional physical labor. These include Lewis Larson, Ray Crook, Karl Steinan, Jerald Ledbetter, Lisa O'Steen, Dan Elliott, Mike Griffin ("Chief"), Jean Spencer, Dean Wood, Chad Braley, Gary Shapiro, and Marvin Smith. I thank all these archaeologists for their help both individually and collectively. Each made comments and suggestions that measurably aided our understanding of the site. Dean Wood and Chad Braley, both of Southeastern Archeological Services, Inc. are additionally thanked for the loan of some field equipment critical to the project. The positive cooperation experienced on this project between private companies, the University, and the Federal Agency in charge should serve as a model for future work. Without such cooperation, our common goal of understanding the societies of the past will be unnecessarily hampered.

The work from the 1985 season was carried out as a University of Georgia Department of Anthropology Archaeological Field School. The excavations took place from June 18 to July 10, 1985. Each day the crew commuted from Athens to conduct these excavations. All the fieldwork was directed by the author.

Ultimately, the work at Scull Shoals is an important part of the research of several archaeologists on the late prehistoric Mississippian societies which once occupied the piedmont portion of the Oconee River drainage in northern Georgia. Essentially I am following the lead given by Marvin Smith and Steve Kowalewski in 1980 when they hypothesized the existence of a single large political unit centered in this same area (Smith and Kowalewski 1980). The LAMAR Institute is presently engaged in a multi-year program to investigate this Oconee Province and the work at Scull Shoals forms a vital link in that research.

As with all projects, this one could not have been completed without the generous assistance of many individuals and it is a pleasure to acknowledge these people. The first thanks go to the crew themselves. This was one of the best crews I have ever worked with. They made each day a joy and we all shared a fellowship that I will not soon forget. The 1985 crew included Rob Benson, Bradley Fincher, Janet Grusmark, Brian Gumbert, Matt Harlan, Kyoko Iemura, Thomas Pickett, and Brent Tozzer. My only parting comment to this little family is that sometimes it is okay to conceptualize.

The U. S. Forest Service is responsible for allowing us to conduct these excavations on land administered by them in the Oconee National Forest. Kent Schneider of the Atlanta Regional Forest Service Office helped provide essential funds for the project and provided positive encouragement as he always does. Jack Wynn of the Gainesville Forest Supervisor's Office performed several important tasks to allow smooth running of the project as well as occasionally working in the field with us. Without his help the project would have never taken place.

John Moore, the District Ranger for the Oconee National Forest, helped us in several ways, always in his friendly down home manner. He is particularly to be thanked for arranging help



with the backfilling operations. The late Chuck Roberts from the Monticello office also is to be thanked for his help.

David Hally of the University Of Georgia Department Of Anthropology visited the site several times to help the author interpret the profiles, particularly in Excavation Unit 2. He also aided in the laboratory analysis of the ceramics and provided insights from his many years of experience in Georgia archaeology. Other archaeologists visited the site during our work and also helped in our interpretation of the strata revealed in the excavations. These include Chad Braley, Dan Elliott, Jerald Ledbetter, Jim Rudolph, Dean Wood, and Kay Wood. I thank all these people for their comments and suggestions.

There were several volunteers who worked with us for various lengths of time from 2 hours to 5 days. These dedicated people include Mark Burrell, Janet Johnson, Russ Page, Sid Robbins, Carol Ventura, Marty Walker, Cindy Williams, Woody Williams, Cathy Wynn, Tommy Wynn, and Meg Wynn. I thank each of them for their contributions of themselves.

I thank Rachel Schneider of the Gainesville Forest Service office for producing video tapes of the fieldwork. These tapes form a valuable document of our excavations and this technique should be used more extensively in future excavations.

Much of the laboratory analysis of the artifacts from the 1985 season was performed by Margie Klein and Beverly Montgomery. I thank these kind people for their help. Without them this report would not have been possible. I also want to give a special thanks to Beth Misner for analyzing the lithic material from the site.

As with any report, any errors of omission or commission in this report are the exclusive property of the author.

This version of the report was lightly edited by the author in January of 2011.




Figure 1. Site Location.

## BACKGROUND

### Oconee River Valley

Much progress has been made in understanding the prehistory of the Georgia Piedmont in the last ten years. This is particularly true for our knowledge of Mississippian period, or late prehistoric societies. Much of this new understanding is a result of research conducted by the University of Georgia in and about the Wallace Reservoir (Lake Oconee). This project has provided the data for many reports and papers on Mississippian in the Georgia Piedmont (DePratter 1976; Elliott 1981; Lee 1977; Rudolph 1980; Rudolph and Blanton 1980; Shapiro 1984).

In this part of Georgia, Late Mississippian culture is called Lamar (Kelly 1938). The Lamar period dates to the latter part of the Mississippian period--about A. D. 1350-1650. Recently archaeologists have been able to subdivide the 300-year Lamar period into finer temporal phases. The earliest of these, the Duvall Phase, dates from A. D. 1350 to A. D. 1450. The subsequent Dyar Phase dates from A. D. 1450 to A. D. 1600. Finally, the Bell Phase dates from A. D. 1600 to A. D. 1670 (Smith 1981).

In an intriguing study, Smith and Kowalewski recognized that Lamar period mound sites along the Piedmont portion of the Oconee River are distributed in an ordered manner (Smith and Kowalewski 1981). The evenly-spaced distribution of villages with more than a single mound may be due to political interaction between the separate mound centers. For purposes of research, this system of sites (and all the related small sites) has come to be called the Oconee Province (ibid).

There are six known mound sites in the Oconee Province. The largest of these is the Shoulderbone site in Hancock County. Smith and Kowalewski believe that this site may have been the major center or capital for the entire province. Other mound sites are the Shinholser site south of Milledgeville, the Little River site in Morgan County, site 9Ge35 in Greene County, the Dyar site west of Greensboro, and the Scull Shoals site-- the subject of this report. Scull Shoals is the most northerly of the mound sites in the Oconee Province.

Archaeological excavations have taken place at the Dyar site (9Ge5) as part of the Wallace Reservoir project (Smith 1981). Minor testing at site 9Ge35 took place as part of the Wallace project, but because the site was not to be flooded, no extensive excavations were conducted. A small amount of archaeological testing took place at the Shinholser site in the 1920s, but very little is known about this work. No professional work has been conducted at the Shoulderbone site. Archaeological testing at the Little River site took place during the summer of 1984 under the direction of the Lamar Institute. The initial work reported here for the Scull Shoals site is another step toward understanding the regional integration of Lamar societies in the Georgia Piedmont.

### Scull Shoals

The earliest known reference to the Scull Shoals site is a newspaper article in the *Augusta Chronicle and Sentinel* in June of 1877. The article was written by Charles C. Jones, a famous Georgia preacher, lawyer, and writer who lived in Savannah, New York, and Augusta during his long and brilliant career. His article described the mounds, their setting, and briefly discussed the artifacts found. Substantially, the same report was published the same year in the Annual Reports of the Smithsonian Institution in Washington. This was reprinted the following year as a separate

thirteen page report including descriptions of several other Georgia sites. Omitted from the Smithsonian accounts, but present in the original newspaper article, are several interesting paragraphs about the extent of upland erosion and the attendant deposition of sediments in the bottom lands along the Oconee by the mid 1870s. When the area was first cleared for farming about 1800, the soil in the bottom was, apparently, a well drained brown fine sandy loam. With the accelerated clearing of upland areas through the nineteenth century, red sandy loam and clay from the surrounding hillsides was deposited by erosion on the bottom, burying it eventually to a depth of over 1 meter. The area was abandoned for farming by the early 1880s (see below), at least partially because it flooded so frequently under the new river characteristics and became a virtual swamp (Trimble 1974).

We do not know how Jones came by his information on the site. It is not clear from his description that he actually visited it. In examining his papers and letters at the Hargrett Rare Book Room of the University of Georgia Library, I found no information describing such a visit, or any letters to him regarding it. His data on the site, however it was obtained, must have been after 1873 when his book *Antiquities of the Southern Indian* was published since there is no mention of it there. I located a previously unknown pen and ink sketch of the site among his papers at the UGA library. This was apparently the source document from which the engravers made the plate map of the site published in his Smithsonian account. This previously unpublished original is included here as Figure 2. The published map is reproduced here for comparison as Figure 3.

There are at least two significant differences between the two maps that are important to our present work. First, the shape of Feature B, the so-called "irregular shaped excavation," is shown to be far more crescent shaped in the original (Figure 2) than in the engraved plate (Figure 3). The placement of this feature, which Jones thought was the borrow pit for the dirt used to construct Mound A, is apparently at the exact location of the present bend in the river channel just north of Mound A. It seems likely that this was actually a relic channel of the Oconee that was reoccupied by the river some time after Jones described the site. Aerial photos of the area show the river in its present position back to 1938, thus this hypothetical reoccupation of the channel would have had to be between Jones' visit and that time. This will be discussed in greater detail below.

The second significant comparative feature between the two maps involves Feature C, the elusive Mound C. of recent years. No one has been able to relocate this "mound" since Jones' account was published. Figure 2 shows this feature to have a long elliptical shape with pointed ends rather than the rectangular shape of the published version (Figure 3). Apparently the shape was altered in the engraving process to give the "mound" a more "mound-like" shape. I know of no actual Mississippian mounds with this elliptical shape and suspect that Feature C may not have been one. This feature was not relocated with any certainty during the summer of 1983. The shape of the feature suggests that it may have been a natural levee remnant within the limits of the village. Jones further describes Feature C as littered with large quantities of midden and artifacts. If this area were a naturally high spot within the village, it would have been an ideal location for normal living structures with their attendant garbage and refuse accumulation. This might explain the midden he noted around Feature C. Tests for this possibility were conducted, but the results, as will be seen below, are far from conclusive.





Figure 2. Site Map, Jones Original.



**Ancient tumuli on the Oconee River.**

Figure 3. Site Map, Jones 1878.

The site was again visited and briefly described in 1886 by the editor of the *Athens Banner-Watchman* and reported in the August 31 issue of that newspaper. The relevant portion of his rather long narrative about the Scull Shoals region follows:

The region round Scull Shoals was a favorite haunt of the Red Man, as evidences (*sic*) by the tumuli on the river and creek banks, and the relics of their handiwork that bestrew the ground. Every field in this locality is rich in pottery, arrow-heads, and other indestructible implements formed by their crude skill. Just across the river from Mr. Fambrough's stand three large mounds, while a number of smaller ones are found on the creek bottoms. Mr. Morton tells us that the large mounds were evidently intended as a fortification, for many years ago, after a freshet had carried away the soil around them down into the clay, a black circle of decayed wood was seen, showing where timbers had been driven into the ground and rotted off. This stockade perhaps even antedated the Indian race, as these people could not tell who erected these immense piles of earth. Mr. Morton says that after that freshet Indian relics could have been gathered by the cart-load. He saw several pieces of flint, shaped like a saucer, but hollowed on both sides, of different colors, cut and polished as smooth as glass. With the rude implements that the aborigines had, it is a mystery to know how they fashioned their vessels. The ground around these mounds is now pasture and covered with Bermuda grass, and relics are not so easily found as heretofore.

In a more poetic vein, the same author adds:

Scull Shoals and its surroundings are certainly an interesting and historic spot, and the antiquarian can profitably spend days here. At every step his feet presses into the earth relics that would be welcome additions to any cabinet of curiosities, while the towering mounds and acres of exposed bones reveal an unwritten history of power, skill, and carnage.

Leaving aside the carnage for the moment, this account confirms Jones' assertion that there are (or were) three mounds, although the same arguments above apply here. Perhaps the most interesting and useful part of the account is that the site had a stockade wall around it. This is not unusual for Mississippian period site, nor for a Lamar site, (Fairbanks 1940), but it is still very gratifying to have this information in hand for future work at the site. No evidence of a palisade was found in our work, although it was not designed to find one.

Finally, it appears that the site was no longer in cultivation by 1886. Based upon the size of the trees presently on the site, they must have begun growing then and the area was essentially abandoned after that time.

There are some intentionally produced drainage ditches on the southern side of the site. It seems likely that these were dug about the turn of the century as part of a futile attempt to restore the swampy area for agriculture (Personal Communication, Larry Meier). I know of no other references to the site until the work of A. R. Kelly of the University of Georgia beginning in the early 1950s.

The only direct information of Kelly's work at Scull Shoals (which he called the Watson's Springs mound site) is a four page typed account in which he says several trips were made to the site from the University between 1950 and 1955 to collect artifacts. He does not mention any excavation and one may surmise that most of the items found were recovered from the badly potted surfaces of the mounds. He does state that he put no tests in the village. In this paper he correctly identified the site as a Lamar period site based upon his inspection of the pottery. No artifact counts are included in his brief report. He recommended that a map be made of the site and that the village be tested as well as the mounds. Kelly assumed, apparently incorrectly, that there was an empty plaza between the two mounds. In essence, we are now, some 30 years later, undertaking his suggestions and examining his assumptions.

In the mid 1960s, two 10 foot squares were placed on the southeastern edge of Mound A by a class from the University, apparently under the direction of the late Dr. Kelly. Gordon Midgette of Atlanta was in charge of much of this fieldwork. The name used for the site at the time was the Brightwell mounds. The notes and artifacts from this work are presently unavailable. Discussions with one of the workers on the project (Max White) revealed that there was relatively little material found, but that the possible remains of a collapsed structure in the form of a large pile daub was found running diagonally across the floor of the excavation. This apparently was not removed. Excavation of the two squares was filmed briefly as part of a motion picture about archaeological methods made at the time. This film is in the possession of the Department of Anthropology of the University of Georgia. Inspection of it reveals little of value, however, toward interpreting the excavations in the absence of the recorded profiles and floor plans. The two excavation squares were never backfilled and are presently eroding badly into the southeastern edge of Mound A. They must be refilled and stabilized soon to avoid further damage to the mound.

The work by the University of Georgia in the Georgia Power Company Wallace Reservoir project (Lake Oconee) to the south of the site is important in understanding the Scull Shoals site. This project produced valuable archaeological information that provides a much better understanding of the site's regional importance than would have been possible otherwise. Between 1977 and 1980, this massive project enabled archaeologists to define several subdivisions of the Lamar period (Smith 1981). These new ceramic phases are important to the present investigations of the site. Indeed, many of the people involved in the defining of these phases for the Oconee, including the author, have been directly involved in the present project as consultants, thus the present work takes advantage of all current knowledge about the archaeology of the area.

## **GOALS AND METHODS**

Very few assumptions could be made about the Scull Shoals mound site prior to our work in 1983. Based upon an inspection of the very small ceramic collections made there in the past and still available for inspection in at the University of Georgia Laboratory of Archaeology in Athens, the site certainly had a Lamar occupation, but even this could not be certain. What was obviously called for was a program to acquire very basic information about the site. Probably the most important goal was to define the present limits and extent of the village surrounding the mounds. Prior to the reported here, there were no data regarding the sites' physical dimensions.



A second major goal was to produce an accurate map of the site, including the locations of the mounds relative to one another and to the river that surrounds them. Further, it was desired to obtain sufficient topographic data to produce a working contour map of the village. The final major goal for the 1983 season was to test the village midden with excavations placed at intervals within the site. These tests would enable us to define the chronological position of the site and to identify possible structures.

The methods employed to achieve each of these goals were quite traditional and served our purposes well. The mapping and village limit determinations were hampered by the extremely thick vegetation present in the bottom lands at 9Ge4. In particular, the extensive masses of privet hedge (*Legustrum* sp.) made natural lines-of-sight impossible over much of the area -- particularly to the south and southwest of Mound A. Thus, the mapping operations required that linear paths be cleared by hand through the thick undergrowth.

Forest Service surveyors aided our work immensely by placing steel rods with marked aluminum caps at two locations on the site and clearing between them. Two more points, with surveyed relationships to the first, were placed out of the floodplain to anchor the permanent site grid. Sun shots from these points provide correction for the north-south line. The line of greatest importance to our work was the north-south one (actually, this base line is 1.5 degrees west of magnetic north) placed on the western edge of Mound A. This line had steel pins put in first, at a point just southwest of Mound A and labeled as grid point 500 North, 500 West from an arbitrary zero point off the site to the southeast. A second steel pin was put in by the surveyors 300 meters to the south at grid point 200 North, 500 West. A line of sight was cleared between these two points and for an additional distance of 98 meters to the north of the first pin (to 598 North, 500 West). Wooden stakes were then placed at 50 meter intervals along this cleared base line by Forest Service personnel.

With the arrival of the field school students, lines were cut both east and west from the main north-south line just described at each 50 meter interval along its length. This involved extensive clearing operations over a one week period at the beginning of the project. A total of over 2 kilometers was cleared by the students through the heavy growth. Following these clearing operations, wooden stakes were placed at 50 meter intervals along each east-west lines. The accurate placement of these stakes often involved sighting around large trees that could not be removed. The original north-south line (the 500 W line) was eventually extended to the north an additional 52 meters to 650 North, 500 West, and lines cut east and west along this extended length.

To prevent undue attention to the isolated site by boaters on the Oconee River, none of our grid lines of sight were extended all the way to the river, but typically stopped 10 to 40 meters short of it. The distances from the ends of each line to the river were recorded, however, to permit the mapping of the location of the river into our grid system and thus our site map. Elevations were not recorded for these additional uncleared distances and thus our contour lines stop abruptly before reaching the banks of the river. In future work, these elevations should be recorded in some manner consistent with the protection of the site.

The coring operations to define the limits of the buried midden took place as follows. First, the wooden stakes previously installed in a 50 meter grid as part of the mapping operations provided the locations for the tests. To prevent the removal of the stakes for the actual coring, the holes were, in almost all cases, placed 1 meter due south of the appropriate stake. In a few cases

this was modified due to the presence of trees. All tests were begun using standard post-hole diggers. These allowed a typical penetration of about 140 centimeters. The average hole diameter was 20 centimeters. Since 140 centimeters was often not deep enough, almost all holes were deepened with a hand powered bucket auger. With one extension, this tool was capable of penetrating to a depth of 3.5 meters, more than enough for all points on the site. All artifact bearing layers were screened in its attempts to define the limits of the midden.

Some tests were made using a 1 inch diameter solid core extraction system provided by the Forest Service. It was found that this was inappropriate for several reasons. First, there was a tremendous amount of compaction in removed cores. This often reduced core length by more than 30 percent. This made depth analysis very difficult. Secondly, the small holes produced made it unlikely that sufficient artifacts would be recovered to verify the presence of midden on this site. Finally, the equipment weighed over 200 pounds and was extremely difficult to move in and out of the site, since the nearest approach road was approximately 0.5 mile away.

Additional post-hole/auger tests were placed at several locations on the site other than at the exact 50 meter grid points. These tests were used to help answer questions about the distribution of the midden and to help find areas that were less disturbed for the excavation units. All these locations are noted on the site map (Figure 4).

The excavation units excavated on the site were all 2 meters square. A total of six was excavated. As with the post-hole tests, the soil from the artifact bearing layers was screened through 1/4 inch mesh screen. No attempt was made to screen the sterile red clay over the midden. This deposit was of modern origin and was often over 1 meter thick. Maximum depth of the excavation units varied from 150 to 230 centimeters. A single post-hole/auger test was placed in the bottom of each excavation unit upon completion. In no case was evidence of earlier human occupation found in these deep holes. No problems were encountered with collapsing walls in the deep excavation units. That most of the soil layers were high in clay content probably is the reason stepped pits were not necessary. Photographs were made of all four walls of each pit and profiles were drawn of the eastern and western walls of each, even though there was typically very little difference between them. Upon completion of the work in each pit, it was backfilled, as were all the post-hole tests made on the site.

## MAPS

Three separate contour maps were generated from our work during the summer of 1983. Those are: (1) the village, (2) Mound B, and (3) Mound A. The mounds were contour-mapped separately from the village due to their much greater height and because greater accuracy was desired for them. The discussion here will be on the methods employed and observations upon all three maps. The dense vegetation at the site made all this work difficult (Plate 1).

### **The Village**

The method for producing the village contour map was as follows. After lines of sight were established along all grid lines, elevations were taken with transits and elevation rods along them. All elevations were referenced back to the aluminum cap on the steel pin at 500 North, 500 West. The top surface of the cap was arbitrarily assumed to have an elevation of 100.00 meters. If there were no obvious rapid changes in elevation, elevations were typically taken at 10 meter



Plate 1. Vegetation Problems at Scull Shoals.

intervals. If there were distinct high or low spots within any given 10 meter stretch, the elevations of those spots and their locations were also recorded. To facilitate the contour mapping, notes were taken on the locations of the several natural and man-made drainage ditches, which coursed through much of the area of the site. It should be mentioned that the data gathered for contour mapping the village is barely adequate for the task. Ideally, lines for elevation measurements should be made north and south along each 50 meter point east and west from the 500 West line. This would have involved probably two or even three more weeks of fieldwork and was not done. The contour map resulting from our limited data will suffice for the present, however.

Following the gathering of the village elevation data, the 345 readings were all converted to the reference stake elevation and plotted at their property location on a large (2 foot by 3 foot) map. Contour lines were drawn at intervals of 20 centimeters. This resulted in the map in Figure 4. As shown on the map, the area of contouring falls short of the river in all areas. These areas must await the extension of lines to the river for mapping. Several natural flood channels cross the village, primarily from northeast to southwest. These are particularly prominent to the southeast of Mound A. The Oconee River is slowly cutting south toward the village at the large bend northeast of Mound A and may, some day, cut through in the location of these flood channels. At present, the bend does not appear to be damaging the village, however. No midden is exposed in the river bank and our post hole testing showed no village in that area. There are long fans of alluvial deposit trailing to the southwest of both mounds. While the small fan southwest of Mound B was apparent in the field, thick privet hedge made the high ridge southwest of Mound A not at all obvious. Whether the mounds were built on the northeastern edges of existing ridges in the bottom, or if these are recent phenomena, associated with the sedimentation in the bottom over the last 130 years, is not yet clear. This should be explicitly tested in the future.




Figure 4. Site Map.

## Mound B

Mound B was contour mapped (Figure 5) before Mound A and will be discussed first. The primary survey instruments used for this work were a plane table and an alidade. Elevations and distances were recorded along 10 lines radiating from the plane table at a location on the western edge of the mound summit (338 N, 421.5 W). An eleventh line began on the eastern edge of the mound summit and was extended, like the rest, off the mound. Some 260 elevation readings were made to produce this map. The top center of the mound has a large pot hole and thus prevented our mapping from that point. Typically, elevations were taken at 1 meter intervals along all lines. The locations of all recognized potholes were also recorded by taking location points around their perimeter. In this manner, the number and location of these 13 holes was recorded. Most are fairly small, but the one in the top and the one on the northern face are quite large. Time did not permit the cleaning and recording of the profiles in these holes. The walls are reasonably stable at the present, fortunately, and erosion is not severe. The mound did not appear to have been recently disturbed.

All the elevations recorded in the process were converted to elevations tied to the reference elevation for the site by taking an elevation reading from the plane table location to grid point 350 North, 400 West, which was just northeast of the mound. The elevation of this point had been taken in constructing the village contour map. The contour interval selected in drawing the map was 20 centimeters.

The shape of the mound, as seen in Figure 5, is decidedly rectangular, although the corners have been somewhat eroded. Further, the summit can also be seen to be rectangular. The major pot hole in the middle of the summit covers only about a quarter of the mound top. Thus, the top of the mound may be sufficiently intact to make its future excavation worthwhile. Jones stated in his 1878 work that there were ramps leading from this mound on all sides except the north. While the northern edge is certainly the steepest at the present time, I don't see clear evidence of a ramp on any of the other three sides. The small raised ridge at the edge of the summit on the western edge and extending down the side a short distance, is most likely back dirt from a pot hole. The steepness of the northern face may be a result of recent erosion in the bottom, but this cannot be determined without controlled excavations. The highest point on the mound has a referenced elevation of 101.28 meters and is located just west of the large pot hole on the summit of the mound. Given the undulating surface of the surrounding bottom land, it is difficult to pick a point off the mound to be the reference point for stating the height of the mound. On its' southern side, the mound is only about 1.5 meters (4.9 feet) high, while on the northwestern corner it is slightly over 3 meters (9.8 feet) high. Ultimately, the only accurate way to judge the height would be to record it at the center from the top down to the old land surface under the mound.




Figure 5. Mound B Contour Map.

## **Mound A**

The method used to produce the contour map for Mound A (Figure 6) was somewhat different from that for Mound B. A transit was set up in the middle of the greatly disturbed summit of the mound and 16 elevation lines were run to the base of the mound. The first line was set up with grid north and the rest of the lines were made at 22.5 degree intervals around the entire mound. Six of the lines thus produced began at the edge of the top of the mound. As with Mound B, the lines were run off the edge of the mound and elevations were taken at 1 meter intervals along each line. The use of a long multi-section fiberglass stadia rod made the work possible. The job of stretching tapes and maintaining proper intervals on the very steep slopes of the mound was not simple. A total of 290 elevation readings was recorded for Mound A.

Following the completion of the elevation lines, the locations of the pot holes on the mound were recorded using a plane table and alidade set up on the summit at the same base station. It was difficult to define individual pot holes in this operation because many of them cut through older ones. The 17 shown on the map (Figure 6) are, probably, not the only ones on the mound, but are certainly representative. The large semi-circular hole on the southern edge of the mound represents the heavily eroding edge of the excavation unit placed by Kelly and Midgette in the mid 1960s. This must be filled and stabilized soon because erosion is badly damaging intact mound fill at that point. The contour interval selected to produce Figure 6 was 20 centimeters, as were all the rest of the contour maps.

The shape of Mound A, as seen from the map, is decidedly circular. There is no hint of a ramp visible on the drawing. This is surprising in view of the steepness and height of the mound. The summit of the mound, while heavily disturbed, does reveal a roughly rectangular shape, with the long axis running slightly north of east. The highest part of the mound consists of a ridge that extends east to west across the top. The highest reading was at the western end of that ridge and had an elevation of 108.58 meters. The height of this mound, just as with Mound B, is difficult to state because of the uneven nature of the ground at the base of the mound. With reference to its southeastern corner, Mound A has an elevation of 9.8 meters (32.2 feet) while with reference to its southwestern corner the maximum height is 8.8 meters (28.9 feet). The base of the mound appears to be buried under at least a meter of red sandy loam sediment around it, and the top has certainly had some erosion due to untrained digging, thus, the original maximum height was probably around 11 meters (36 feet).

The top of the mound is very steep on all sides except the southern edge. While I do not see the more gradual slope of the upper portion of this side as a ramp, I do think this feature is worthy of further comment. Since this side of the mound appears, from the posthole testing, to face the major portion of the village and Mound B, a situation similar to that at the Dyar mound may exist in which there were multiple structures on the mound at one time with lower portion toward the village (Smith 1981:45-47). The lower, southern portion of the top may have a second structure paired with the one on top or there may be a "shed-like structure" (Ibid: 47) at this lower level. It is also possible that this part of the mound could have been open to provide greater visibility of the village from the presumed main structure on the actual top of the mound. These notions should be tested with excavation on the mound summit.




Figure 6. Mound A Contour Map.



## VILLAGE LIMITS

Data were recovered from a total of 78 post hole tests around the bottom land in which the mound site is located. All but four of these were done during the field school. Those four were made in April of 1983 by Jack Wynn and Shirley Starr of the U. S. Forest Service and the author as part of the planning operations for the project. Coupled with the six post hole tests placed in the bottoms of the six excavation units, a total of 84 post holes was recorded. As stated earlier, these were typically placed at (actually 1 meter south) the intersections of the even 50 meter points on the grid system imposed on the site. Individual strata sheets were completed for each post hole test. It was possible using the post hole method to discern and record gross changes in soil color and texture and these were recorded on the sheets.

The major strata of note were the top sterile red sandy loam of recent alluvial deposition and the brown fine sandy midden zone beneath it. All brown soil found at the base of the red sandy loam was screened for artifacts, primarily potsherds. It was initially thought that the mere presence of the fine brown sandy loam was sufficient indication of the distribution of the buried village. This was not the case because this brown zone actually is buried topsoil that extends far outside the limits of the actual prehistoric village. Thus, the only way to use the posthole data to define village limits was by noting the presence and quantity of potsherds from screening the buried topsoil in the post hole tests. This was initially done using the counts of potsherds for each post hole. The sizes of sherds found in the holes across the site were far from uniform, however, and so the total weight of potsherds from each hole was ultimately used instead.

The use of the total weight of potsherds to define the area of the village involves several assumptions. First, and perhaps most obvious, is the assumption that the sherd distribution is a good indicator of village location. It also assumes that the density of potsherds is roughly equal over the surface of the site except any possible plaza area. This doesn't mean that there will not be high and low density zones within a given part of the village, but that taken as a whole the assumption is true. A third assumption is that the outer edge defined by the potsherd density is roughly the same as the actual village edge. This assumption would be stronger if a stockade well had been present surrounding the site and if the village garbage had been disposed of just inside or outside the wall. A fourth assumption is that there has not been so much erosion on the site that the pattern of sherd distribution has been destroyed.

With these assumptions in mind, it is possible to delineate a boundary for the village based upon our post hole data. With reference to the site map (Figure 4), the boundary is as follows. Beginning west of Mound A, the boundary starts near the river along the 550 North line, goes just north of Mound A, comes around its northeastern edge and goes in an almost straight line to the area just northeast of Mound B, curves around Mound B at its southeastern edge and runs to about the 300 North line, runs slightly north of due west to a point at about 350 North, 625 West, and angles back slightly east of north to the original point.

These boundaries describe a roughly circular area about 250 to 280 meters across which includes an area of between 5 and 6 hectares (between 12 and 15 acres). Several observations can be made about this distribution. First, the two mounds appear to be, based on this data, on the very edge of the village distribution. Further, the most of the village is to the southwest of a straight line between the mounds. That there were no artifacts found in post holes immediately to the southeast of Mound A may be related to a deep erosion channel at the northwestern corner of

the distribution west of Mound A than it does at the southwestern corner of the distribution. This probably can be explained in terms of the outside bend in the river at that point. As long as the river has had that shape at that point, the natural point of deposition would be on the inside of the bend, thus the river is moving away from the southwestern corner of the distribution. That part of the site may have been adjacent to the river at the time of occupation. As pointed out in the discussion of Jones' site map, the river may well have gone almost straight north from the extreme northwestern corner of the site at the time of occupation of the village. Coupled with the observation on the old river shape at the southwestern part of the site this would mean that the river was relatively straight north to south during the occupation. Actually, the angle would have been slightly northwest to southeast, at an angle close to that between Mounds A and B. This can be no more than an hypothesis, unfortunately, until a geomorphologist studies the problem in detail. I see no evidence for a plaza in the data.

The Scull Shoals village, thus defined, is somewhat smaller than the area within the palisade at the Lamar site near Macon, Georgia. The wall at that site enclosed an area of 8.7 hectares (21.5 acres) (Smith 1973:16). According to Marvin Smith, the Dyar site, now in Lake Oconee some 12 miles to the south of Scull Shoals, had a village area of only 2.13 hectares (5.25 acres) or less than half the latter's size (Smith 1981:5). It is noteworthy that the Scull Shoals site (two mounds), is closer in size to the Lamar site (two mounds) than to the Dyar site (one mound).

## VILLAGE EXCAVATIONS

A total of six excavation units was placed in the Scull Shoals village during the summer of 1983. All excavation units were 2 meters square and were aligned with the site grid. Each was excavated through all midden layers to sterile soil. Most excavation units were stopped at just over 2 meters in depth. Features were very rare in the excavated excavation units. Although this was a blessing for interpreting the profiles, it resulted in a low frequency of artifact recovery. When sterile soil was well penetrated, a single 20 centimeter auger hole was placed in the middle of the floor of each excavation unit. These were typically excavated an additional 2 meters below the floor level or about 4 meters from the surface. No earlier middens or artifacts were found in these auger holes. Because of the thick layer of overlying sediment, which sometimes separated the midden layers, not all the fill from each excavation unit was screened. Rather, screening began when the midden layers themselves were first encountered. In all cases a good idea of where the midden would begin in individual excavation units was available due to the earlier post hole operations. All screening was done with 1/4 inch mesh hardware cloth using tripod-based hand shaker screens. Within the middens, natural levels were used when possible to segregate artifacts because natural levels were typically difficult to distinguish within midden artifacts. Profiles of the eastern and western walls of most excavation units were drawn. All four walls of all excavation units were photographed. Numbers were assigned to the excavation units in the order in which they were excavated. All excavation units were backfilled upon completion. Modern garbage (milk jugs, cans, toys, etc.), collected from the surface of the site, was placed in the bottom of each excavation unit prior to backfilling.

### **Excavation Unit 1 (1983)**

This excavation unit was located at 388 to 390 North and 565 to 567 West. This placed it some 140 meters south-southwest of Mound A in the general vicinity of the Jones' supposed third mound (see Figure 2). Posthole tests just northeast and southwest of the excavation unit had shown an unusually large number of potsherds, albeit of very small size. This helped us to decide upon this location for the first excavation unit. The exact location was determined, as was that for all the excavation units, by the necessity of avoiding the large trees in the bottom and their attendant root systems. Specifically, a huge cottonwood tree just to the east of Excavation Unit 1 determined its exact location.

The strata revealed in this excavation unit were, for the most part, distinct and almost perfectly horizontal (Figure 7 and Plate 2). This lack of significant vertical fluctuation in the layers made profile recording and interpretation relatively simple. A wide range of soil colors and textures were, not too surprisingly for a river flood plain, present in this excavation unit. The maximum depth of excavation in this excavation unit was 210 centimeters. In general, the profiles show, from the top down, (1) a 50 centimeter layer of sterile red sandy loam, (2) a 30 centimeter layer of mixed red sandy loam with pottery, (3) a 50 centimeter layer of brown turning to white fine sandy loam without artifacts, (4) a 30 centimeter layer of brown to black fine sandy loam with artifacts and (5) a 50 centimeter layer of brown clay with almost no artifacts. There are definite subdivisions within these general strata as seen in Figure 7, but these will not be discussed here.

The top red sandy loam is of recent origin. Probably all of it has been deposited since the site was last farmed about 1880. It is of no interest archaeologically. Almost all the surface topographical irregularities seen on the site map are variations in the deposition and recent erosion of this layer. At the present time, however, the red alluvium serves to protect the middens below from much damage. As shall be seen shortly, however, it may be moot protection. The damage may already have been too extensive.

The second major stratum contains pottery, but sherds from this level are all quite small (fingernail size) and worn. It appears that these do not represent an intact midden but were redeposited at this location from somewhere else on the site. Where that might have been is anybody's guess, but it probably was from the upstream part of the same site. In any event, these sherds have very little to tell us about the site and its chronological position. My guess is that they were deposited at this depth in the 1860 to 1880 period, although this cannot be certain. No nineteenth century artifacts were located in this excavation unit.

The third major level consisted of relatively pure sand, varying from white below to brown above. This level appears to have been deposited during the first half of the nineteenth century. Plow scars were present below this layer. The shift from white sand to brown sand may correlate with the increase in the clearing of the upland forests to the north of this area that was taking place then. There is reasonably well developed banding in the lower white portion of the sand. This may imply a relatively slow buildup from successive years floods although this major flood of 1840 may be involved in the production of this level. There were no artifacts in this layer. A thin red stratum separated this entire thick stratum from the layer below. This may represent the leaching of iron bearing minerals downward through the sand and their accumulation on the surface of the less permeable layer below.



Plate 2. Excavation Unit 1 (1983), Western Profile.




Figure 7.

The fourth level represented the actual midden layer of the Scull Shoals village. This layer is called "midden" for two reasons. First, this layer had a large quantity of sherds and, second, the soil was medium brown to dark brown. This midden could not be characterized as unusually rich, however. No bone was present and the black, greasy nature of many middens was absent. It appears that this midden had been plowed extensively during the beginning of the nineteenth century and badly damaged before being covered with the upper layers just described. Evidence to support this idea is the presence of apparent plow ridges and furrows at the top of this level as mentioned above. These were visible on the eastern part of the northern profile of Excavation Unit 1. Further, while the sherds were of larger size than those from Layer 2 discussed above, they still appear to be small relative to average midden sherds from other Lamar middens. While collections were separated according to 10 centimeter levels, it is doubtful that any significant chronological information could be recovered under such disturbed conditions. No features or posts were noted in this layer.

The lowest levels of the excavation unit were brown to dark brown levels of clay with very little sand. Visually, this soil differed little from the artifact-bearing "midden" above it. This must represent the subsoil of the site during its occupation. Almost no artifacts were found in the layers and those few present were probably taken into the layer through earlier root and rodent action. The auger hole in the bottom began at 210 centimeters deep and was taken to a depth of almost 400 centimeters. The clay became wetter and grayish with brown inclusions. No artifacts of any sort were found in the auger hole.

### **Excavation Unit 2 (1983)**

This excavation unit was located at 447 to 449 North and 449 to 451 West. This placed it about 60 meters south-southeast of Mound A or about one-third of the way between the two mounds (Figure 2). The excavation unit was placed in this location primarily because the post hole placed at 449 North, 450 West had yielded several sherds of half dollar size (fairly large for this site). This post hole test also penetrated a layer that contained several charred acorns. On the suspicion that this was a feature, Excavation Unit 2 was laid out immediately to the south of the posthole test.

Excavation Unit 2 was excavated to a depth of only 135 centimeters (Figure 8). The strata were less complicated than those of Excavation Unit 1 just described. The top alluvial red sandy loam layer was about 100 centimeter thick. Unlike Excavation Unit 1, there was no white sand layer in Excavation Unit 2. Midden in this excavation unit was a brown to dark brown fine sandy loam. There were plow marks present into the zone on the northern wall of the excavation unit and a probably furrow was traced across the floor at the surface of this dark layer. Sherds were plentiful, if somewhat small in size. Several pottery disks and pipe fragments were also recovered.

Below the brown sandy midden was a soil of light tan color and fine silty texture. Several post molds were visible in this surface at about 130 centimeter deep. These are shown in the plan in Figure 9. Most of these were excavated and all were quite shallow, some less than 20 centimeters. This implies that much of the original soil into which the posts had been set was removed through plowing and erosion as in Excavation Unit 1. The lack of greasy black midden in Excavation Unit 2 lends further support to this idea. No features were noted in the excavation unit other than the post molds. This was disappointing since a feature with charred acorns was




Figure 8.




Figure 9.



anticipated in this location. No acorns were found so the excavation unit must have been just to the southern edge of the probable feature. There was a small amount of what at first appeared to be daub at the top of the midden zone on the eastern wall of the excavation unit. This is more likely just the first deposition of upstream red sandy loam in furrows of the plowed field.

The quantity of pottery found in Excavation Unit 2 was unanticipated since the area between the mounds on Lamar sites is often an artifact-free plaza area. That this area was not cleaned of garbage may have several implications. First, the two mounds at Scull Shoals may not have been in use at the same time. This possibility cannot be investigated until excavations take place on the summits of both mounds. Second, the plaza may have been at another location within the village. Based upon our work, however, the location is unknown. Finally, it is possible that there was no real plaza as such at this site. The data to choose among these alternatives is not yet available.

### **Excavation Unit 3 (1983)**

Excavation Unit 3 was placed on a high area of the flood plain just south of Mound B. It was thought that this area might have been somewhat protected from erosion due to the presence of the mound. The exact location of this excavation unit was 320 to 322 North and 429 to 431 West. The degree of midden erosion, however, was similar to that of Excavation Unit 2. The maximum depth of excavation was only 120 centimeters (Plate 3).

The profile of Excavation Unit 3 is shown in Figure 10. The top red sandy loam was about 40 centimeter thick, but it was underlain by red brown and yellow brown sands, also of recent sedimentary deposition, to a depth of about 75 centimeters. The "midden" zone in this excavation unit was a 20 centimeter layer of dark brown fine sandy loam. There were a moderate number of potsherds and a few projectile points from the layer, but clearly this layer had also been badly disturbed by plowing during the first half of the nineteenth century. No items of any ceremonial nature were found that might have been related to the function of Mound B. Below the "midden" layer there was a layer of a lighter brown clayey sand that had relatively few artifacts. The floor level of the test excavation unit lacked features, although a poorly defined excavation unit was visible on the northern part of the eastern profile. No artifacts were associated with this area and it probably was a tree root stain. One post mold was present on the floor near the center of the excavation unit. Like those in Excavation Unit 2, it was shallow, again indicating the disturbance in the area. The auger hole placed in the center of this excavation unit was excavated to a final depth of 275 centimeters. Mottled red/grey clay was found at 170 centimeter and water and yellow clay were encountered at 255 centimeters. No artifacts were recovered from the auger test.



Plate 3. Excavation Unit 3 (1983), Western Profile



Plate 4. Excavation Units 4 & 5 (1983), Western Profile




Figure 10.

### Excavation Units 4 and 5 (1983)

In an attempt to find some areas that had not been so badly disturbed by the plow, Excavation Unit 4 was placed just off Mound A at its southwestern corner. This approach was successful. Because no intact midden had been found in the rest of the village area, and because more intact midden was necessary to access the chronological position of the site, Excavation Unit 5 was opened next to Excavation Unit 4 on the latter's southern edge. These two excavation units form a 4 by 2 meter trench (Plate 4). The exact location of Excavation Unit 4 was from 503 to 505 North and 489 to 491 West. Excavation Unit 5 was located from 501 to 503 North and 489 to 491 West. The combined eastern profile of the two excavation units is shown in Figure 11.

As in all portions of the site, there was a layer of sterile red sandy loam from the surface to about 50 or 60 centimeters. Immediately beneath this was a brown sandy midden with a moderate number of small sherds. This layer must represent a plowed and redeposited midden zone not unlike those found in Excavation Units 1, 2, and 3. Below this layer was an unusual layer of coarse white sand mixed with brown clay nodules. This sandy layer was thicker in Excavation Unit 5. There were definite plow scars at the base of this sand. These ran from northwest to southeast in the southern part of Excavation Unit 5. The coarse sand was unusual in its contents. Not only did it contain a moderate number of good sized sherds, but it contained a moderate amount of animal bone of several species. More bone came from this layer in Excavation Unit 5 than from all the rest of the site put together. While the bone was not in a good state of preservation, most was in condition to be identified. These have not been identified for this report, unfortunately. Because this layer had obviously been subjected to plowing and flooding during the first half of the nineteenth century makes it remarkable that any bone had been preserved. Below the plowed zone, about 15 to 20 centimeters of relatively intact brownish black fine sandy loam midden was present. This midden was better preserved than any found in any excavation unit up to that point of our work. It was rich in sherds but the layer was too thin to allow much stratigraphic separation of the ceramics.

As shown on the profiles, the lower layers slope downward from north to south. The reason for this slope in the layers is not entirely clear. On the one hand, this may represent outwash on the flanks of Mound A, since Excavation Unit 4 is only 2 to 3 meters away from its southwestern edge. The slope continues to deepen all the way to the south end of Excavation Unit 5, which is a good distance from the mound. The situation is further complicated by the presence of a thin red clay/daub stratum with imbedded charcoal. This layer looked suspiciously like the remains of a burned and collapsed structure. The only possible edge to this area recorded within the confines of the two excavation units was a diagonal edge (northeast to southwest) just at the northern part of Excavation Unit 4. If the remains are that of a structure, it might be but a small part of a large semi-subterranean one such as those known from other contemporaneous sites. In an attempt to define better the nature of the layer without removing the entire level a single 2 by 1 meter section on the northern side of Excavation Unit 5 was deepened. This is shown on the profile (Figure 11) as the deeper cut to 185 centimeters. The sloping bottom level of Excavation Units 4 and 5 ranged in depth from 70 centimeter at the northern edge of Excavation Unit 4 to about 130 centimeters on the southern edge of Excavation Unit 5.

A few sherds were recovered from the deepened part of the excavation unit at a depth of about 170 centimeters. These were located in a light brown sandy silt. A few possible post

molds were recorded as randomly penetrating the floor layer. Time did not permit us to excavate them. Some of these stains were probably simply smears of charcoal. The floor plan for these excavation units is shown in Figure 12. Although a structure may have located here, the only way to be sure would be to open a larger excavation, probably to an extent of 10 by 10 meters or more. This could only be done with the aid of power equipment to remove the overburden down to almost 1 meter.




Figure 11.




Figure 12.

### **Excavation Unit 6 (1983)**

Although some intact midden was found in Excavation Units 4 and 5, its thickness was not very great. Another attempt to locate thicker midden for a stratigraphic pottery sample was made. The northeastern flank of the Dyar Mound (9Ge5) and the Tugalo Mound (9St1) both had thick "pottery dump" areas on the northeastern flanks of their mounds. A series of posthole tests was placed on the very edge of the northeastern part of Mound A to determine if a "pottery dump" stratum was present at Scull Shoals. These showed that intact midden was present, but the stratum was probably not as thick as at Dyar and Tugalo. In the interest of protecting the Mound, the Forest Service elected to postpone excavation of this area to a future season. In an attempt to recover some information about this possible dump without actually excavating on the edge of the mound, Excavation Unit 6 was excavated about 3 meters off this northeastern edge. The exact location was from 543 to 545 North and 460 to 462 West. This excavation was relatively successful in finding thicker intact midden (Plate 5). Certainly it was the best preserved midden of any in the six excavation units excavated during the summer of 1983.

The eastern profile is shown in Figure 13. Time permitted the recording of only a single profile of Excavation Unit 6. The maximum depth in this excavation unit was just over 230 centimeters, making it the deepest of all the excavation units excavated. Sterile red sandy loam, with some lenses of yellow clay and bands of sand, extended to a depth of about 110 centimeters. Below this, to a depth of 170 centimeters, there were brown sandy loam midden zones with artifacts, which probably had been plowed and disturbed. No plow scars or furrows were noted in this excavation unit, however. Below the 170 centimeter level, the midden appeared to be intact. The quantity and size of sherds from this 60 to 70 centimeter thick succession of midden layers increased from top to bottom as did the blackness of the soil. The bottom midden zone was the blackest and had larger sherds than any other excavation unit on the site. Almost no bone was preserved, however. The lowest midden stopped abruptly on the surface of a fine silt of light grey brown color. There were no features or post molds in this surface. There was much charcoal in the lowest middens.

The middens found in this excavation unit may represent the outer edge of a "Northeastern Dump" overflowing off the edge of the mound, but only further excavation can confirm this. The midden here may simply represent village debris around the mound at an early, and much smaller stage of mound construction. A trench into the tail edge of the mound could clear up this question. A single auger hole was placed in the middle of the excavation unit after its completion. It was excavated to a depth of 342 centimeters where ground water was encountered. The grey-brown silt slowly graded into yellow-brown clay with black inclusions and finally to a yellow clay at the water table. Fortunately the summer of 1983 was very dry, for the ground surface here is typically under 3 or more meters during the winter floods and the spring water table must be shallow. Another dry summer will be necessary if further work on these middens is to be attempted.





Plate 5. Excavation Unit 6 (1983), Southern Profile




Figure 13.

## VILLAGE ARTIFACTS AND 1983 CHRONOLOGY

The artifacts recovered during the summer of 1983 from 9Ge4 consisted almost entirely of potsherds. Sherds were analyzed with two purposes in mind. First, their presence and absence was used to indicate the extent of the village. Soil color would have been insufficient for this goal because the midden soil was severely disturbed by plowing. Second, sherds were used to define the temporal range of the site's occupation. Several other kinds of ceramic objects were recovered in addition to pottery sherds. These include the ubiquitous pottery disks as well as fragments of smoking pipes. Besides the ceramic items, the only other artifacts recovered were a few projectile points and some quartz and chert debitage.

Sherds used to define the extent of the village were recovered from the screening of soil from post holes. Although these sherds were classified according to pottery type, they are not included in the chronological analysis. This is because so few sherds were recovered from each hole that a table of these data would be almost exclusively zeros. These data are also less useful because of the way the samples were recovered, and because of the heavily disturbed nature of the deposits from which the material came. Finally, there are no types of sherds from the post hole tests that are not found in the excavation units in much greater quantities. For the 78 post holes placed in the village, the total sherd count was 854 sherds, most of which were very small. As discussed in the section on the village limits, the weight of these sherds was a better indicator of site use-intensity. The total weight for all these sherds was 1591 grams (3.5 pounds). The data on sherd types by post hole is on file at the Laboratory of Archaeology at the University of Georgia for those interested in the specific results.

Pottery from the six excavation units is listed by type for each unit individually, as well as in summary chart form in Tables 1 through 7. Rim sherds are included in these tables. While each table is self explanatory, a few comments are necessary. Grid coordinates and depth for each lot number given in the tables is listed in the site catalog in Appendix 1. In the laboratory all samples of sherds were screened through a 1/2 inch mesh screen before sorting by type and recording counts. This was done to cut analysis time. Sherds smaller than this size were not further analyzed. Only their weight in grams was recorded. The last row on each table lists of the weight (by lot number) for all sherds that were of this small size. These sherds are so heavily broken anyway, perhaps from plowing, that their surfaces are heavily eroded. This renders the sherds difficult to identify.

There are a few stratigraphic patterns present in the ceramic data. Incised sherds are typically present only in the upper levels of each excavation unit. There seem to be no patterned differences in the frequency of the bold, medium, and fine incised categories. The middens that appeared to be the most intact were the bottom levels of Excavation Units 4, 5 and 6. Not too surprisingly, the totals show that these levels produced the largest number of sherds, although separate tables were not produced for the rim sherds from all excavation units. Table 8 represents rim sherds from Excavation Unit 6 grouped into two types: those with folds or rim strips on their exterior surface and those without any such fold. Rims called "rolled" are here grouped with simple (unfolded) rims.

**Table 1. Excavation Unit 1 Ceramics (1983)**

Lot Number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Totals
POTTERY TYPE												
Plain	71	131	4	2	2	62	101	21	21	7	6	428
Red Filmed	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Incised												
Fine	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Medium	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	5
Bold	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Check Stamped	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	2	1	0	9
Complicated Stamped												
Unidentified	16	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	27
Rectilinear												
General	8	4	0	0	0	7	10	6	3	0	0	38
Diamond	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1 Bar Cross	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Bar Cross	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Bar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Line Block	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Curvilinear												
General	5	5	0	0	0	4	15	3	2	2	0	36
Key Hole	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Concen. Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
1 Bar Cross	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Bar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Cob Marked	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Cord Marked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Fabric Marked	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Pipe Fragments	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Disks	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Handles	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Totals	105	150	4	2	2	76	132	35	32	12	6	556
Small Sherd Weight	155	449	1	3	0	199	155	95	37	7	0	1101

**Table 2. Excavation Unit 2 Ceramics (1983)**

Lot Number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Totals
POTTERY TYPE													
Plain	59	143	886	39	6	8	0	2	0	6	1	0	1150
Red Filmed	0	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Incised													
Fine	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Medium	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Bold	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Check Stamped	0	2	11	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Complicated Stamped													
Unidentified	5	14	68	1	3	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	98
Rectilinear													
General	6	5	90	6	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
Diamond													
1 Bar Cross	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Bar Cross	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Bar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Line Block	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Curvilinear													
General	4	3	57	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Filfot Cross	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Concen. Circle													
1 Bar Cross	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Bar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pipe Fragments	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Disks	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Handles	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	74	169	1144	53	12	20	0	5	1	6	1	0	1485
Small Sherd Weight	52	190	816	46	11	14	1	0	0	1	1	0	1132

**Table 3. Excavation Unit 3 Ceramics (1983)**

Lot Number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Totals
POTTERY TYPE										
Plain	64	186	34	81	15	15	0	5	9	409
Red Filmed	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Incised										
Fine	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Medium	16	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	19
Bold	0	1	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	8
Check Stamped	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Complicated Stamped										
Unidentified	16	24	2	19	5	0	0	0	4	54
Rectilinear										
General	14	34	50	18	6	4	0	0	1	127
Diamond										
1 Bar Cross	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Bar Cross	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Bar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Line Block	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Curvilinear										
General	1	23	4	13	1	0	0	0	0	42
Filfot Cross	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Concen. Circle										
1 Bar Cross	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Bar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pipe Fragments	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Disks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Handles	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	96	278	93	134	28	19	0	5	15	668
Small Sherd Weight	146	190	113	117	6	0	2	0	1	675

**Table 4. Excavation Unit 4 Ceramics (1983)**

Lot Number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	Totals	
POTTERY TYPE																											
Plain	13	21	1	0	98	99	69	16	11	26	8	7	19	11	0	2	0	5	41	51	2	1	0	11	22	713	
Red Filmed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4
Incised																											
Fine	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Medium	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Bold	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	9
Check Stamped	0	1	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	
Complicated Stamped																											
Unidentified	1	2	0	0	5	6	9	7	0	1	2	0	4	2	1	0	0	3	18	4	0	0	3	1	8	103	
Rectilinear																											
General	2	5	0	0	7	3	4	12	1	0	5	2	4	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	0	0	64	
Diamond																											
1 Bar Cross	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	19	
2 Bar Cross	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
2 Bar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Line Block	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	
Curvilinear																											
General	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	6	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	7	4	1	3	0	3	4	2	53	
Filfot Cross	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Key Hole	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Concen. Circle																											
1 Bar Cross	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Bar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Cord Marked	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Pipe Fragments	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Disks	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Handles	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	4	
Node	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Pinched	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Totals	19	30	1	0	120	118	94	54	12	30	16	11	27	14	5	8	0	22	71	65	6	1	13	16	36	1000	
Small Sherd																											
Weight	24	53	0	0	134	242	99	169	6	4	15	4	17	15	4	2	0	31	34	50	2	7	17	23	23	1030	

**Table 5. Excavation Unit 5 Ceramics (1983)**

Lot Number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Totals
POTTERY TYPE													
Plain	138	84	115	115	139	93	86	20	22	24	1	26	863
Red Filmed	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Incised													
Fine	1	1	5	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	11
Medium	1	1	5	2	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	15
Bold	3	4	5	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	16
Check Stamped	0	1	3	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	10
Complicated Stamped													
Unidentified	13	7	25	28	1	21	22	20	6	7	3	0	153
Rectilinear													
General	9	16	18	10	12	6	13	3	6	1	1	1	96
Diamond													
1 Bar Cross	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Bar Cross	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
2 Bar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Line Block	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Curvilinear													
General	8	5	6	3	8	6	5	1	1	1	0	0	44
Key Hole	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Concen. Circle													
1 Bar Cross	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Bar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Pipe Fragments	3	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Disks	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
Nodes	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Handles	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Other	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Totals	177	123	185	163	171	132	132	44	35	36	5	27	1230
Small Sherd Weight	66	153	338	350	69	48	107	31	38	7	0	0	1207



**Table 6. Excavation Unit 6 Ceramics (1983)**

Lot Number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	Totals
POTTERY TYPE																
Plain	0	83	68	45	85	62	27	30	133	84	164	193	349	442	76	1841
Red Filmed	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	1	7
Incised																
Fine	0	1	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	8
Medium	0	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Bold	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Check Stamped	0	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	2	28	13	1	55
Complicated Stamped																
Unidentified	0	7	7	0	3	6	3	4	10	7	17	15	0	50	11	140
Rectilinear																
General	0	4	6	2	5	4	3	5	4	9	9	10	31	42	12	146
Diamond																
1 Bar Cross	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
2 Bar Cross	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	7
2 Bar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Line Block	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3
Curvilinear																
General	0	6	4	1	3	1	0	1	5	8	5	13	26	36	3	112
Filfoot Cross	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3
Key Hole	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	7
Concen. Circle																
1 Bar Cross	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Bar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Cord Marked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Corn Cob Marked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4
Pipe Fragments	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	8	0	16
Disks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	1	8	1	15
Nodes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Handles	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Other	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	0	16
Totals	0	104	90	61	101	76	37	41	158	114	199	234	454	618	109	2396
Small Sherd Weight	0	53	37	54	92	58	26	28	110	74	111	180	298	510	64	1695

**Table 7. Village Excavation Units Ceramics Summary (1983)**

Excavation Unit	1	2	3	4	5	6	Totals
POTTERY TYPE							
Plain	428	1150	409	713	863	1841	5404
Red Filmed	1	8	1	4	1	7	22
Incised							
Fine	2	8	0	7	11	8	36
Medium	5	4	19	9	15	7	59
Bold	0	4	8	9	16	4	41
Check Stamped	9	17	3	10	10	55	104
Complicated Stamped							
Unidentified	27	98	54	103	153	140	575
Rectilinear							
General	38	112	127	63	96	146	582
Diamond							
1 Bar Cross	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
2 Bar Cross	0	0	0	4	2	7	13
Line Block	0	4	3	2	1	3	13
Curvilinear							
General	36	70	42	53	44	112	357
Filfot Cross	0	1	1	1	0	3	6
Key Hole	1	0	0	1	1	7	10
Concen. Circle							
2 Bar	1	0	0	1	1	1	4
Cord Marked	1	0	0	1	0	1	3
Corn Cob Marked	1	0	0	0	0	4	5
Fabric Marked	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Pipe Fragments	0	3	1	8	6	16	34
Handles	0	1	1	4	2	1	9
Disks	1	5	0	5	4	15	30
Nodes	0	0	0	2	3	1	6
Pinched	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Other	4	0	0	0	1	16	21
Totals	554	1485	669	1001	1230	2396	7337
Small Sherd Weight	1101	1132	575	1030	1207	1695	6740

**Table 8. Rim Sherds, Excavation Unit 6 (1983)**

Lot Number	Folded	Simple
2	7	5
3	1	5
4	3	6
5	5	11
6	3	8
7	1	4
8	1	0
9	6	6
10	4	5
11	2	10
12	0	22
13	2	49
14	4	79
15	1	9
Totals	40	219

The lower levels of Excavation Unit 6 yielded sherds other than rims that are assignable to the Late Etowah-Early Savannah period (Table 6). Almost all of the Etowah diamond-stamped sherds came from the bottom two levels of this excavation unit. The only diamond motif recognized was what Rudolph and Hally (1984) call the "2-bar diamond." A few sherds of probable Etowah Red Filmed were also present in the lowest levels. Savannah Checked Stamped sherds were mixed with these Etowah materials, again in the lowest levels of Excavation Unit 6. Finally, the "keyhole" motif (ibid) was present only in the bottom layers of this unit.

For 45 years, folded rims have been an important defining characteristic for the Lamar period in Georgia (Kelly 1938). While these are present at almost all levels in Excavation Unit 6 it is clear that in the levels below 180 centimeters (Lot Number 11) the frequency of folded rims falls drastically in relation to the frequency of simple rims. Across Georgia and particularly in northeastern Georgia the period proceeding the Lamar period is the Savannah period (Rudolph and Hally 1984). Typically, Savannah period ceramics are similar to those of the succeeding Lamar period except that folded rims on complicated stamped jars are absent during the former. There are also some temporal differences in the stamping motifs. Furthermore, incised pottery is almost absent during the Savannah period. The period before Savannah is the Etowah period. The most typical stamped motif on Etowah pottery is some version of a concentric diamond design, often with bars crossing the middle of the diamond. Diamonds are still present in the stamped pottery of the Savannah period, although the quality of execution is typically not as good.

On the basis of these known temporal markers, it appears that the earliest occupation at the Scull Shoals site dates to the late Etowah or Savannah period. It is difficult to estimate a date in years for this initial occupation, but comparison with ceramics from other sites for which radiocarbon dates have been obtained leads to an estimate of A. D. 1250. There are no radiocarbon dates from the Scull Shoals site.

The earliest ceramics found at Scull Shoals are similar to those of the Stillhouse phase, named by Marvin Smith based on his work at the Dyar mound (1981:242-243). He does not state whether he considers this a phase of the Etowah period or the Savannah period. The phase that follows the Stillhouse phase is called the Duvall phase (ibid:243). The beginning date for Duvall phase was originally estimated by him at A. D. 1375 (1976:4). By 1981, Smith revised his estimate to A. D. 1275 for the beginning of Duvall phase. My estimate for the beginning of Duvall phase is A. D. 1350. This must represent the beginning of the Lamar period at both Dyar and Scull Shoals.

Strangely, one of the marker ceramic types of the Duvall phase at Dyar and the Lake Oconee region downstream, is absent from our collections from Scull Shoals. This type, Morgan Incised, has a decoration of fine incised lines in a cross-hatch or grid pattern. It was first found at the Joe Bell site in Morgan County (Williams 1983:211). Since it seems almost certain that people were living at the Scull Shoals site during the Duvall phase, the absence of this type is noteworthy. Perhaps the northern limit of its distribution is just to the south of the site or, more likely, it eluded us in our brief excavations.

There are sherds in the collections that clearly date throughout the Dyar phase, which begins at about A. D. 1450 to 1475 (Smith 1978, 1981), and ends at about A. D. 1600 (Williams 1983:54). Rim sherds with wide folds and body sherds with bold incised designs are included

here. This is the period when Hernando DeSoto and his men came through the Oconee River valley, probably somewhere to the south of 9Ge4 (Personal Communication, Charles Hudson).

There are a few sherds in the collection that probably belong to the Bell phase, the latest of the phases for the Lamar period in this area. The dates for this period are from about A. D. 1600 to 1675. Diagnostic sherds for this period are decorated with fine incised lines, often in multiple parallel line patterns (Williams 1983:216).

Historic artifacts, in the form of glass beads, are known to occur from sites in the Lake Oconee area. It would have been difficult to be certain of Bell phase occupation except for the fortuitous find of a single, deep blue, spherical glass bead in the upper part of the plowed midden in Excavation Unit 5. This was found during washing operations in the lab. The diameter of this small necklace bead was about 5 millimeters. Marvin Smith states that such beads were in use by about 1565 and were used until 1800 (Personal Communication). The bead is, therefore, not associated with the DeSoto journey through the area. The Spanish had established missions on the Georgia coast by 1565. There are accounts of journeys made by Spaniards up the Altamaha and Oconee Rivers in 1597 (Personal Communication, Chester DePratter).

It is possible that this bead originally came from Spanish sources on the Atlantic coast during this period. The presence of the bead implies that people were still living at the site at least during the first part of the Bell phase. How far into the Bell phase there were people living at the Scull Shoals site is uncertain, but I doubt if it was for long. The following chart summarizes the preceding discussion of the occupation period of the Scull Shoals site.

<b>PHASE</b>	<b>DATES</b>	<b>SCULL SHOALS</b>
	1675	
Bell		
	1600	
Dyar		
	1450	
Duvall		
	1350	
Stillhouse		
	1250	

Three projectile points were recovered in the 1983 season. All but one, an Early Archaic Palmer point, were small Mississippian triangular arrow points. The latter are typically rare on Lamar sites and may be associated with the late Etowah or Savannah occupations (Stillhouse phase). The lithic debitage has not yet been quantified or analyzed for this project, but the quantity is not large. Inspection of the small amount of chert debris suggests that it is of local Piedmont origin (Personal Communication, Jerald Ledbetter). The nature of our goals and methods, as well as our limited finds, limit the usefulness of the data toward any possible use-function studies of those artifacts, however, and these types of studies are better dealt with in the future.

The small amount of poorly preserved faunal material recovered during the summer of 1983 has not been identified by a zooarchaeologist. Field observations include, not unexpectedly,

deer, turkey, raccoon, and other small animals. The only floral material recovered consisted of a few charred acorns in the post hole that led to the excavation of Excavation Unit 2.

### **SUMMARY 1983**

The 1983 excavations at the Scull Shoals site were designed to recover basic information on a site that was unknown archaeologically and which is to be protected for the future as an archaeological resource. The base maps made for the site are essential to future research and site management. The present size and extent of the village have been defined with reasonable accuracy. The village covers about 5 to 6 hectares and is located mostly to the southwest of Mound A. The site was first occupied about A. D. 1250 and was finally abandoned about A. D. 1600. The village, unfortunately, is not in as good condition as had been hoped, due to extensive nineteenth century plowing. All of this new information can now serve as a base line for future work, although the accuracy of these determinations must be continuously reexamined.

There are certainly many important questions that now can and should be investigated at Scull Shoals. Some of the more important ones are: (1) When were the two mounds begun and completed within the time range above? (2) Does the premound midden show evidence of earlier occupation than found thus far? (3) Were both mounds used at the same time? (4) What is the nature of the possible structure found to be the southwest of Mound A? (5) Can better stratigraphic data be obtained with excavation units placed on the northeastern edge of that mound? (6) If large areas are stripped of the sterile overburden with power equipment, will the village reveal greater detail about houses? One area that might receive further attention in this manner is southwest of Mound A. on the sedimentary fan at about 475 North, 525 West. (7) Will backhoe trenches placed through the village (perhaps east to west) reveal areas that have better preserved midden than the areas tested? (8) When was the site at its largest size and population? (9) Why was no Morgan Incised pottery recovered from the Duvall Phase component at the site? (10) Does anything remain of the top structures on each of the two mounds? (11) If so, then is the form of those structures similar to those that were on the Dyar mound? (12) Is our preliminary idea on the shape of the river at the time of occupation valid? These are but a small number of the questions to be asked in the future about the site.

Examination of Questions 4, 6, 7, and 8 will require some form of earth moving equipment. This will take special planning and timing in the future to ensure success, but is considered important in the overall goals for understanding the site. Of these, the highest priority is placed on Question 7. Question 9 cannot be addressed by excavation strategy. Consultation with a flood plain geomorphologist would be necessary to answer Question 12.

## THE 1985 EXCAVATIONS

The Forest Service felt it would be better to delay test excavations on Mounds A and B until the 1985 season. The work for the 1985 season attempted to gain answers to Questions 1, 2, 3, 5, and 9, and 10. These will be addressed in greater detail with discussion of the methods to be employed. Several of the questions can be simultaneously addressed with the same excavations.

Question 1, when were mounds begun and completed, must be split into two separate questions in terms of excavation strategy. To answer the question of period of completion, excavation had to be undertaken on the summits of both Mounds A and B. The easiest way to accomplish this was to clean out some of the potholes on these mounds and to expand slightly on each. The fill from the top would be screened to allow the recovery of sherds that could be used to date the final use of each mound. One problem that existed, and for which there was no simple solution, was that the X may have brought deeper and earlier artifacts to the surface. This problem did not appear to be an insurmountable one, however. The excavation strategy did not require deep excavation on the mound summits. The question of the beginning date for the mounds is addressed separately below.

Question 2, was the site begun before the Late Etowah/Savannah period, was based on scanty evidence that this was the period of initial settlement from the 1983 season. The best place to get evidence for this, other than directly under the center of Mound A, was believed to be under the edge of this mound. The location of this excavation was designed to coincide with excavations designed to answer Question 5.

That question, whether there was good site stratigraphy on the northeastern edge of Mound A, grew from our knowledge of both the Tugalo site (9St1) 60 miles to the north (Williams and Branch 1978) and the Dyar site (9Ge5) 10 miles to the south (Smith 1981). At both of these sites the mound had a stratified midden deposit on its northeastern edge. This deposit was presumably made from garbage thrown from the mound summit. In 1983 a few posthole tests on the northeastern edge of Mound A at Scull Shoals were made and much midden was found. It was hoped that this area would have stratified deposits similar to these other sites. Further, the early levels of a pit placed on the northeastern edge of Mound A would offer the best chance for providing a better answer to Question 2 discussed above. It would also help to answer Question 9. This question, whether the site was occupied in early Lamar times, grew from the lack of the discovery of material dating to this period in the 1983 season. A pit in an area of good stratified deposits would help answer this question. Question 3 addresses the issue of contemporaneity of both mounds at the site. This could not be answered completely without a large excavation to the center of Mound A, an impossible operation for now, but a partial answer could be provided. First, the terminal dates for the mounds would be determined by the same excavations needed to answer Question 1 above. The best estimate obtainable for the period of the beginning of Mound A would have to come from the bottom of the unit to be placed on the northeastern edge of that mound in connection with Questions 2, 5, and 9 discussed above. The beginning dates for the smaller Mound B could have been addressed by taking the excavations to be conducted in the summit of Mound B all the way through the mound to the bottom with a small test. Further work on this question will have to be addressed in the future.

In sum, four excavation units were planned for the 1985 season. Three of the four involved cleaning potholes--two on Mound B and one on the summit of Mound A. The fourth

unit was to be a 2 meter square excavation pit on the northeastern edge of Mound A. The sizes of the pits in the potholes would be determined by the sizes and shapes of the potholes themselves. All the fill from all pits would be screened through 1/4 inch mesh hardware cloth for artifact recovery. The long trench to be excavated on the northern edge of Mound B would have a substantial portion of the disturbed backfill shoveled out to speed the operation and ensure completion of the unit in the time allotted. Where possible, all excavation would be in natural levels and divided into 10 centimeter arbitrary levels. As many carbon samples would be recovered as possible.

## **MOUND B EXCAVATIONS**

The initial work in the 1985 season was on Mound B. Two excavation units were opened on it, both placed so as to take advantage of existing potholes as described earlier. The two pits, therefore, are not aligned with the existing site grid. The locations of the corners of the excavation units have been determined from a point of known location on the summit of the mound, 338 North, 421.5 West. This point, the referenced elevation of which is 100.79 Meters, is the same point used for the mapping of Mound B in 1983. The wooden stake was miraculously still in place and unrotted.

The excavation in the top center of the mound was designated Excavation Unit 1 and the excavation in the large pothole on the northern edge of the mound was called Excavation Unit 2. Both of these excavation units are shown in Figure 14. Soil from the screening activities was used to backfill all the rest of the existing potholes on the mound. The former locations of these are all marked on the figure for any future excavators.

### **Excavation Unit 1 (1985)**

The initial excavation area was on the top of Mound B. A 6 by 3 meter rectangular excavation unit was placed around the large double pothole in the crest of the mound. The location of the unit is shown in Figure 14. The excavation could not be oriented with the existing grid for the site. It was placed at an angle such that the long axis of the unit was 30 degrees west of grid north. The calculated locations for the four corners of the unit are as follows.

<b>Corner</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>West</b>
Southeast	334.80	413.70
Southwest	333.40	416.25
Northwest	338.55	421.50
Northeast	340.05	416.75

Most of the excavation in this unit consisted of clearing the existing potholes down to undisturbed soil and squaring it up just past the limits of the pothole (Plate 6). This was complicated by two factors. The first was an incredible mass of tree roots along the southern part of the western wall of the pit. Excavation of the profile in this area was slowly done with trowels, axes, and machetes.





Plate 6. Excavation Unit 1 (1985), Mound B.



Plate 7. Excavation Unit 2 (1985), Mound B.




Figure 14.

The second factor was a bit more difficult to overcome. The sides of the large potholes were badly undercut starting about 30 centimeters beneath the surface of the mound. It was thought that this undercutting, which had been noted in earlier visits to the mound, was caused by amateurs picking at the walls of the large existing pothole. As the crew excavated the walls it was found that in some parts of the pit the walls were undercut by as much as 60 centimeters. The mechanism for this undercutting also became clear. Mound B has a top level of permeable loam that overlies an impermeable clay cap level at a depth of about 30 centimeters. When rain fell on the mound it easily penetrated the top level down to the impermeable clay. The water then ran laterally over the surface of the clay until it found a way to penetrate further into the mound. The walls of the pothole provided an easy path for water to penetrate the mound. As the water ran down the exposed face of the clay level it eroded it back. This action over a 20 to 30 year period probably accounts for the badly undercut nature of the potholes. While the crew could have cut back far enough to clear much of this undercutting, it would have required enlarging the northern end of the pit substantially. Rather than dig away more of the undisturbed layers on the top of Mound B, I elected to leave the undercut areas in the profiles.

We found a few artifacts to help date the large potholes in the mound. A 12 ounce Pepsi bottle of an early 1960s style and the remains of an aluminum lawn chair were both found in the back dirt on the mound. Apparently the pothunters had an enjoyable and comfortable time at their destructive activities.

Excavation Unit 1 was divided into two parts during our excavations. This was done because the original pothole actually consisted of two separate deep holes with a less deep bridge between the two holes. This bridge was not excavated and provided a boundary used to divide Excavation Unit 1 into two sub-units. These were designated Excavation Unit 1A for the northern part of the excavation and Excavation Unit 1B for the southern part of the excavation. Excavation Unit 1A was 3 meters by 2.5 meters, with the long axis in the east-west direction. Excavation Unit 1B was 3 by 3 meters. The unexcavated bridge between these two sub-units was therefore .5 by 3 meters.

Units 1A and 1B were centered over each of the two deep parts of the pothole. I intended to excavate these units to the level of the bottom of each pothole. During the time the crew was excavating these pits, however, they were also excavating Excavation Unit 2 adjacent to Excavation Unit 1. It became clear that more would be learned of the structure of the mound from Excavation Unit 2. Thus, while the crew did trowel out these potholes to their bottoms, they did not attempt to square up the pits placed around them all the way to the undisturbed level. There were very few artifacts found in Excavation Unit 1.

The top surface of Mound B outside the potholes was quite irregular due to the random placement of dirt removed from these large holes. Thus the depth of Excavation Units 1A and 1B varied along their profiles. Excavation Unit 1A varied in depth below surface between 95 and 109 centimeters. Most of the unit was approximately 1 meter deep.

The remaining pothole in the center of the floor of the unit was only about 20 centimeters deeper than the rest of the unit when the crew finished deepening the pit. Profiles were recorded for the northern, eastern, and western walls of the unit. These are presented here as Figures 15, 16, and 17.

As can be seen, the pothole badly disturbs the center of each of these three profiles. Further, the top layer on all these consists of mixed back dirt from the potholes themselves. The

slightly longer northern profile (Figure 15) clearly shows the remains of a collapsed and burned structure on its western side 50 centimeters below the present ground surface. Two post molds that belong to this structure also were revealed below the collapsed daub and charcoal pile. These posts were probably interior posts to this structure. While it is not certain, the thin pinkish layer above this house and just under the back dirt level may also be the remains of a structure. No post molds were recorded for it, however, and no daub was noted. A 15 centimeter thick layer of tan clay and loam separates this possible structure from the burned structure.

The burned structure also shows on the eastern end of the northern profile and on both the eastern and western profiles (Figures 16 and 17). One additional posthole for this structure was revealed on each of these profiles. It is clear that the potholes on the top of the mound were dug through the middle of a well preserved, burned structure near the top of the mound. Given the location and size of the potholes and our excavation trench, there should still be substantial portions of this structure intact on Mound B, perhaps as much as 40 percent, including most of the outside walls. Future excavations could profitably excavate the rest of this structure to determine its exact size, shape, and orientation.

Below the burned structure a thick layer of brown loam was present over most of the area of Excavation Unit 1A. The nature of this layer could not be determined from this pit, but became clearer with the excavation in Excavation Unit 2 and will be discussed further with that unit.

The profiles for Excavation Unit 1B are presented in Figures 18, 19, and 20. These are the southern, eastern, and western profiles respectively. Because of the uneven surface of the mound the depth to the floor of this unit varied from 75 to 95 centimeters. The center part of the pothole extended an additional 60 centimeters below the floor of the unit. A 1 meter wide area on the center of the southern profile was extended to the full depth of the pothole in the center of the unit (Figure 18).

In general, the profiles of Excavation Unit 1B are a bit less interesting than those of Excavation Unit 1A. There were more disturbances due to roots in this unit, particularly on the western profile. Also, there was more pothunter back dirt deposited in this area. The burned structure seen clearly in Excavation Unit 1A was barely visible in Excavation Unit 1B. A single posthole associated with this structure was present on the western profile (Figure 20). Another posthole was 30 centimeters east of this post on the floor of the excavation unit. No burned daub or charcoal layers were noted on the profiles, however. The thin pinkish level just below the top back dirt was present on all the profiles. Other than these few observations, nothing of the structure of the mound that is not more clearly revealed in Excavation Unit 2 was noted in Excavation Unit 1B.

Although the crew initially tried to screen the fill from the potholes cleaned to produce Excavation Unit 1, the large amount of clay in the soil made this impossible. Sherds were saved when seen, but they were quite rare. Once the profiles began to take shape sherds were saved by levels as much as possible. The crew also saved sherds from the postholes and burned structure when they were seen. No food remains of any sort were found in Mound B. Also, no large vessel fragments or other artifacts were located in Excavation Unit 1. The sherds from the unit are discussed in detail in the chapter on the artifacts, but it is clear that the burned structure revealed in the profiles of Excavation Unit 1A dates to the Dyar phase of the Lamar period. Our best evidence for this are Dyar phase Lamar Bold Incised sherds found in the postholes in Excavation Unit 1A.




Figure 15.




Figure 16.




Figure 17.

Following the completion of our excavations on Excavation Unit 1, it was backfilled by YCC workers with the Forest Service to the level of the surrounding mound top. Some fill dirt was obtained from the village red clay overburden for this job. For future excavators this means that the pit was filled to the level of the pot hunted back dirt surrounding the unit and shown as the top levels on the profiles. Thus, barring erosion between A. D. 1600 and the time of the looting, the present mound is 20 to 30 centimeters higher than it was when it was abandoned.




Figure 18.







Figure 19.



9Ge4  
 MOUND B  
 UNIT 1B  
 WEST PROFILE

Figure 20.

## Excavation Unit 2 (1985)

This was the largest unit excavated in the 1985 season. It was produced by clearing and slightly expanding a large linear pothole that had been placed at a diagonal on the northern side of Mound B that had apparently been dug as an attempt to reach the center of the mound. From what little was found in the way of artifacts or features, I doubt seriously if the looters found any artifacts other than a few potsherds. In a portion of the pothole the crew found where the looters had dug to within 10 centimeters of the bottom of the mound.

In placing a rectangular excavation unit around this large pothole I had to choose an area that, just as with Excavation Unit 1, was not aligned with the existing grid for the site. North for Excavation Unit 2 was 18 degrees west of grid north for the site. The unit was basically a long rectangle with an extension on the eastern portion of the short southern side. This extension was 1.80 meters wide and 40 centimeters deep. The western profile of Excavation Unit 2 was given the most attention in our excavations because the eastern one was cut through by a number of smaller potholes all along its length. The total length of the western profile was 9.20 meters. The width of the trench was 2.67 meters (Plate 7). The location of the trench on Mound B is shown on Figure 14 above.

The calculated grid coordinates for the corners of the excavation in the Mound B trench are listed below.

<b>Corner</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>West</b>
Northwest	348.00	418.30
Northeast	348.00	415.40
Southeast	339.60	412.65
SW Extension	339.05	414.35
Southwest	339.15	415.35

As with Excavation Unit 1, the crew initially screened the back dirt from the pothole first with 1/4 inch and then 1/2 inch mesh hardware cloth before realizing that the large amount of clay mixed in the soil made screening impractical. Very little material was being recovered anyway so I eventually decided just to shovel out the fill and wheel barrowed it to a large dump just north of the base of the mound. Sherds were recovered as seen, but most were from mixed levels anyway.

Two small trees were removed from the slopes of the mound in order to excavate the trench. The roots from these, as well as the roots from a large tree just west of the western profile slowed the excavations. One rain storm that occurred during the period of this excavation flooded the unit even though it was covered with black plastic at the time. This created a large mud hole that also slowed progress on the unit. A total of 13 field days with a four person crew was necessary to complete the excavation and recording of Excavation Unit 2.

Our basic goal in the excavation of this unit was to produce a complete profile of the mound by clearing the pothole and expanding it slightly to the west into intact layers. Unfortunately, this gave us only small portions of each stratigraphic layer to screen for artifact recovery. For clay layers, screening was impossible. In the upper levels of our excavation the crew only expanded a few centimeters into undisturbed levels. The pothole became smaller as it was excavated deeper into the mound and the crew was thus able to excavate some reasonable sized portions of these undisturbed lower levels. These lower levels were screened with 1/4 inch

mesh screen. In this way some sherds from known stratigraphic associations were recovered for most of the lower part of the mound. After the crew had excavated about half way to the pre mound level they divided the trench into two parts along its length. A 1 meter wide portion of the 9.20 meter long trench on its western side was then excavated all the way to the bottom of the mound.

The major accomplishment of our work on Excavation Unit 2 is the large western profile drawing reproduced here as Figure 21. This profile extends from outside the mound to within 3 meters of its center. The total height of the profile at its highest point was 3.15 meters. The total height of the aboriginal mound itself at that point from the top of the pre mound midden to the bottom of the pothunter back dirt on top of the mound was 2.85 meters.

In order to discuss the stratigraphy of Mound B in terms of its construction sequence and the cultural and natural modifications to it, a sequence of 43 numbers have been assigned to the layers defined in the mound without regard to size or extent. In some cases different numbers have been assigned to levels that are clearly the same construction stage if differences in color or texture were noted in the field. These numbers are used simply as a basis for discussion of the structure of the mound. The discussion of Figure 21 will be presented from bottom to top--that is in the same sequence that the mound was constructed.

### **Premound**

The pre mound soil consisted of fine brown sands. Levels 42 and 43 are these sands. Level 42, above and slightly darker than Level 43, was apparently a humus layer in the flood plain at Scull Shoals before the mound was begun. There is actually very little midden in this old topsoil. In screening it only a few small sherds were found. In the floor of the deeper 1 meter by 9 meter western section of the excavation the crew looked carefully for features or posts that might be present in this pre mound soil. None were found. This was surprising considering the large number of pits found under the mound at the Beaverdam Creek site, 9Eb85 (Rudolph and Hally 1985). It seems that there was very little, if any, occupation at Scull Shoals before Mound B was begun. The presence of a dark pre mound topsoil indicates that the builders probably did not strip any existing village midden away before the first mound was built. The crew did place a posthole test in the bottom of the exposed pre mound to test for deeper cultural strata, but none were present.

### **Stage I**

Level 37 represents the initial mound stage of Mound B. It was made from various shades of fine gray sand, which were probably obtained from close to the river. The height of this first mound was only about 75 centimeters and it was quite flat on top. A small amount of gray and orange clay was also used in the construction of the mound (Levels 38 and 39). The outer edge of the mound was sloped fairly steeply down to the village level.

A thin (2 to 3 centimeter) layer of brown sand was present over most of the summit of the first mound stage. This is represented by Level 36 on the profile. This may represent the remains of a structure. If so, it was apparently not burned, as neither daub nor charcoal was associated with the floor. Also, no postholes were found on this profile, although a possible one was located on the small southern profile of Excavation Unit 2 at this same level. No sherds directly associated with this thin floor were recovered. Level 35 was a thin level of fine gray sand




Figure 21.

covering the floor level near its outer edge. It may represent more of the floor of the first structure, but this is unclear.

## **Stage II**

The second mound stage is represented on the profile by Level 25. This mound was smaller than the first one in both height and diameter. This mound stage varies from 40 to 55 centimeters in height and was apparently the same size as the possible structure on top of the first mound stage. The material used to construct this mound stage was also different from that of the first mound, consisting of bright orange and brown clays. The color differences between the first two mound stages are striking.

Defining the structure on the summit of Mound Stage II is not easily done. As can be seen on the profile, the top of the fill of this mound is very uneven, particularly on the southern end of the profile. At that point Levels 21 through 24 form a confusing assortment of layers, none of which forms a clear floor level. Level 22 does have some charcoal and there are bits of charcoal scattered through most of these layers.

Further, there are a number of confusing levels outside the body of the second mound on its down sloping outer edge. These include Levels 19, 26, 27, and 29. Level 27, in particular, is formed of heavily banded, water-laid fine sands that are mostly brown in color. The other levels are brown sands of a less distinctly banded nature. These banded sands could have been laid down in two possible ways. First, they may represent sands that washed down the outside slope of Mound Stage II during its occupation over an extended period of time. While this may be possible, another option, which also helps to explain the confusing nature of the top of the mound, also presents itself. This is the possibility that the water-laid sands and the disturbance on the top of Mound Stage II are the result of a major flood of the Oconee River that caused severe damage to the mound while it was still in use.

This hypothetical flood would have disturbed or destroyed the floor level of the structure on the mound summit and washed in all the sands that were deposited on the slope of the mound. This would also help explain Levels 40 and 41, which were on the lower outer edge of the entire mound. Level 40 contains some charcoal and fired clay, however, and may simply be material thrown out from either the structure on Mound Stages I or II.

Levels 31 and 32 are essentially the same level and are interesting in light of this discussion of a possible devastating flood. First, these levels are of a very tough yellow-orange clay that would be resistant to erosion compared to the sands in Mound Stage I over which it was placed. They are also stratigraphically above Level 27 as can be seen on the profile and were thus placed on the mound some time after the hypothetical flood during the period of use of Mound Stage II. One interpretation for Levels 31/32 is that they were placed on the edge of the mound as an aid to control erosion on the mound or to aid in the repair of it after the possible flood.

## **Stage III**

The top of Levels 31/32 appear to have been truncated and are buried beneath the next mound stage, Level 20. Level 18 is actually the same as Level 20, the former simply has a bit of loose charcoal scattered through it and the latter does not. Both levels consist of mixed gray and brown sands. The thickness of Mound Stage III varies from 15 to 55 centimeters, with an average of about 40 centimeters. This stage covers both Mound Stages I and II, but does not extend much

further to the north than Mound Stage I. There are four levels of clean brown sand in the middle of Level 18 that are probably just individual basket loads from different locations used in the construction of this stage. These are Levels 15, 16, 17, and 20.

There is no clear floor or structure visible on the summit of Mound Stage III. In fact, at this point in the mound that there are two separate interpretations about its construction that make it difficult to judge just how many stages are represented in Mound B.

#### **Stage IV**

Above the sand mound formed from Levels 18 and 20, and just identified as Mound Stage III, is another stage formed from Levels 11 and 12. These two levels are both composed of clay and differ only in the relative proportions of gray and orange clays. Levels 13 and 14 are probably basket loads of orange clay that are included in this level.

This mound stage covers almost all the previous stages and it is possible that Stages III and IV were actually built at the same time, the sand level as fill and the clay level as a thick cap designed to hold it in place against erosion. This makes even more sense given the apparent problems the occupants had with erosion on the earlier mound stages. Whether these two stages are really one cannot be decided with certainty until more of the mound is excavated, however. The lack of a visible floor level between the two stages does not conclusively prove that there was not one present. Level 32, on the edge of the mound adjacent to Level 20, contains some daub and charcoal and may represent debris thrown from the top of this mound stage.

Regardless of whether the previous sand and clay levels represent one or two stages of construction, another problem immediately presents itself in the interpretation of Mound B. There is no clear evidence of a house floor on top of clay Level 11/12. Logic says there should be some sort of structure here, but none was evident. To make matters even more confusing, the method of construction of the mound changes drastically above this level.

#### **Stage V**

This new method of adding elevation to the mound centers upon Level 9, a large ridge or bank of clay that slopes in two directions. The clay is mostly of a gray color, but is mixed with some yellow and tan clay. This level comes all the way to the present ground surface on the slope of the mound.

There are similar shaped levels in several other mounds from northern Georgia. In particular, banked levels of this sort are known from the Wilbanks site (9Ck5) in Cherokee County (Sears 1958), the Stubbs Mound (9Bi12) in Bibb County (Williams 1975), and the Beaverdam Creek Mound (9Eb85) in Elbert County (Rudolph and Hally 1985). In all these cases, these banks have been interpreted as part of semi-subterranean earth lodges. The bank would represent clay packed around the base of a slanting roof that comes all the way to the ground. A wall of posts is typically present just inside the bank on the edge of the sunken floor.

At Mound B it is possible that a structure of this sort is present at this level. Level 9 would represent the bank around the structure and the floor level would be represented by the bottom of Level 7. Level 7 is a dark brown humus that would have been used to fill the sunken floor structure during the next stage of construction.

While this scenario is possible, there are some problems with this interpretation. First, there is no clear evidence of a floor level at the bottom of Level 7. It is known that floors of this

type were generally kept clean, but it is dangerous to put much faith in negative evidence. Second, there are no posts through the floor level just inside the bank, Level 9. These might be absent depending on exactly where our profile cut the wall of this possible structure. Finally, the inside wall of the bank is usually fairly straight up and down and not sloping as much as is Level 9 in this profile.

An alternate explanation for the mound structure represented by Levels 7 and 9 has been suggested by Jim Knight (Personal Communication). This explanation, as applied to Mound B, is that both Levels 7 and 9 were part of a single construction stage that first placed a bank of clay around the perimeter of the entire mound and then filled the center of the enclosed area with sand or loam. The supposed reason for this style of construction was to use clay on the outside in order to protect the easily eroded sand or loam placed on the inside. Jack Wynn suggests (Personal Communication) that a similar arrangement was used at Mound B-V-6 at Kaminal-juyu in Guatemala. In that case, the exterior ring was of a sandy clay and the inner material was hard-packed clay. While this method of construction cannot be completely rejected for Scull Shoals Mound B, I tend to support the idea of a semi-subterranean structure for these levels in it, but admit that more excavation will be necessary to decide which option is correct.

### **Stage VI**

No matter which of the above explanations is correct, it is clear that a structure was eventually built on top of Level 7. This is the floor of a burned structure and is represented by Levels 5 and 6 and the posthole labeled Level 8. These remains are part of the same burned and collapsed structure that was evident in the profiles of Excavation Unit 1A, which was discussed earlier. Because it was burned, this floor is the best preserved in the entire mound and would make an important contribution to our knowledge if, at some point in the future, the rest of the structure could be carefully excavated. A very few sherds were recovered from the floor, all apparently Dyar or Iron Horse phase Lamar.

### **Stage VII**

Level 4 is a 20 to 25 centimeter thick layer of gray and orange clay that was placed over the burned structure just discussed and represents the final actual addition to the body of the mound. On top of this level is a thin pinkish/brown layer (Level 2), which is probably the remains of the last structure on the entire mound. The pink color may be the result of burning on this surface, but this is unclear. This level was also present in the profiles in Excavation Unit 1 and was discussed there.

Level 1 represents dirt thrown out from the large potholes on the top of the mound and was probably put there within the last 30 years. On the outer edge of the mound are two levels of red clay alluvium. The larger of these two is Level 10 and represents soil deposited from upstream by flooding over the last 150 years. This is the same alluvium that covers the entire village to a depth of about 1 meter. The red clay of Level 10 goes quite high on Mound B and gives a fair estimate of the height of floods during that time. Level 34 simply represents recent topsoil development in the red clay alluvium. Neither of these levels has anything to tell us about Mound B itself.

Just as with Excavation Unit 1, artifacts were not common in Excavation Unit 2. No animal or plant remains were recovered. A total of only 602 sherds was recovered from this very large unit. These are analyzed in detail in the artifact chapter, but a few comments can be made



here. It appears that the pre-mound levels date to the Savannah period (Scull Shoals phase). This is not too surprising, although the lack of any clear Etowah material is noteworthy. What is surprising is that much of the rest of the mound also is of Savannah date.

Savannah materials are the only ceramics as high as Levels 11 and 12 in Mound B. These are included in the fill primarily rather than on floors, but the lack of Lamar ceramics in the fill of the major portion of the mound strongly implies that most of the construction took place in the Savannah period. It is even possible that Levels 7 and 9 also date to this time. The first clear evidence of later Lamar construction is the burned structure floor shown in the profile as Levels 5 and 6 and located only about 35 centimeters below the original surface of the mound. This Lamar structure appears to be a Dyar or Iron Horse phase structure and dates to perhaps a century or more after the last Savannah construction. The evidence for this gap in the construction of Mound B is purely ceramic, however, and cannot be detected on the profile itself. It is still possible that larger excavations will negate this idea of abandonment and reuse, but for now the former interpretation must stand.

In summary, then, Mound B appears to be almost exclusively a Savannah period mound, which had a small Lamar addition to its summit, probably after some years of abandonment. It is surprising that no evidence of burial was found, but I believe it still likely that burials, possibly elaborate ones, are present in this mound. The Savannah period was the period of peak use of Southeastern Ceremonial Complex artifacts and, as Rudolph and Hally (1985) have recently pointed out, the small mounds at several Savannah sites in the Georgia Piedmont often contain these artifacts.

There were no faunal or floral remains found in the mound. This is probably not due to poor preservation. The top of this mound is never submerged in winter floods as is the rest of the village (where the faunal preservation is poor indeed). There is much faunal material on the summit of Mound A and preservation characteristics should be no different for the summit of Mound B. Mound B was not used as a place to feed anyone and was more likely the location of a Temple rather than the residence of the chief of Scull Shoals.

## MOUND A EXCAVATIONS

Just as on Mound B, two excavation units were placed in Mound A. Both of these units were smaller than their counterparts on Mound B, however. They also were designed to answer slightly different questions.

The first unit, designated Excavation Unit 3, was located on the summit of the large mound. It is uncertain if any of the top of this mound is undisturbed. There are large and obvious potholes on the summit (Figure 22), but these may have been dug through even older potholes. The archaeological work needed to define the remnants of any possible structures on this badly disturbed summit would be considerable. This was not pursued in the 1985 season due to lack of time. I did, however, want to recover a sample of artifacts from the top of the mound, whether from intact parts of the summit or not. Excavation Unit 3 was a single 2 meter square designed to do just that.

The second area of excavation on Mound A, and the last initiated in the 1985 season, was a single 2 meter square placed on the edge of Mound A just above its base at its northeastern edge. This pit, designated Excavation Unit 4, was designed to intercept a possible garbage dump there that would help greatly in understanding the chronology of the occupation at Scull Shoals. Both this unit and Excavation Unit 3 were successful in their intended goals.

### Excavation Unit 3 (1985)

This was by far the simplest excavation unit from the 1985 summer's work. It consisted of a single 2 by 2 meter square on the summit of Mound A. The location for the pit was chosen in one of the few areas that was relatively free of obvious recent potholes. The location was just west of a large pothole in the center of the top and grid southwest of the exact center of the mound (Figure 22). The pit was placed immediately adjacent to the sloped and eroding pothole at that location. The sloping side of the pothole was thus on the eastern side of the excavation unit. This sloping area on the east of the square was excavated before the square itself to produce a vertical wall on the eastern side of the square that was intended to be a stratigraphic guide for the excavations. The Eastern Extension was 2 meters wide and was extended 1 meter to the east where it leveled off with the bottom of the existing pothole (Plate 8).

Excavation Unit 3 was placed in this location without regard for the site grid orientation. The pit turned out to be oriented 5 degrees east of grid north. The calculated locations for the four corners of the 2 by 2 meter pit in the grid system are as follows.

<b>Corner</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>West</b>
Southeast	522.15	480.00
Southwest	522.35	482.00
Northwest	524.35	481.80
Northeast	524.10	479.80

The initial profile in the eastern extension of the eastern side of Excavation Unit 3 was disappointing. There was but a single level to a depth of 50 centimeters. This consisted of a very dark brown to black loamy humus with very little color variation. The soil from the Eastern




Figure 22.

extension was all screened through 1/4 inch mesh hardware cloth. Artifacts, mainly potsherds, were plentiful.

The main part of Excavation Unit 3 was excavated in arbitrary 10 centimeter levels and was excavated to a final depth of 50 centimeters. There was no profile development on any of the three standing walls of the unit. All the soil in the pit was of the same dark brown to black midden and was very rich in artifacts and animal bones. The soil was first dry screened through 1/4 inch mesh hardware cloth. Because there were so many small daub pieces shot through the midden it was very difficult to complete dry screening of the fill. Thus, the residue in the screen after initial dry screening was transported to the Oconee River to the north of the site and water screened through 1/16 inch mesh window screen.

There were no features showing in the bottom of the unit at the 50 centimeter level and the black midden appeared to go deeper into the mound. The most striking result of these limited excavations on the top of Mound A was the large quantity of midden present. This mound was relatively filthy compared to the extremely clean Mound B. The ceramics from this excavation were all the late Lamar Dyar phase. Almost no Bell phase ceramics were found. Much animal bone was recovered, however. While this has not been analyzed by a zooarchaeologist for this report, it appears that a high proportion of turkey bone is present in the collection. The large quantity of daub in the midden must be from a final burned structure on Mound A, but no other direct evidence of this structure was found in unit 3. It is unknown whether this is because the structure has been destroyed by vandalism or whether the excavations were too shallow to define any part of the final building on the summit.

#### **Excavation Unit 4 (1985)**

The last excavation pit at Scull Shoals during the 1985 season was located on the northeastern edge of Mound A. The reason for placing this pit here was to intersect suspected layers of garbage. Marvin Smith found a thick layer of garbage at that location on the nearby Dyar Mound (Smith 1981). Further, a large garbage dump was located on the northeastern edge of the mound at the Tugalo site (9St1) (Williams and Branch 1979). In the 1983 season the crew placed a few tests with a posthole digger on the northeastern edge of Mound A at Scull Shoals (Williams 1983:15, 36). These tests tended to support the idea that a garbage dump was in this location at this site also. Thus, in order to refine the chronology for Scull Shoals, as well as this region of the Oconee Valley, I decided to place a test pit at this location in the 1985 season.

Excavation Unit 4 was placed on the steep northeastern slope of Mound A. The pit was placed so it would be perpendicular to the mound side at that point. This meant that the pit could not be oriented with the site grid. The exact location of the pit with reference to the grid was determined by measuring from Excavation Unit 6 for the 1983 season (Williams 1983:33). The stakes for that pit were still in place after the two year interval and provided firm points of reference for Excavation Unit 4. The locations for the four corners of this excavation are as follows.

<b>Corner</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>West</b>
Southeast	539.70	464.75
Southwest	539.05	466.60
Northwest	540.95	467.30
Northeast	541.60	465.40



Plate 8. Excavation Unit 3 (1985), Mound A.



Plate 9. Excavation Unit 4 (1985), Mound A.

This placed the pit at an angle of 20 degrees to the west of grid north. Because the slope of the mound was so great at this point (ca. 35 degrees), the pit was laid out using line levels and plumb bobs so that it measured 2 by 2 meters with reference to the horizontal plane. This meant that the on-the-ground initial east-west measurement was greater than 2 meters. The actual measurement was 2.35 meters. In this way, the pit was two by 2 meters when it reached a horizontal level deep in the pit.

Excavation began by removing 10 centimeter levels at the steep angle of the mound in order to maintain artifact recovery according to presumed natural levels down the slope of the mound. As was anticipated, the work was very difficult. It became increasingly difficult to stand at this steep angle and do effective shovel work. After 40 centimeters deep I modified our excavation strategy somewhat in order to overcome this problem. The floor of the pit in its higher, western third, was flattened to horizontal to create a flat surface upon which the excavator could stand. Work on the eastern two-thirds of the pit could then be continued at the natural slope of the mound by cutting slanted 10 centimeter levels while standing on the flat digging platform.

After two or three angled 10 centimeter cuts were made from the digging platform, its width was reduced to the point where it was inadequate to stand upon. When that point was reached, a new and deeper horizontal platform was cut. The screened artifacts from this new cut were bagged as Digging Platform 2 and new 10 centimeter sloping cuts were again made to the east of the platform. A total of six digging platforms was made, one on top of the other, before the crew reached the premound midden and were able to flatten the floor of the pit completely into a normal excavation. This technique of using digging platforms worked well as a compromise between ease of excavation and the accurate recovery of artifacts by natural, strongly sloping, stratigraphic levels.

We began the screening of Excavation Unit 4 using 1/4 inch mesh hardware cloth. Because the soil was quite gummy and filled with much daub, the crew was forced to switch to 1/2 inch screen for most of the pit. They did switch back to 1/4 inch mesh screen when they reached the sandy, easily screened deposits of the premound midden. In the artifact section it is clear that more material was recovered from the premound, but this is not due to the difference in screen size. The soil from the digging platforms was screened and bagged separately from the main 10 centimeter levels because these contained material from more than one level.

This unit was of much greater depth to sterile soil than was anticipated (Plate 9). The depth of the deposits along the eastern wall of the excavation was 268 centimeters below the surface while the depth on the high western wall was 385 centimeters. The water table was not reached in the pit during the 1985 season. To ensure that the excavations were indeed to sterile soil at this lowest level, a single 20 centimeter diameter posthole test was placed in the northeastern quadrant of the pit floor (33 centimeters from the eastern wall and 33 centimeters from the northern wall). This test was taken down an additional 55 centimeters to a total depth below the eastern wall surface of 323 centimeters. The soil quickly changed from a very fine medium brown sandy silt to a hard orange clay in this posthole test. No artifacts or evidence of cultural activity were found in the test and it is assumed that the excavations were indeed through all the cultural deposits. There were no post molds or pits in the premound sterile soil.

Profiles were drawn for the sloping southern wall (Figure 23) and the high western wall (Figure 24). Counting both of these two adjacent profiles, a total of 38 separate natural

stratigraphic levels and pockets was recognized. These are numbered on these figures from the ground surface down. The levels are not all present on either profile.

While the exact interpretation of all 38 of these levels is not completely clear, the basic outline is. The easiest profile to interpret is the high western one (Figure 24). The outer edges of six successive stages appear to be visible in that profile. A sequence of sandy premound village layers underlay the lowest of these artificial mound stages. It appears from Figure 23 that for the final layers of the mound, the diameter of the mound as a whole was only barely increased. It was made taller than wider. The following chart lists possible mound stages from the bottom up and equates them with numbered levels on the profiles. These stage numbers are not those for the mound as a whole, but just those at the outer edge of the mound.

<b>Mound Stage</b>	<b>Level</b>
I	30
II	27
III	24
IV	16
V	9
VI	4

It is difficult to assess the relative sizes of these mound stages because of the location of the pit at the edge of the mound. Mound Stage I, for instance, is the smallest, but all that can be seen of it is its very outside edge. Mound Stage II is almost as thick as the final stage, Mound VI. It may be a more substantial addition to the mound, but even this is not certain. There were thin sections of garbage and construction debris on the top of Mound Stage III (Level 19) and Mound Stage V (Level 8). These contained burned house daub and charcoal. This may indicate rebuilding of summit structures without actually building a new stage. The surface of most of the mound stages are fairly even, but Mound Stage VI is very irregular. This may indicate erosion of this mound summit during its period of use. Level I represents fairly recent erosion off of the upper slopes of the existing final mound stage.

The names of the mound stages are perhaps a bit misleading since Stage I is certainly not the earliest mound stage in the whole mound. It is simply the earliest in our test pit at this location on the edge of the mound. It may be years before anything of earlier stages in this huge mound is known. Indeed, the six mound stages may actually turn out to be a different number when and if larger excavations are ever performed.

Eight natural levels are recorded in the premound village on Figure 24. They consisted of various grades and colors of sand and silt and are labeled Levels 31 through 38 on Figure 24. The lowest of these, Level 38, was a very coarse sand with much pottery included. It is not clear how much of the premound midden is intact and how much of it was mixed by cultural and natural forces before they were covered by the edges of the later mound stages. It does appear that they were subject to at least some mixing due to water action, possibly from floods of the Oconee River. In particular, Levels 34, 35, and 36 all include what appears to be water laid banding of the sand particles. It may be that these layers represent erosion off of the sides of mound stages that are buried further toward the center of the mound than the location of our pit. The sterile soil in the

bottom of the pit was very fine medium-brown sandy silt. There were no features or posts visible in this soil.

Figure 23, the sloping southern profile of the unit, was more difficult to interpret directly. With the help of Figure 24, however, most of this complex profile can be understood. The main mound stages defined on Figure 24 can be traced to the adjacent profile, although they become thin very quickly at the edge of the mound.

This profile is complicated by the presence of many thin layers that interleave with the edges of the various mound stages. These thin layers are composed of burned house daub, charcoal, food remains, stone tools, and broken ceramic vessels and tobacco pipes. All this probably represents garbage and house debris thrown down the side of the mound during each stage of mounds use. Obviously, the material from these stratified garbage deposits forms a very important chronological data base--one of the best in all northern Georgia.

There is no garbage level on top of Stage I of the mound construction (Level 30). This may be because so little of this stage is present. There may be garbage on the slopes of the stage further into the body of the mound from our excavation. All the rest of the stages above this one however, have some garbage on their slopes.

Levels 25 and 26 form a garbage layer on the slope of Mound Stage II (Level 27). It averages just under 10 centimeters in thickness. These two levels differ in the presence of more dark brown loam in Level 25 than Level 26. Both have much daub and charcoal.

The garbage layer on top of the slope of Mound Stage III (Level 24) consists of Levels 19 and 23. Mound IV is somewhat confusing in Figure 24, but probably is to be defined with a combination of named levels. In addition to Level 16, Levels 17, 18, 20, 21, and 22 also collectively form part of the disturbed outer edge of Mound IV. Why the edge of this mound stage should be so confused is not known, but it may have to do with erosion.

The garbage layer on top of Mound Stage IV is also confusing and is here interpreted as consisting of Levels 10 through 15. Most of these levels have daub. These distinct layers of daub probably represent different episodes of garbage deposition or house rebuilding during the life of Mound Stage IV.

Above these levels, the garbage dump and mound stages become more mixed and confusing. While it is clear that Level 9 is equated with Mound Stage V all the way to the western side of Figure 24, Level 6 above it appears to be a mixture of a garbage dump on top of Mound Stage V and the body of Mound Stage VI. There was some daub and charcoal in Level 6. Level 4 near the surface of the southern profile is clearly associated with Mound Stage VI, but Level 3, which it grows out of, has more charcoal and is probably best interpreted as a mixture of Mound Stage VI and garbage on its surface.

Level 2 represents red clay alluvium that was deposited over this area by flooding during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Poor upland land management during that time of heavy cotton farming caused much erosion and concomitant deposition in Piedmont flood plains (Trimble 1974). Level 1 represents very recent (<30 years?) erosion off of the side slopes of the mound above the excavation unit.

The premound sand layers under Mound Stage I seen in Figure 24 are only five in number. These are Levels 31, 32, 34, 37, and 38. The same comments about these levels made in the discussion of Figure 24 apply here. The few levels on the profiles not mentioned in this description, but numbered on the profiles, are just small pockets that were probably parts of other



levels. No post molds or features were noted on any of the profiles, although one of the posthole tests made in 1983 appeared on the northern portion of the eastern profile of Excavation Unit 4.

In summary, the edges of six (more or less) mound stages were revealed in this excavation unit. One of the stages had no garbage on its surface, three had clear garbage pile on them and two had mixed, but probable garbage piles on their slopes. There were no features found in the pit. The thick pre-mound sands date to an uncertain amount of time before Mound Stage I. I cannot accurately estimate the total number of stages in Mound A based upon the tests in this pit, but there may be as many as 15 or 20. The thick deposits, as well as the good natural stratigraphy in this unit, make it an important one for refining the chronology of the Scull Shoals section of the Piedmont Oconee Valley.




Figure 23.




Figure 24.

## MOUND ARTIFACTS (1985)

The four different units excavated in the 1985 season at Scull Shoals produced widely varying quantities of artifacts. Essentially, those on Mound B (Units 1 and 2) produced relatively few materials and those from Mound A (Units 3 and 4) produced much material. The units from the summits of the mounds (Units 1 and 3) will not yield information of direct stratigraphic importance because of their relatively shallow depths and the heavily disturbed nature of their tops. The materials from these two excavations are, therefore, useful simply to define the types of ceramics used during the last stage of each mound.

Excavation Unit 2 yielded very interesting stratigraphy, but because most of it was revealed by clearing a large pothole, not many artifacts were recovered in good context. Enough was recovered in context to provide much useful information, however.

From the point of view of the stratigraphic recovery of substantial quantities of artifacts, Excavation Unit 4 was clearly richer than any of the pits. Indeed, Excavation Unit 4 represents one of the deepest and richest stratigraphic tests ever dug in the state of Georgia. Strata of this sort are known from only a very few sites. Because of the importance of Excavation Unit 4, it will be analyzed first. It will be followed by analysis of Excavation Unit 3, the other unit on Mound A and then Excavation Units 2 and 1 on Mound B. The artifact provenience numbers were continued from the 1983 season and are as follows: Excavation Unit 1 (Provenience 12), Excavation Unit 2 (Provenience 9), Excavation Unit 3 (Provenience 10), Excavation Unit 4 (Provenience 11).

## CERAMICS

### Excavation Unit 4 (Provenience 11)

A total of 67 lot numbers was assigned within this unit. All these but four had some potsherds. For the 63 lots with pottery a total of 8250 sherds was recovered, exclusive of pottery discs, pipe fragments, and other odd ceramic items. These sherds are broken down by type, for rim and body sherds, and listed according to lot numbers in Table 9. The lot numbers are referenced to the lot number descriptions in Appendix 1.

Table 10 was created from Table 9 by combining lots into levels. The lots from the digging platforms were eliminated from this analysis. The levels in this chart are not stratigraphic ones, but represent arbitrary 10 centimeter levels in the deep pit. The features in the pit are simply piles of daub and garbage and are included here as levels. The middle levels are slightly under represented because of the separate excavation of the digging platforms, but there was no easy way to integrate these data.

There is a total of 18 levels of mound fill represented in Table 10. Below this are eight levels of premound village deposits. These are labeled PM1, PM2, etc. on the table. Rim and body sherds also have been combined in this analysis. A total of 7921 sherds was thus available for analysis in the 26 defined levels in Excavation Unit 4.

A total of 6104 or 77.1 percent of all the sherds in the pit came from the premound levels. This means that the data for all the six mound levels analyzed amounts to only 1817 sherds or 22.9 percent of the total. The predominance of the premound in the sherd counts is actually caused by the final three 10 centimeter levels before sterile

**Table 9. Excavation Unit 4 Ceramics (1985), by Lots**

Table 9	Plain		Burnished Plain		Red Filmed Plain		Unidentified Stamped		Rectilinear Stamped		Curvilinear Stamped		Check Stamped		Fine Incised		Medium Incised		Bold Incised		Stamped & Incised		Punctated		Cord Marked		Cob Marked		Brushed		Simple Stamped		Sub Totals		Totals
Lot	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	
1	6	88	0	0	0	0	1	19	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	112	119	
2	7	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	46	53	
3	6	83	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	6	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	103	110		
4	9	132	0	0	0	0	1	24	0	1	0	5	0	0	1	0	1	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	1	0	18	168	186	
5	16	181	0	0	0	0	0	30	0	4	0	6	1	2	1	0	0	1	4	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	227	249		
6	0	70	0	1	0	0	0	12	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	6	86	92
7	12	126	0	3	0	0	1	32	0	6	0	7	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	181	194
8	3	99	0	3	0	0	3	18	0	7	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	134	141	
9	6	145	0	0	0	0	0	31	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	187	195	
10	17	127	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	7	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	168	186	
11	0	38	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	51	53	
12	2	15	0	1	0	0	0	9	0	1	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	35	37	
13	5	88	0	1	0	0	0	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	123	130		
14	0	32	0	0	0	0	1	18	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	59	60	
15	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	14	
16	2	16	0	0	0	0	0	19	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	42	46	
17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
19	2	12	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	4	0	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	40	43		
20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 9	Plain		Burnished Plain		Red Filmed Plain		Unidentified Stamped		Rectilinear Stamped		Curvilinear Stamped		Check Stamped		Fine Incised		Medium Incised		Bold Incised		Stamped & Incised		Punctated		Cord Marked		Cob Marked		Brushed		Simple Stamped		Sub Totals		Totals
	Lot	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body		
21	1	6	0	1	0	0	0	6	0	4	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	22	
22	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	
23	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	9	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	49	
24	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1		
25	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3		
26	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	13		
27	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	10		
28	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	9		
29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1		
30	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5		
31	2	21	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	30	32			
32	4	27	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	31	36			
33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1			
34	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2			
35	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	9			
36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
37	0	35	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	42		
38	2	116	0	7	0	1	2	14	0	4	0	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	151	155		
39	5	132	0	1	0	0	2	21	0	3	0	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	163	170			
40	11	153	0	3	0	0	1	39	0	4	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	12	209	221			
41	6	118	0	2	0	1	2	27	1	5	0	9	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	9	170	179			
42	6	72	0	6	0	3	3	31	2	5	1	11	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	12	135	147			
43	14	91	0	9	0	3	13	59	2	23	1	25	0	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	30	222	252			
44	12	82	1	20	0	0	13	51	1	27	2	18	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	29	203	232			

Table 9	Plain		Burnished Plain		Red Filmed Plain		Unidentified Stamped		Rectilinear Stamped		Curvilinear Stamped		Check Stamped		Fine Incised		Medium Incised		Bold Incised		Stamped & Incised		Punctated		Cord Marked		Cob Marked		Brushed		Simple Stamped		Sub Totals		Totals
	Lot	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	
45	9	70	0	7	0	1	8	25	0	6	0	12	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	17	126	143	
46	18	122	3	20	0	4	13	59	1	18	0	14	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	253	288	
47	9	62	0	5	0	0	1	13	1	4	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	93	104		
48	11	68	0	6	0	0	3	35	0	11	1	11	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	16	135	151		
49	7	125	1	17	0	3	1	31	0	2	1	2	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	12	187	199		
50	12	78	0	23	0	0	8	37	1	2	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	21	149	170		
51	17	150	2	19	0	1	7	37	0	12	0	13	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	236	264		
52	20	139	0	18	2	2	1	35	2	3	0	4	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	210	236		
53	24	106	2	12	0	0	1	38	0	1	0	2	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	27	170	197	
54	13	163	4	17	0	2	1	44	1	6	1	15	0	11	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	258	279		
55	16	187	0	6	0	0	1	52	0	6	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	17	259	276		
56	5	62	0	12	0	0	8	16	2	13	0	6	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	15	113	128		
57	18	170	5	13	0	1	8	40	1	3	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	33	233	266	
58	15	110	1	23	0	1	5	33	1	24	0	31	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	237	259		
59	16	100	1	25	1	3	22	29	0	18	0	11	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	40	194	234		
60	6	132	1	17	0	2	14	27	0	11	0	9	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	22	207	229	
61	4	58	3	16	0	0	0	8	0	13	0	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	7	106	113		
62	8	85	4	31	1	0	1	25	0	30	2	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	16	180	196		
63	12	85	2	12	1	0	2	25	1	8	0	5	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	139	157		
64	9	151	3	53	0	1	0	39	3	24	1	16	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	7	0	0	0	0	16	303	319		
65	20	72	3	34	0	5	0	33	0	18	1	16	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	26	184	210		
66	20	151	3	20	1	0	3	30	1	19	0	17	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	29	247	276		
67	7	18	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	2	0	6	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	7	44	51		
Totals	454	4659	39	464	6	34	154	1316	21	391	13	389	7	148	4	1	3	12	16	38	0	1	7	14	1	25	1	25	1	0	5	1	732	7518	8250

**Table 10. Excavation Unit 4 Ceramics (1985), by Levels**

Table 10	Plain		Burnished Plain		Red Filmed Plain		Unidentified Stamped		Rectilinear Stamped		Curvilinear Stamped		Check Stamped		Fine Incised		Medium Incised		Bold Incised		Punctated		Stamped / Incised		Cord Marked		Cob Marked		Brushed		Simple Stamped		Totals	
	Level	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1	231	81.9	0	0	0	0	31	11	8	2.8	5	1.8	0	0	0	0	3	1.1	3	1.1	1	0.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	282	3.6
2	141	75.8	0	0	0	0	25	13.4	1	0.5	5	2.7	0	0	1	0.5	3	1.6	5	2.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1.6	1	0.5	1	0.5	186	2.3
3	197	79.1	0	0	0	0	30	12	4	1.6	6	2.4	3	1.2	1	0.4	1	0.4	6	2.4	0	0	1	0.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	249	3.1
4	208	72.7	4	1.4	0	0	45	15.7	8	2.8	8	2.8	1	0.3	1	0.3	1	0.3	4	1.4	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	286	3.6	
5	151	77.4	0	0	0	0	31	15.9	1	0.5	4	2.1	0	0	0	0	1	0.5	5	2.6	1	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.5	195	2.5	
6	144	77.4	0	0	0	0	20	10.8	7	3.8	7	3.8	0	0	0	0	1	0.5	7	3.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	186	2.3
7	93	71.5	1	0.8	0	0	31	23.8	0	0	1	0.8	0	0	0	0	1	0.8	3	2.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130	1.6
8	32	53.3	0	0	0	0	19	31.7	1	1.7	5	8.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.7	0	0	0	0	60	0.8
9	18	39.1	0	0	0	0	19	41.3	0	0	7	15.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	0.6
10	14	32.6	0	0	0	0	16	37.2	4	9.3	5	11.6	1	2.3	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	0.5
11	4	66.7	0	0	0	0	1	16.7	1	16.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0.1
12	13	26.5	0	0	0	0	17	34.7	9	18.4	9	18.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	49	0.6
13	1	33.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	33.3	1	33.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0.0
14	5	38.5	0	0	0	0	3	23.1	1	7.7	1	7.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	23.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0.2
15	4	40	0	0	0	0	4	40	1	10	0	0	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0.1
16	2	40	0	0	0	0	1	20	1	20	1	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0.1
17	23	71.9	0	0	0	0	5	15.6	2	6.3	2	6.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	0.4
18	31	86.1	0	0	0	0	4	11.1	0	0	1	2.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	0.5
PM1	161	77	7	3.3	1	0.5	23	11	5	2.4	10	4.8	1	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.5	0	0	0	0	209	2.6	
PM2	137	80.6	1	0.6	0	0	23	13.5	3	1.8	5	2.9	1	0.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	170	2.1
PM3	164	74.2	3	1.4	0	0	40	18.1	4	1.8	9	4.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	221	2.8	
PM4	124	69.3	2	1.1	1	0.6	29	16.2	6	3.4	9	5	4	2.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.6	3	1.7	0	0	0	0	0	179	2.3
PM5	78	53.1	6	4.1	3	2	34	23.1	7	4.8	12	8.2	4	2.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.7	2	1.4	0	0	0	0	147	1.9	



Table 10	Plain		Burnished Plain		Red Filmed Plain		Unidentified Stamped		Rectilinear Stamped		Curvilinear Stamped		Check Stamped		Fine Incised		Medium Incised		Bold Incised		Punctated		Stamped / Incised		Cord Marked		Cob Marked		Brushed		Simple Stamped		Totals	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
PM6	568	48.5	71	6.1	8	0.7	293	25	94	8	90	7.7	34	2.9	0	0	1	0.1	2	0.2	3	0.3	0	0	3	0.3	3	0.3	0	0	0	0	1170	14.8
PM7	1691	61.8	219	8	18	0.7	496	18.1	109	4	110	4	67	2.4	2	0.1	0	0	1	0	9	0.3	0	0	6	0.2	8	0.3	0	0	1	0	2737	34.6
PM8	675	53.1	184	14.5	9	0.7	166	13.1	117	9.2	66	5.2	36	2.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0.3	0	0	14	1.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1271	16.0
Totals	4910	62	498	6.3	40	0.5	1406	17.8	395	5	379	4.8	153	1.9	5	0.1	12	0.2	46	0.6	21	0.3	1	0	26	0.3	22	0.3	1	0	6	0.1	7921	

soil was reached, PM6, PM7, and PM8. These three levels account for 5178 sherds or 65.4 percent of all the sherds from the pit. Why there should be so much more ceramic remains in the lowest levels of the village deposits in this area is unknown. Although Excavation Unit 4 from the 1985 season was even richer, the same pattern was found in Excavation Unit 6 in the 1983 work. Quite clearly, this area of the site is the best area outside the mounds proper to learn of the early period of occupation at the site.

The ceramics from these rich lower levels of the pre mound midden are clearly of the Savannah period and are significantly different from the Lamar materials higher in the pit (Plates 10-15). The differences will be made clearer shortly when the rim sherds are analyzed separately by style from the rest of the sherds.

Some of the ceramic types identified in the collection show large variation in proportions from the bottom of the pit to the top and some show little variation. Much of the patterned changes seen clearly in these data were already known or suspected from excavations at many sites in northern Georgia and the Oconee Valley. Because of its depth and richness it is a particularly useful pit to verify and expand our knowledge of the sequence of Lamar and pre-Lamar cultures in the Oconee Valley.

In classifying the plain pottery from the unit, I avoided the use of the rough plain category used by Smith (1981) at the nearby Dyar mound. Although there certainly were sherds in the collection that could have fit into this category, the difficulty of consistency in separating burnished plain, regular plain, rough plain, and unidentified stamped sherds made simplification necessary. *Unidentified stamped* refers to the many stamped sherds that were too lightly or poorly stamped to define them even as *rectilinear stamped* or *curvilinear stamped*. Classification using just *burnished plain*, *plain*, and *unidentified stamped* categories was not even simple. All sherds were examined by a low angle 300 watt quartz-iodine lamp to refine initial separation into these three categories.

Because the middle levels of the unit often contained very few sherds (even counting the digging platforms), the counts from some of these were combined to avoid the problems low sherd counts produce in terms of percentages. The collapsed data are presented here in Table 11 and provides the basis for the following discussion.

With the exception of the collapsed middle levels of the pit, the proportion of plain pottery in the lowest five levels of the pre mound are less than 70 percent and the upper pre mound and mound levels are above 70 percent. Level 1 has the highest percentage of plain pottery, 81.9 percent. The upper three levels of the pre mound are more similar to the mound levels than the lower part of the pre mound in terms of plain pottery percentages. Overall, 4910 or 67.3 percent of the sherds from Excavation Unit 4 were plain.

*Burnished plain* pottery forms a small, but significant percentage of the ceramics only in the four deepest pre mound midden levels. The greatest percentage is in the lowest level and amounts to some 14.5 percent of the sherds in that level. The proportion decreases steadily above that point. There are small amounts of burnished plain pottery in all the rest of the pre mound levels also. This pottery is probably best thought of as Savannah Burnished Plain and apparently is restricted to and helps define the early occupation of Scull Shoals. At the Dyar mound, Smith found burnished pottery in almost all levels of his Provenience 11 and it varied from 5 to 9 percent from bottom to top (Smith 1981:137). It is possible that differences in identification may account for the differences between Scull Shoals and Dyar with respect to burnished plain.




Plate 10. Ceramics Excavation Unit 4 (1985), Premound.



Plate 11. Ceramics Excavation Unit 4 (1985), Premound.



Plate 12. Ceramics Excavation Unit 4 (1985), Premound.




Plate 13. Ceramics Excavation Unit 4 (1985), Middle Levels.



Plate 14. Ceramics Excavation Unit 4 (1985), Upper Levels.



Plate 15. Ceramics Excavation Unit 4 (1985), Upper Levels.

Level	Plain		Burnished Plain		Filmed Plain		Unidentified Stamped		Rectilinear Stamped		Curvilinear Stamped		Check Stamped		Fine Incised		Medium Incised	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	231	81.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	31	11.0	8	2.8	5	1.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	1.1
2	141	75.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	25	13.4	1	0.5	5	2.7	0	0.0	1	0.5	3	1.6
3	197	79.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	30	12.0	4	1.6	6	2.4	3	1.2	1	0.4	1	0.4
4	208	72.7	4	1.4	0	0.0	45	15.7	8	2.8	8	2.8	1	0.3	1	0.3	1	0.3
5	151	77.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	31	15.9	1	0.5	4	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.5
6	144	77.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	20	10.8	7	3.8	7	3.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.5
7	93	71.5	1	0.8	0	0.0	31	23.8	0	0.0	1	0.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.8
8-11	68	43.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	55	35.5	6	3.9	17	11.0	1	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
12-18	79	53.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	34	23.0	15	10.1	15	10.1	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
PM1	161	77.0	7	3.3	1	0.5	23	11.0	5	2.4	10	4.8	1	0.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
PM2	137	80.6	1	0.6	0	0.0	23	13.5	3	1.8	5	2.9	1	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
PM3	164	74.2	3	1.4	0	0.0	40	18.1	4	1.8	9	4.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
PM4	124	69.3	2	1.1	1	0.6	29	16.2	6	3.4	9	5.0	4	2.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
PM5	78	53.1	6	4.1	3	2.0	34	23.1	7	4.8	12	8.2	4	2.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
PM6	568	48.5	71	6.1	8	0.7	293	25.0	94	8.0	90	7.7	34	2.9	0	0.0	1	0.1
PM7	1691	61.8	219	8.0	18	0.7	496	18.1	109	4.0	110	4.0	67	2.4	2	0.1	0	0.0
PM8	675	53.1	184	14.5	9	0.7	166	13.1	117	9.2	66	5.2	36	2.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
Totals	4910	62.0	498	6.3	40	0.5	1406	17.8	395	5.0	379	4.8	153	1.9	5	0.1	12	0.2

Level	Bold Incised		Punctated		Stamped/ Incised		Cord Marked		Cob Marked		Brushed		Simple Stamped		Totals	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	3	1.1	1	0.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	282	3.6
2	5	2.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	1.6	1	0.5	1	0.5	186	2.3
3	6	2.4	0	0.0	1	0.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	249	3.1
4	4	1.4	3	1.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	1.0	286	3.6
5	5	2.6	1	0.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.5	195	2.5
6	7	3.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	186	2.3
7	3	2.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	130	1.6
8-11	7	4.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	155	2.0
12-18	3	2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	148	1.9
PM1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	209	2.6
PM2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	170	2.1
PM3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	221	2.8
PM4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.6	3	1.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	179	2.3
PM5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7	2	1.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	147	1.9
PM6	2	0.2	3	0.3	0	0.0	3	0.3	3	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1170	14.8
PM7	1	0.0	9	0.3	0	0.0	6	0.2	8	0.3	0	0.0	1	0.0	2737	34.6
PM8	0	0.0	4	0.3	0	0.0	14	1.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1271	16.0
Totals	46	0.6	21	0.3	1	0.0	26	0.3	22	0.3	1	0.0	6	0.1	7921	

**Table 11. Excavation Unit 4 Ceramics (1985), by Levels-Simplified**

As with the burnished plain pottery, *red filmed plain* pottery is restricted to the bottom five levels of the pre mound midden (with a single exception from PM1). The percentage is small and varies from .5 to 2 percent of the sherds by levels. This is greater than the .1 to .4 percent found in the low levels at Dyar (Smith 1981:137). If Smith is correct that the low levels at Dyar represent a late Etowah occupation (Stillhouse phase) then in the slightly later Savannah occupation at Scull Shoals red filmed pottery was more popular. Just as at Dyar mound, it does not seem to occur with the Scull Shoals Lamar occupation.

It is somewhat difficult to compare the stamped pottery from Scull Shoals with that from Dyar mound due to differences in the way they have been classified. At both sites, sherds with obvious rectilinear and curvilinear stamped designs were separated and counted as such. At Dyar, however, the category of unidentified stamped was not used. One possible way to make sherd counts comparable between the sites would be to assume that the unidentified stamped

sherds from Dyar were forced into the rectilinear and curvilinear categories. This does not seem to be quite the case, however. The total proportion of unidentified stamped, rectilinear stamped, and curvilinear stamped sherds from Scull Shoals is consistently greater than at Dyar. This may have to do with the rough plain category used in Dyar analysis. It is likely that some of the sherds placed in this category at Dyar would have been classified as unidentified stamped at Scull Shoals. Unfortunately, even this assumption does not allow the totals to add up.

In variance to what was expected, the proportion of stamped pottery shows relatively little change from bottom to top. Rectilinear stamped sherds are slightly more common in the bottom three levels of the pre mound and then curvilinear is slightly more common in most of the levels above this point, but the differences are never great. In general, the proportion of definable curvilinear and rectilinear designs decreases from bottom to top. The proportion of unidentified stamped varies from 10.8 percent to 35.5 percent and appears to vary unpredictably by level. Probably of most significance in all this is the **lack** of levels that had total stamping of less than 10 percent. Low percentages of stamped pottery represent one of the characteristics of the Duvall phase of early Lamar as defined by Smith (Smith 1981:184).

*Check stamped* pottery is present in most of the levels of the pit, but is far more common in the bottom five levels of the pre mound. This should probably be classified as Savannah Check Stamped because of its association with Savannah Complicated Stamped. The proportion in the deep levels at Scull Shoals is consistently between two and three percent. This is more common than at Dyar, where check stamped is never above one percent in Provenience 11 (Smith 1981:137).

The incised pottery shows patterns by levels that are in agreement with our previous understanding. There are no incised sherds in the pre mound (save three non-Lamar incised sherds in PM7). Beyond that, the *Lamar Bold Incised* pottery varies from 1 to 4 percent in most of the mound levels. Sherds classified as *medium incised* (lines between 1 and 2 millimeters wide) occur in very low quantity beginning in Level 7 and increase in frequency toward the surface. A few *fine incised* sherds (lines less than 1 millimeter) occur in the top levels of the pit. A study of the number of lines on the incised sherds will be presented shortly.

Of great surprise, there was not a single Morgan Incised sherd from the entire pit. This type, first seen at the Joe Bell site (Williams 1983), was determined by Smith to be the marker type for the early Lamar Duvall phase at the Dyar site (Smith 1981:185). Since the Dyar site is only 10 miles to the south, it does not appear likely that its absence is the result of an areal difference in its distribution. The absence of this type may indicate that Scull Shoals was not occupied during the Duvall phase. This is in agreement with the lack of levels with very low proportions of stamped pottery mentioned above. No Morgan Incised sherds were found in the testing of Scull Shoals in 1983 either. It is also clear that there are no small sites near Scull Shoals, particularly to the north, that have Morgan Incised sherds (Personal Communication, Jerald Ledbetter).

The sherds analyzed as *punctated* are actually a small assortment of several different styles, all rare. Those from the bottom levels of the pre mound are fingernail marked, usually under the rim area. They appear to be a consistent but rare (.3 percent) part of the Savannah period component. The punctated sherds from the upper levels of the pit are cane punctated.

The *cord marked* sherds occur only in the deep Savannah levels also. These are marked with very fine string-like marks rather than actual cord marks. The impressions are much finer than on Savannah Fine Cord Marked sherds.

*Corn cob marked* sherds also occur in the deep levels, but interestingly, appear to be most common in PM4. These seem to peak in popularity a bit later than some of the other Savannah types. It is never very common--always less than 2 percent. Crudely *brushed* and nondescript *simple stamped* sherds are present but very rare. The later surprisingly appear to be most common in the higher levels.

### **Rim Sherd Analysis**

The rim sherds from Excavation Unit 4 were classified into a number of forms. The data for these different rim forms grouped according to the levels in the pit are listed in Table 12. A total of 686 rim sherds was recovered. Just as in the main ceramic table, most of the rims are from the bottom three 10 centimeter levels of the pre mound. This amounts to 511 sherds or 74.5 percent of the total.

The major rim form, accounting for 66.9 percent was the simple, unmodified rim. Rolled rims amounted to 22.9 percent of the rims. These were sherds with the lip rolled to the outside and were counted in this category if any break could be seen or felt with the thumbnail just below the lip on the outside of the vessel. Rudolph and Hally (1985) have shown this to be a Savannah trait at the Beaverdam Creek mound. These are certainly more common at Scull Shoals in the lowest levels.

The remainder of the rims represents many different styles of modified rims. Most of these are styles that have traditionally been defined as Lamar rim styles. The thickened rims are similar to the folded rims, but the pinching or notching appears to have been performed on a vessel's top exterior without the addition of an extra strip of clay. The pinching of the vessel surface made the rim area a bit thicker and thus the name.

There are not large enough numbers of the many different styles of modified rims to assign chronological significance with confidence, but a few observations can be made. The folded forms do not occur in the deepest levels of the pre mound and this is consistent with Savannah rim forms (Caldwell 1941). The folded rims occur mostly in the upper levels of the pit. The thickened rims (Rudolph and Hally 1985) occur in the upper levels of the pit in addition to the Savannah levels. In both the folded and thickened categories the pinched category is twice as common as the notched category. Whether this would be true in larger collection is uncertain. The other modified rim forms are too rare to make comment.



**Table 12. Excavation Unit 4 (1985), Rim Sherds by Levels**

Level	Simple	Simple, Punct.	Rosette	Rolled	Rolled, Pinched	Punct.	Thickened, Pinched	Thickened, Notched	Folded Pinched	Folded Notched	Folded Punct.	Notched Lip	L-Type Lip	Totals
1	14	3	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	21
2	12	1	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
3	16	0	0	3	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	23
4	7	2	1	1	0	0	2	2	1	0	2	0	0	18
5	1	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	8
6	6	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	18
7	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	7
8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
9	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
14	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
18	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	5
PM1	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
PM2	1	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	7
PM3	7	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
PM4	7	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
PM5	9	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
PM6	85	2	0	48	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	138
PM7	197	3	0	62	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	267
PM8	75	4	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	106
Totals	459	19	2	153	2	1	17	9	9	9	4	1	1	686

LEVEL	SIMPLE	ROLLED	MODIFIED	TOTALS
1	14	2	5	21
2	12	1	4	17
3	16	3	4	23
4	7	1	10	18
5	1	3	4	8
6	6	2	10	18
7	5	1	1	7
8	1	0	0	1
9	2	0	2	4
10	3	0	0	3
11	0	0	0	0
12	0	0	0	0
13	1	0	0	1
14	3	0	0	3
15	0	0	0	0
16	0	0	0	0
17	0	1	1	2
18	2	0	3	5
PM1	5	0	1	6
PM2	1	2	4	7
PM3	7	2	2	11
PM4	7	2	0	9
PM5	9	2	1	12
PM6	85	48	4	137
PM7	197	62	8	267
PM8	75	24	7	106
TOTALS	459	156	71	686

**Table 13. Excavation Unit 4 (1985), Rim Sherds by Levels**

In order to examine the rim data further Table 13 was created from Table 12 by collapsing all the rolled and modified rim styles into two categories and matching them with the simple rims. The simple unmodified rims are the predominant form in almost all levels. Rolled rims are very common in the three lowest pre-mound levels, but drop to a small percentage above that point. Modified rims, while present in the lowest levels, are rare there. Above that point they become more common than rolled rims by the third level of the pre-mound and continue to be so in the higher levels. The most interesting thing about this data is that there are no levels without a few modified rims and, even more surprisingly, the rolled rims never quite disappear in the upper levels of the pit. It does not seem likely that mixing between the levels is responsible for this pattern.

The simple rims are on the incurving rim cazuela bowls in all levels and on the excruciate rim jars in the lowest levels. The rolled and modified rims are usually of jar rims. Data on the changes in vessel form and size has not been compiled for this report. Most of the sherds in the pit were not large enough to produce a large collection of identifiable vessels, anyway.

### **Stamped Pottery Design Analysis**

The designs on the complicated stamped sherds were identified when possible. Of the 2333 sherds that are complicated stamped and identifiable as to level, 153 or 6.6 percent are check stamped. A total of 60.3 percent (1406) of the sherds was obviously stamped but were either too poorly stamped to identify a design. There were 395 sherds (16.9 percent) that could be identified simply as rectilinear designs and 379 sherds (16.2 percent) that could only be identified as curvilinear. The number of sherds that had definable complicated stamp designs, whether curvilinear or rectilinear, was 108. This represents 4.6 percent of the stamped sherds. Included within these sherds are 28 different designs.

A short code system was developed to apply abbreviated designations to many of the designs defined. This was necessary because there were many variations on the diamond and circle motifs bisected by lines that represent the majority of the designs. This code system is a three part code with each separated by a period. The first part is either a D or a C depending on whether the basic motif is of concentric diamonds or concentric circles.

The second part of the code designates the number of horizontal lines through the diamond or circle and the third part involves the number of vertical lines. The simplest diamond motif with a single line horizontal line and no vertical line, traditionally called a one-bar diamond, is designated D.1.0 in this code system. If there are two or more horizontal lines through a design, it is necessary to code whether or not the lines of the diamond or circle are broken by the bar or not. A two-bar diamond with unbroken lines, usually called a ladder-based diamond, needs a code different from a two-bar diamond in which the lines do not cross. This is coded by a letter placed after the number in the second part of the code. A C is used when the lines cross and an N is used when the lines do not cross. A two-bar ladder based diamond, for instance, would be coded D.2C.0. There are two additional modifier letters that are used in the third part of the code.

**Table 14. Excavation Unit 4 (1985), Designs by Lots (See Appendix 2 for Codes)**

Lot	D.1.0	D.1.1	D.1.1S	D.2N.0	D.2N.1	D.2N.1S	D.2N.1V	D.2N.1SV	D.3N.0	C.1.0	C.1.1	C.1S.1S	C.2N.0	C.2C.0	C.2N.1	C.2N.2N	C.2N.2NV	C.2NS.1S	C.3N.3C	C	LB	F	8	9	Oval	Eye	Key Hole	Circle in Box	Totals	
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
9	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
26	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
40	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
42	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
43	2	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
44	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Lot	D.1.0	D.1.1	D.1.1S	D.2N.0	D.2N.1	D.2N.1S	D.2N.1V	D.2N.1SV	D.3N.0	C.1.0	C.1.1	C.1S.1S	C.2N.0	C.2C.0	C.2N.1	C.2N.2N	C.2N.2NV	C.2NS.1S	C.3N.3C	C	LB	F	8	9	Oval	Eye	Key Hole	Circle in Box	Totals
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
45	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4
46	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	8
48	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
49	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4
50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
51	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
52	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
53	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
54	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
55	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
56	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
57	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	6
58	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

Lot	D.1.0	D.1.1	D.1.1S	D.2N.0	D.2N.1	D.2N.1S	D.2N.1V	D.2N.1SV	D.3N.0	C.1.0	C.1.1	C.1S.1S	C.2N.0	C.2C.0	C.2N.1	C.2N.2N	C.2N.2NV	C.2NS.1S	C.3N.3C	C	LB	F	8	9	Oval	Eye	Key Hole	Circle in Box	Totals
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
59	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
60	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
61	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4
62	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5
64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
65	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
66	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6
Totals	5	1	5	22	11	5	1	1	4	1	2	2	4	1	2	3	1	4	1	1	2	17	3	1	4	1	2	1	108

The first is an S that indicates a short line segment that only crosses the inside diamond in a group of concentric diamonds. The last is a V that indicates that the vertical line (or lines), when present, cross the center horizontal line or lines. Lack of this letter in the third part indicates that the vertical lines are broken by the horizontal lines.

This code system is primarily necessary because the description of the many designs in tabular form requires more room than available. Further, the system is expandable to other diamond and circle motifs that may be found both at Scull Shoals and at other sites in the future. Appendix 2 equates traditional descriptive names with the code designations for those designs or the sherds from Scull Shoals.

In addition to the designs defined using the code system, there are a number of other designs that are simply described. These include Concentric Circles, Line Block, Filfot Cross, Figure 8, Figure 9, Oval, Eye, Keyhole, and Circle in a Box. Table 14 lists all the raw data by Lot Number for all these designs. These designs are included in that table by a simple abbreviation. Table 15 takes the data from Table 14 and recombines it by levels. The bottom three levels of the pre mound (the Savannah levels) account for 96 (89.7 percent) of the identifiable design stamped sherds.

Three designs, which account for 45.8 percent of the total, are far more common than the rest. The first of these is D.2N.0, the two-bar diamond, which accounts for 20.6 percent of the total. These sherds have traditionally been defined as belonging to the Etowah ceramic complex exclusively. At Scull Shoals they obviously persist into the Savannah period. The same is true of D.2N.1, the two-bar cross diamond, which makes up 10.3 percent of the designs. Both of these designs are almost completely associated with the bottom three levels of the pre mound. Most of the sherds with diamond designs are poorly stamped.

The third common design was the Filfot Cross, which accounted for 15.0 percent of the designs. This design is less common in the Savannah levels (by percent) than in the upper levels of the pit. It seems to persist through the entire occupation at Scull Shoals. Beyond the designs mentioned here, the others are all few in number and do not require comment. It is clear that more of the sherds with identifiable designs occur in the Savannah levels. Stamping became increasingly sloppy during the Lamar period and it becomes more and more difficult to define designs in the upper levels.

### **Incised Line Analysis**

The final table used in the analysis of the ceramics from Excavation Unit 4 is Table 16. This table shows the number of incised sherds per level by the number of lines on each sherd regardless of sherd size. Almost all these sherds are small broken sherds that do not present a complete example of the intended design, but a pattern is still clear. There are no incised sherds listed below stratigraphic Level 14, and most are in the top 10 levels. None are listed in the pre mound. As can be seen from the chart the number of lines on the sherds tends to increase as one comes toward the surface, particularly in the top five levels of the pit. This stratigraphically documents what has been suspected for some time by researchers in the Oconee area--that the Lamar people increased the number of lines on their incised vessels from middle to late Lamar times.

Level	D.1.0		D.1.1		D.1.1S		D.2N.0		D.2N.1		D.2N.1S		D.2N.1V		D.2N.1SV		D.3N.0		C.1.0		C.1.1		C.1S.1S		C.2N.0		C.2C.0			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0		
3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0		
5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0		
9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0		
13	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0		
14	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0		
PM1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0		
PM2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0		
PM3	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0		
PM5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0		
PM6	3	12.0	1	4.0	1	4.0	7	28.0	1	4.0	3	1.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.0	0	0.0	0	0.0		
PM7	1	2.0	0	0.0	4	8.0	8	15.0	7	14.0	1	0.2	0	0.0	1	2.0	1	2.0	1	2.0	1	2.0	1	2.0	2	4.0	1	2.0		
PM8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	23.8	3	14.3	1	0.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.8	0	0.0	1	4.8	0	0.0	2	9.5	0	0.0		
Totals	5	4.7	1	0.9	5	4.7	22	20.6	11	10.3	5	0.5	1	0.9	1	0.9	4	3.7	1	0.9	2	1.9	2	1.9	4	3.7	1	0.9		

Level	C.2N.1		C.2N.2N		C.2N.2NV		C.2NS.1S		C.3N.3C		Circle		Line Block		Filfot Cross		Figure 8		Figure 9		Oval		Eye		Keyhole		Circle in Box		Totals	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.9
3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.9
5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.9
9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	1.9
13	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.9
14	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.9
PM1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	1	0.9
PM2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.9
PM3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.9
PM5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.9
PM6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	12.0	2	8.0	0	0.0	2	8.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	25	23.4
PM7	0	0.0	3	6.0	1	2.0	4	8.0	1	2.0	1	2.0	1	2.0	7	14.0	1	2.0	0	0.0	1	2.0	1	2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	50	46.7
PM8	2	9.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.8	2	9.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.8	0	0.0	2	9.5	0	0.0	21	19.6
TOTALS	2	1.9	3	2.8	1	0.9	4	3.7	1	0.9	1	0.9	2	1.9	16	15.0	3	2.8	1	0.9	4	3.7	1	0.9	2	1.9	1	100.0	107	

**Table 15. Excavation Unit 4 (1985), Designs by Levels (See Appendix 2 for Codes)**



Level	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Totals
1	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	5
2	0	3	3	0	2	1	0	0	9
3	1	2	1	1	0	2	0	2	9
4	2	1	7	1	2	0	0	0	13
5	2	0	3	0	2	1	0	0	8
6	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	7
7	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
8	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
10	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PM1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PM2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PM3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PM4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PM5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PM6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PM7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PM8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	13	16	19	4	7	4	0	2	65

**Table 16. Excavation Unit 4 (1985), Number of Incised Lines by Levels**

There seem to be three separable cultural levels in Excavation Unit 4 based upon the different analyses of the ceramics just presented. These consist of: (1) the bottom 30 centimeters of the pre-mound (2) the top 60 centimeters of the pit and (3) everything in between. The implications of these levels in terms of the Oconee chronological sequence will be examined later.

### **Excavation Unit 3 (Provenience 10)**

The ceramic data from Excavation Unit 3 on the top of Mound A is presented in Table 17. There is no attempt to analyze these data by stratigraphic level because it was relatively clear that the soil was heavily disturbed in this part of Mound A and the pit was only 50 centimeters deep. The materials from this unit are best examined as if they were from a single level. With the exception of a few sherds, the pottery from this unit is very similar to that from the top levels of Excavation Unit 4 just described and adds little to our understanding of the late pottery from Scull Shoals.

A total of 1493 sherds was recovered from Excavation Unit 3. The presence of a few red filmed, check stamped, cord marked, and cob marked sherds is probably due to the mixing of earlier sherds from the village with the soil used to construct the final stage of the mound. There are almost no fine incised sherds of the style known to belong to the Bell phase from the top of Mound A.

The summary percentages are as follows: Total Plain--1022 sherds or 68.5 percent; Total Stamped--406 sherds or 27.2 percent; Total Incised--63 or 4.2 percent. There were 40 sherds each of rectilinear and curvilinear stamped, each representing 9.9 percent of the total stamped pottery. The rest of the stamped pottery was unidentifiable to design. A total of 45 bold incised sherds, representing 71.5 percent of the incised sherds, was recovered. Sherds classified as medium width incised were 17 in number (27.0 percent of the incised sherds). These figures indicate a much greater proportion of bold incised sherds than from the Bell phase type site, 9Mg28 (Williams 1983). The main area of that site produced 265 incised sherds that were classified for line width (Williams 1983:207). Of these only 23 or 8.7 percent were bold incised. There were 184 medium incised sherds (69.4 percent) and 23 fine incised sherds (8.7 percent). These figures clearly suggest that the top of Mound A at Scull Shoals was abandoned well before the Bell phase. The present estimate for the beginning of the Bell phase is about A. D. 1590 to 1600. This implies that Mound A was not used after perhaps A. D. 1560 or 1570. The discovery at Scull Shoals in 1983 of a single blue glass bead of probable late sixteenth century Spanish origin implies some use of the site as late as possibly 1570 or 1580. But this must have been at or just after the time that the mound was no longer being used.

The data for the rim sherds from Excavation Unit 3 are presented in Table 18. A total of 97 sherds was analyzed. Of these 60 (61.9 percent) were simple unmodified rims. Eight rolled rims (8.2 percent) were present on the top of the mound. Although it might seem likely that these were earlier rims that were accidentally included in the final fill of the mound, the data from Excavation Unit 4 suggests that this form may actually continue through the Lamar period. Given the much lower proportion of other clearly Savannah period sherds on the mound summit (red filmed, cob marked, cord marked, and check stamped) it seems reasonable that these rolled rims do belong with the last occupation of the mound. Modified rims of all sorts accounted for 30 of the rims (30.9 percent). Of these, folded pinched and folded notched rims accounted for 63.3 percent.

**Table 17. Excavation Unit 3 (1985), Ceramics by Lots**

Table 17	Plain		Burnished Plain		Red Filmed Plain		Unidentified Stamped		Rectilinear Stamped		Curvilinear Stamped		Check Stamped		Fine Incised		Medium Incised		Bold Incised		Stamped / Incised		Cord Marked		Cob Marked		Sub Totals		Totals	
	Lot	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	
1	8	134	0	6	0	0	1	57	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	16	220	236	
2	4	15	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	20	25
3	3	72	0	1	0	0	2	14	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	96	101	
4	1	46	0	0	0	0	2	14	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	73	76	
5	3	28	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	42	45	
6	4	43	0	2	0	0	2	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	62	68	
7	5	69	0	0	2	0	0	41	0	3	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	118	127	
8	1	48	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	68	69		
9	7	91	0	0	0	0	2	27	0	1	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	129	141		
10	7	114	0	0	0	0	1	18	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	142	151		
11	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3		
12	2	27	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	42	45		
13	0	25	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	34	35		
14	0	32	0	1	0	0	1	13	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	49	51		
15	2	31	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	50	53		
16	2	108	0	0	0	0	2	17	0	4	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	134	141		
17	3	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	20		

Table 17	Plain		Burnished Plain		Red Filmed Plain		Unidentified Stamped		Rectilinear Stamped		Curvilinear Stamped		Check Stamped		Fine Incised		Medium Incised		Bold Incised		Stamped / Incised		Cord Marked		Cob Marked		Sub Totals		Totals		
	Lot	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body		
18	5	49	0	0	0	0	0	19	0	2	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	76	81
19	1	8	0	2	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	24	25	
Totals	59	949	0	12	2	0	16	307	1	39	0	40	0	1	1	1	5	12	12	33	0	1	1	1	0	3	97	1396	1493		

Lot	Simple	Simple, Punct.	Rolled	Thick, Pinched	Thick, Notched	Folded Pinched	Folded, Notched	Folded Punct.	Totals
1	10	0	2	2	0	1	1	0	16
2	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	5
3	3	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	5
4	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
5	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
6	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	6
7	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	9
8	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
9	7	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	12
10	5	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	9
11	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
12	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
13	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
14	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
15	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
16	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	7
17	2	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	5
18	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	5
19	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Totals	60	2	8	5	1	9	10	2	97

**Table 18. Excavation Unit 3 (1985), Rim Sherds**

Finally, Table 19 presents a simple assessment of the incised sherds from the summit of the mound according to the number of incised lines on the sherds. The maximum number was six lines. These figures are in line with those presented in Table 16 for the upper levels of Excavation Unit 4 and further support the late date of the deposits on the top of Mound A.

Number of Lines	1	2	3	4	5	6
Number of Sherds	8	25	26	4	2	1

**Table 19. Excavation Unit 3 (1985), Number of Incised Lines**

of the total. Sherds classified as thickened also apparently are a part of the rim styles of the last period at Scull Shoals.

### **Excavation Unit 1 (Provenience 12)**

The ceramics of Provenience 12 are from Excavation Unit 1 in the top of Mound B. There were only 185 sherds recovered from the entire excavation and these are listed in Table 20. There is no likelihood that any of these are in good stratigraphic sequence since the excavation merely consisted of cleaning out the large potholes on the summit. There are virtually no Savannah period ceramics in the sample--most are Lamar types. While no fine incised sherds were found, one medium incised and nine bold incised sherds were located. These accounted for 5.4 percent of the sherds. Stamped sherds accounted for 34.1 percent of the total (63 sherds). Of these, only 33 or 52.4 percent were classified as unidentifiable stamped. Taken together, the lower proportion of unidentifiable stamped and the preponderance of bold incised, as compared to medium and fine incised, tends to imply that the final Lamar occupation on the summit of Mound B was a bit earlier than the final occupation on Mound A (Plate 16). It is not completely clear, however, and more excavation on the summit is necessary.

### **Excavation Unit 2 (Provenience 9)**

The major excavation in Mound B was Provenience 9 in the northern side of that mound. As with Excavation Unit 1, most of the material was recovered in the process of cleaning a large pothole and many of the lots are from uncertain stratigraphic provenience. Table 21 presents the ceramic data for Excavation Unit 2 by lot number. The exact locations for these lots are listed in the catalog in Appendix 1. A total of 602 sherds was found in Excavation Unit 2. Rather than discuss this particular table, the lots that could be assigned to specific levels were combined to create Table 22. This includes 472 sherds or 78.4 percent of those from the excavation. The levels in this table correspond to the numbers used in the description of the western profile of the excavation (Figure 21).

Level 42 is the premound brown sand and contained 51 sherds. Most of these were plain--39 sherds accounting for 76.5 percent of those from this level. The first mound stage is Level 37 and contained 108 sherds. Included in this level were a few check stamped, cob marked, and burnished plain sherds. The proportion of stamped sherds is quite high in Level 37, amounting to 55.6 percent. Level 27 represents the banded sand level above the second and first mounds and contained 44 sherds. The largest number of sherds from Excavation Unit 2 was from Level 18. This was interpreted as the fill for the third mound stage in Mound B and contained 252 sherds. A very high 66.3 percent of these sherds were stamped. Burnished plain sherds were still present at this level and accounted for 3.2 percent of the sherds.

The rim sherds are important in determining the construction dates for the various mound stages. There were 43 rim sherds found in this excavation and these are listed by lot number in Table 23. Of these, 36 can be assigned to mound levels. This analysis is presented in Table 24. The only rims that are clearly of Lamar date are from Level 18.

Lot	Plain		Burnished Plain	Unidentified Stamped		Rectilinear Stamped		Curvilinear Stamped	Check Stamped	Medium Incised	Bold Incised		Punctated	Cob Marked	Sub Totals		Totals
	Rim	Body	Rim	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Body	Body	Rim	Rim	Body	Body	Body	Rim	Body	
1	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	11
2	1	10	0	0	0	1	4	4	1	0	0	2	0	0	2	27	29
3	1	14	1	1	6	0	0	4	0	0	0	2	1	0	3	26	29
4	1	45	0	0	5	0	2	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	59	60
5	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	4
6	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	2
8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
9	1	11	0	0	6	0	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	23	25
10	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4
11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	2
14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16	1	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	12
17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Totals	5	104	1	1	32	1	7	20	2	1	1	8	1	1	10	175	185

**Table 20. Excavation Unit 1 (1985), Ceramics by Lots**

and consist of a single narrow folded punctated rim and a single rosette appliqué. All the rim sherds from lower levels apparently are of Savannah date. The low number of identifiable Lamar rims from Level 18 leaves the implied early Lamar date for this level in question.

The final ceramic analysis for Excavation Unit 2 was that of the complicated stamped designs. These are listed in Table 25 by lot number. There were only 30 sherds for which the designs could be determined and two-thirds of these were of the filfot cross motif. None of the other motifs had more than two sherds. The diamond and circle designs appear to be randomly distributed in the mound and are not restricted to the lowest mound levels.

The ceramic analysis of Excavation Unit 2, particularly the rim sherd data, shows that most of Mound B dates to the Savannah period (Plate 17). It is true that most of the sherds from the mound are from fill levels rather than actual floors, but the lack of **any** Lamar sherds in those fill levels argues strongly for a Savannah construction date for those stages. Coupled with the Excavation Unit 1 analysis, it is known that the final stages are probably of Dyar phase Lamar

date. There is some slight evidence that the mound was in use during the early Lamar Duvall phase, but this evidence is not strong. Mound B may have been abandoned before Mound A. It also clearly has fewer artifacts and less midden included in its fill, indicating that food preparation and use were not important activities on that mound.



Lot	Plain		Burnished Plain		Unidentified Stamped		Rectilinear Stamped		Curvilinear Stamped		Check Stamped		Bold Incised		Punctated	Cob Marked		Sub Totals		Totals
	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	
1	0	24	0	0	0	11	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	39	39
2	0	5	0	0	0	5	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	13
3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
4	0	0	0	4	0	3	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	9
5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	8
7	2	22	1	2	0	7	0	9	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	49	53
8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	4	28	0	4	0	8	2	3	2	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	51	59
12	3	7	0	0	0	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	17
13	2	6	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	18
14	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	3
15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16	3	8	0	1	0	11	0	1	0	9	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3	30	33
17	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
18	0	7	0	2	0	13	1	1	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	29	32
19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20	0	4	0	0	0	9	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	18
21	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
22	2	13	0	4	0	4	1	0	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	35	39
23	1	14	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	22
24	0	9	0	0	1	6	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	19	20
25	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2

Lot	Plain		Burnished Plain		Unidentified Stamped		Rectilinear Stamped		Curvilinear Stamped		Check Stamped		Bold Incised		Punctated	Cob Marked		Sub Totals		Totals
	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	Body	Rim	Body	Rim	Body	
26	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
27	1	12	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	15
28	1	21	0	0	1	0	0	6	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	30	32
29	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4
30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
31	0	2	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	8
32	1	4	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	14
33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
34	0	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	8
35	1	5	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	10
36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
37	1	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	15
38	0	3	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	7
76	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	23	221	1	22	4	116	6	36	5	63	1	5	1	2	1	1	4	42	470	512

**Table 21. Excavation Unit 2 (1985), Ceramics by Lots**

Level	Plain		Burnished Plain		Unidentified Stamped		Rectilinear Stamped		Curvilinear Stamped		Check Stamped		Punctated		Cob Marked		Totals	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.4
18	77	30.6	8	3.2	31	12.3	107	42.5	28	11.1	1	0.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	252	53.4
27	25	56.8	0	0.0	4	9.1	10	22.7	5	11.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	44	9.3
37	41	38.0	5	4.6	33	30.6	8	7.4	15	13.9	2	1.9	1	0.9	3	2.8	108	22.9
41	13	86.7	0	0.0	2	13.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	15	3.2
42	39	76.5	0	0.0	8	15.7	0	0.0	3	5.9	1	2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	51	10.8
Totals	195	41.3	13	2.8	78	16.5	125	26.5	53	11.2	4	0.8	1	0.2	3	0.6	472	

**Table 22. Excavation Unit 4 (1985), Rim Sherds by Lots**

Lot	Simple	Simple, Punctate	Rosette	Rolled	Notched, Rolled	Thickened, Pinched	Folded Punctate	Notched Lip	Totals
6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
7	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4
11	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	8
12	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	3
13	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
14	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
16	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
18	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	3
22	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
23	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
24	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
27	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
28	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
29	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
31	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
32	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
34	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
35	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
37	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
Totals	28	4	1	6	1	1	1	1	43


**Table 23. Excavation Unit 2 (1985), Rim Sherds by Lots**

Level	Simple	Simple, Punctated	Rosette	Rolled	Rolled, Notched	Thickened, Pinched	Folded, Punctated	Notched Lip	Totals
8	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	9
18	6	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	9
27	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	5
37	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
42	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	5
Totals	23	4	1	3	1	1	1	1	35

**Table 24. Excavation Unit 2 (1985), Rim Sherds by Levels**

Lot	D.2N.0	D.3N.0	C.2N.0	C.2NS.1S	CIRCLE	FILFOT	FIG 9	EYE	CROSS	TOTALS
2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
3	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
4	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
11	1	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	5
16	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	1	7
17	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
18	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	3
20	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
22	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
23	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
28	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
29	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
38	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Totals	2	1	1	1	2	20	1	1	1	30

**Table 25. Excavation Unit 2 (1985), Designs by Lots**



**Plate 16. Ceramics Excavation Unit 1 (1985), Mound B.**




Plate 17. Ceramics Excavation Unit 2 (1985), Mound B.

## LITHIC ARTIFACTS

Flaked stone items were not common from the excavations in the 1985 season. The total number of analyzed remains was only 493 pieces. The lithic material was sorted into categories based upon styles and stages of the reduction involved in stone tool manufacture. The analysis was designed by Jerald Ledbetter and performed by Beth Misner.

Of all the lithic material, 88.9 percent was from Excavation Unit 4 on the northeastern edge of Mound A. The raw data for this analysis is presented by lots in Table 26 starting on the next page. The lithic data from this unit has been grouped by levels in Table 27. This includes 431 items or 96.0 percent of the Excavation Unit 4 lithics. Almost all the material is from the final three 10 centimeter levels of the pre-mound midden. Based upon what was learned from the ceramics from these levels, all this lithic material dates to the Savannah period. So little material was recovered from the Lamar levels that it is impossible to comment on them except to say they were almost absent.

Since almost all the lithics worthy of comment are from one period, no attempt was made to look at changing percentages of lithic classes within that period. Table 27 does merit some discussion about the Savannah period lithics, however. Most of the flakes were small non-decortication flakes. This implies that the most of the lithic remains represent final stage reduction and resharpening of existing tools. The people were not doing much tool manufacture at this location on the site.

There were fragments of 12 different projectile points from Excavation Unit 4. All were from the pre-mound and all were Mississippian triangular points. None were located in the Lamar levels. There were a few flake tools and utilized flakes from the lower levels as well as a few thin bifaces that were not projectile points. None of these were of consistent or regular forms. The presence of a few small cores along with a few primary decortication flakes does imply that some tool manufacture was taking place.

Table 28 rearranges the data from Table 27 by frequency of different types of lithic material. The percentages from the upper levels are relatively meaningless due to the small sample sizes by level. In the Savannah levels, however, some interesting patterns are present. Local Piedmont chert accounts for 19 percent of the collection (Ledbetter, Kowalewski, and O'Steen 1981). Coastal Plain chert accounts for 2.6 percent and Ridge and Valley chert forms only 1.6 percent of the collection. Both are exotic materials in the upper Oconee Valley and neither appears to be more important than the other. Quartz, not surprisingly, was the most common material used by the Savannah period occupants at Scull Shoals. Together, crystal quartz and other types of quartz and quartzite accounted for 68.6 percent of the lithic material. The clear crystal materials accounted for 22.1 percent of the total quartz material. Several broken and battered quartz crystals were also recovered, and it is possible that these were used to make small tools. Finally, the various coarse flaked rocks of volcanic and metamorphic origins accounted for 6 percent of the stone. The proportions of these materials are almost exactly the same as that of 9Oc26 listed by Ledbetter, Kowalewski, and O'Steen (1981:10).

Table 26. Unit 4 Lithics		Primary Flake	Secondary Flake	Non-Decort. Flake	Biface Thinning Flake	Bipolar Flake	Shatter	Random Core	Bipolar Core	Utilized Flake	PPK Whole	PPK Base	PPK Tip	Drill	Thinned Biface	Flake Tool	Totals
Lot	Material																
1	Local Chert	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Other Quartz	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
4	Local Chert	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Other Quartz	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
5	Other Quartz	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
21	Local Chert	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
31	Crystal Quartz	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
34	Coastal Plain Chert	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
41	Coastal Plain Chert	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
43	Other Quartz	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5
44	Local Chert	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	Coastal Plain Chert	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	Crystal Quartz	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Other Quartz	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
45	Local Chert	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
	Crystal Quartz	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
	Other Quartz	0	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	6
46	Local Chert	2	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	11
	Coastal Plain Chert	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	Crystal Quartz	0	0	4	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
	Other Quartz	0	0	20	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	24
	Metavolcanic	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
48	Local Chert	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Crystal Quartz	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	Other Quartz	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
49	Local Chert	0	3	5	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
	Coastal Plain Chert	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Ridge/Valley Chert	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Crystal Quartz	0	0	4	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
	Other Quartz	3	2	6	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
	Metavolcanic	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
50	Local Chert	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
	Coastal Plain Chert	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Crystal Quartz	0	0	5	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
	Other Quartz	0	0	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
	Metavolcanic	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4



Table 26. Unit 4 Lithics		Primary Flake	Secondary Flake	Non- Decort. Flake	Biface Thinning Flake	Bipolar Flake	Shatter	Random Core	Bipolar Core	Utilized Flake	PPK Whole	PPK Base	PPK Tip	Drill	Thinned Biface	Flake Tool	Totals
Lot	Material																
51	Local Chert	1	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
	Coastal Plain Chert	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Crystal Quartz	0	0	3	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
	Other Quartz	1	0	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	10
52	Other Quartz	0	0	2	0	3	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	9
	Metavolcanic	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
53	Local Chert	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4
	Ridge/Valley Chert	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Crystal Quartz	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
	Other Quartz	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5
	Metavolcanic	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
54	Local Chert	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
	Crystal Quartz	0	1	7	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
	Other Quartz	0	0	14	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	20
	Metavolcanic	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
55	Local Chert	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
	Crystal Quartz	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	Other Quartz	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	3
	Metavolcanic	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
56	Crystal Quartz	0	0	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
	Other Quartz	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3
	Metavolcanic	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
57	Local Chert	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	Crystal Quartz	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
	Other Quartz	1	0	9	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	15
	Metavolcanic	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
58	Local Chert	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Crystal Quartz	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	Other Quartz	2	0	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	12
59	Local Chert	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	Crystal Quartz	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
	Other Quartz	0	0	8	0	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	13
	Metavolcanic	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
60	Local Chert	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	Ridge/Valley Chert	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Crystal Quartz	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Table 26. Unit 4 Lithics		Primary Flake	Secondary Flake	Non- Decort. Flake	Biface Thinning Flake	Bipolar Flake	Shatter	Random Core	Bipolar Core	Utilized Flake	PPK Whole	PPK Base	PPK Tip	Drill	Thinned Biface	Flake Tool	Totals
Lot	Material																
	Other Quartz	1	1	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
	Metavolcanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
61	Local Chert	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Coastal Plain Chert	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	Other Quartz	2	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
62	Local Chert	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
	Ridge/Valley Chert	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Crystal Quartz	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
	Other Quartz	1	0	10	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
63	Local Chert	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	4
	Ridge/Valley Chert	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Crystal Quartz	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
	Other Quartz	1	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
	Metavolcanic	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
64	Coastal Plain Chert	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Crystal Quartz	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	Other Quartz	1	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	Metavolcanic	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
65	Local Chert	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
	Ridge/Valley Chert	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Crystal Quartz	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	Other Quartz	1	0	7	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
	Metavolcanic	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
66	Local Chert	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	Ridge/Valley Chert	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Crystal Quartz	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Other Quartz	0	3	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
	Metavolcanic	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
67	Ridge/Valley Chert	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Crystal Quartz	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Other Quartz	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
	Metavolcanic	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
TOTALS		29	32	265	10	13	51	6	2	14	6	3	7	1	6	3	448

Table 26. Excavation Unit 4 (1985), Lithics by Lot

**Table 27. Excavation Unit 4 (1985), Lithics by Levels**

Level	Material	Primary Flake	Secondary Flake	Non-Decort. Flake	Biface Thinning Flake	Bipolar Flake	Shatter	Random Core	Bipolar Core	Utilized Flake	PP/K Whole	PP/K Base	PP/K Tip	Drill	Thinned Biface	Flake Tool	Totals
1	Local Chert	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Other Quartz	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
2	Local Chert	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Other Quartz	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
3	Other Quartz	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
17	Crystal Quartz	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
PM1	Coastal Plain Chert	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
PM4	Coastal Plain Chert	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
PM6	Local Chert	2	5	5	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	16
	Coastal Plain Chert	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
	Crystal Quartz	0	0	10	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
	Other Quartz	0	0	33	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	43
	Metavolcanic	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
PM7	Local Chert	1	6	22	4	0	2	2	0	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	46
	Coastal Plain Chert	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
	Ridge/Valley Chert	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
	Crystal Quartz	0	2	32	0	4	8	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	49
	Other Quartz	8	4	64	0	6	20	1	0	2	3	1	1	0	6	1	117
	Metavolcanic	6	1	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	15
PM8	Local Chert	2	4	4	0	0	3	0	0	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	18
	Coastal Plain Chert	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	Ridge/Valley Chert	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
	Crystal Quartz	0	0	8	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	Other Quartz	6	4	51	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
	Metavolcanic	2	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Totals		27	32	252	8	13	52	6	2	14	5	3	4	1	9	3	431

Level	Local Chert		Coastal Plain Chert		Ridge /Valley Chert		Crystal Quartz		Other Quartz		Metavolcanic		Totals	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	1	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	0	0.0	2	0.5
2	1	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	0	0.0	2	0.5
3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	0.2
17	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.2
PM1	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.2
PM4	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.2
PM6	16	20.0	4	5.1	0	0.0	14	17.8	43	54.4	2	2.5	79	18.3
PM7	46	19.7	3	1.3	3	1.3	39	21.0	117	50.2	15	6.4	233	54.0
PM8	18	16.2	2	1.8	4	3.6	11	9.9	67	60.4	9	8.1	111	25.8
Totals	82	19.0	11	2.6	7	1.6	65	15.1	230	53.5	26	6.0	431	

**Table 28. Excavation Unit 4 (1985), Material by Levels**

Table 29 lists all the lithic material from Excavation Unit 3 on the top of Mound A by lot number. There were only 35 items found here, over half being small non-decortication flakes resulting from the finishing and probable resharpening of tools. Four projectile point fragments were recovered. The interesting thing is that stone tools, probably in connection with food preparation, were being used on the summit of the large mound. The activity may be the result of people living there after the sacred functions of the mound were no longer important, but this is unclear.

Tables 30 and 31 list the lithic remains from Excavation Units 1 and 2 on Mound B respectively. These units produced only a very small amount of lithic material. The materials may represent only accidental inclusions within the soils used to construct the mound and it is possible that the manufacture and use of stone tools was not a normal part of the activities on Mound B.

Lot	Material	Secondary Flake	Decort. Flake	Non Bipolar Flake	Shatter	PP/K	Totals
1	Other Quartz	0	1	0	0	0	1
3	Local Chert	0	1	0	0	0	1
	Other Quartz	0	1	0	0	0	1
	Crystal Quartz	0	0	0	1	0	1
6	Local Chert	0	1	0	0	1	2
	Crystal Quartz	0	1	0	0	0	1
	Other Quartz	0	2	0	0	0	2
7	Local Chert	0	1	0	0	0	1
	Crystal Quartz	0	0	0	1	0	1
	Other Quartz	1	0	0	0	1	2
9	Crystal Quartz	0	0	0	1	0	1
	Other Quartz	0	1	0	0	0	1
10	R/V Chert	0	1	0	0	0	1
	Local Chert	0	2	0	1	0	3
	Other Quartz	2	3	1	4	0	10
	Metavolcanic	1	0	0	0	0	1
13	Local Chert	0	1	0	0	0	1
	Other Quartz	0	2	0	0	0	2
16	Crystal Quartz	0	0	0	0	1	1
	Other Quartz	0	0	0	0	1	1
Totals		4	18	1	8	4	35

**Table 29. Excavation Unit 3 (1985), Lithics by Lots**

Lot	Material	Non-Decort. Flake	Random Core	PP/K	Totals
13	Other Quartz	0	0	1	1
21	Other Quartz	0	1	0	1
23	Crystal Quartz	1	0	0	1
35	Local Chert	1	0	0	1
Totals		2	1	1	4

**Table 30. Excavation Unit 2 (1985), Lithics by Lots**

Lot	Material	Secondary Decort. Flake	Non- Decort. Flake	Biface Thinning Flake	Shatter	Totals
2	Other Quartz	0	1	0	0	1
	Crystal Quartz	0	1	0	0	1
4	Other Quartz	0	0	0	1	1
10	Crystal Quartz	0	0	1	0	1
16	Local Chert	1	0	0	0	1
Totals		1	2	1	1	5

**Table 31. Excavation Unit 1 (1985), Lithics by Lots**

## MISCELLANEOUS ARTIFACTS

### Pipes

A total of 44 ceramic pipe fragments was recovered from all the excavations during the 1985 season. As is true for most of the rest the artifacts, most of these were from Excavation Unit 4. These number 37 or 84.0 percent of the fragments. The pipe fragments are distributed throughout Excavation Unit 4 from the pre mound to the surface. Just over half were from the pre mound Savannah period deposits. Surprisingly, most of these pre mound fragments were made of the fine temperless clay thought to have been limited to the Lamar period. Apparently, this style of pipe began use during the Savannah period in the Oconee valley. Two stems from the lower levels have several fine incised lines around their circumferences.

Table 32 summarizes the pipe data from Excavation Unit 4. There were only two pipe fragments complete enough to describe. The most complete one was a bowl in the form of a raptorial bird, possibly a hawk (Plate 18). This pipe was covered with a thin coating of red paint and was found in the upper portion of Excavation Unit 4. The second pipe was a stem only, which had two eyes on the end of the stem under the missing bowl.

Level	Bowl Fragments	Stem Fragments	Totals
1	2	2	4
2	2	0	2
5	2	0	2
1st Platform	0	1	1
7	0	1	1
2nd Platform	1	0	1
9	1	3	4
10	0	3	3
PM6	6	2	8
PM7	4	1	5
PM8	5	1	6
Totals	23	14	37

**Table 32. Excavation Unit 4 (1985), Pipe Fragments by Level**



Plate 18. Bird Pipe, Excavation Unit 4 (1985).

Unit 3 atop Mound A produced four pipe fragments. These included three bowl fragments and one stem fragment. Mound B produced only three fragments. Two of these were from Excavation Unit 1 on its summit and are of Lamar in date. Excavation Unit 2 on the side of Mound B produced a single crude, tempered, stem fragment from the middle levels of the mound. This is clearly of the Savannah period.

### **Pottery Disks**

There were 25 pottery disks recovered the 1985 season from Scull Shoals. Sixteen of these were from Excavation Unit 4. Although 11 of these were from the pre mound, only three were from the extremely rich Savannah period deposits of pre mound levels 6 through 8. This implies that these artifacts were not yet as common as they were soon to become during the various Lamar phases. They occur in almost all levels as shown on Table 33.



Level	Number
2	1
5	1
6	1
1st Platform	1
4th Platform	1
PM1	3
PM2	2
PM3	1
PM4	1
PM7	3
PM8	1

**Table 33. Excavation Unit 4 (1985), Ceramics Disks by Level**

The diameters of these disks ranged from 1.5 to 3.5 centimeters and the edges ranged from smooth to rough. Their purpose is still unknown. Surprisingly, there were no pottery disks found in Excavation Unit 3 on the top of Mound A. There were three crude disks found in Excavation Unit 1 on the top of Mound B, probably in Lamar association. Since there was no food debris and few potsherds on this mound, these disks, whatever their function, must have little to do with food preparation. Four disks were found in Savannah levels in Excavation Unit 2 on the edge of Mound B. One of these, found in the fill of the first mound, was a unique fired clay disk or small biscuit that was unground on the edges. I know of no other examples of this ready-made pottery disk. Its intended function may be different from the normal disks.

### **Handles**

Seven handles for pottery vessels were found during the summer of 1985. All these but one were from the two deepest levels of Excavation Unit 4 and thus date to the Savannah period (Plate 16). The single handle not from this unit was a thick loop handle from Level 18 of Excavation Unit 2 in Mound B. This is possibly a Savannah level also. In Excavation Unit 4, three of the Savannah level handles were thick strap handles and two were medium thickness loop handles. Additionally, a strange handle formed by placing a short curved strap section horizontally near the rim of a red-filmed vessel was found in the Savannah levels (Plate 18). In any event, all the handles found in 1985 appear to be associated with the Savannah component and should be a good marker for this period in the Oconee Valley.



Plate 19. Ceramics Handles, Excavation Unit 4 (1985), Premound.

### **Nodes**

There were 10 nodes or bumps that came from near the rim area on ceramic vessels. Many of these are large enough to be small handles, but some are too small to be functional in this way. I consider these to be decorative in nature. Six of the 10 nodes are from the Savannah levels in the bottom of Excavation Unit 4. Two are from the upper levels of this unit and two are from Excavation Unit 3 on the top of Mound A.

### **Beads**

Five ceramic beads were recovered during the summer of 1985. These ranged in size from 3 to 15 millimeters in diameter. Four of the ceramic beads were found in Excavation Unit 4 in levels ranging from the bottom to the top. The fifth bead was recovered from Excavation Unit 3 atop Mound A. They seem to have been used throughout the period of occupation of Scull Shoals.

There were four very small shell beads recovered from the summit of Mound A in Excavation Unit 3. These were less than 1 centimeter in diameter and made from thin fragments of local river clams. Then a single small hole, about 1 millimeter in diameter was placed through

the fragment. The edges were apparently not finished or ground, but these beads are so thin that the edges may have damaged in the earth. Their context is unknown because of the large amount of disturbance in Excavation Unit 3. A single fragment of bird bone with a small hole drilled perpendicularly to its length was also recovered from the top of Mound A. One end of this bone was also carved and the total length of this bead was 3 centimeters. The reason these shell and bone items were still preserved and that none were found in the rich Excavation Unit 4, probably is that the later area is under flood water each winter and the mound summit is never under water.

### **Ceramic Pins**

These items are small knobbed pins, not unlike the shape of the common conch columella ear pins known throughout the late prehistoric Southeast, although they were much smaller. Only one of these was found intact. It was 3.5 centimeters long and the head was 1.5 centimeters in diameter and it was found in the deep Savannah levels in Excavation Unit 4. A single fragment of one of these pins was found in the top of Excavation Unit 4 and two other fragments were found in Excavation Unit 3 on the top of Mound A. These last three must be from late contexts, so these items apparently occur throughout the period of occupation at Scull Shoals. Their purpose is unclear, unless they were inexpensive versions of the exotic shell ear pins.

### **Oddments**

As in all Mississippian ceramic collections of reasonably large size, several unique blobs and doo-dads were present in the collection. Most of these were made accidentally or as play items. One group of these from Scull Shoals deserves a few comments, however. This consists of a group seven thin round strips. These are about 2 millimeters in diameter, straight in form, and average about 1.5 centimeters in length. They are all broken on both ends and appear to be simply short coil pieces left over from ceramic manufacture that were accidentally fired. The small diameter of these pieces, however, makes this unclear. Five of these were found in the Savannah levels in Excavation Unit 4, one from the top level in the same unit, and one from Excavation Unit 3 on the top of Mound A.

## SCULL SHOALS AND THE OCONEE PROVINCE

The Oconee Province was initially recognized and described by Smith and Kowalewski in 1981. Their study delimits a series of mound centers in the Piedmont portion of the Oconee River valley that were all thought to date to the Lamar period. At the time they wrote, only one of the six mound centers in the valley had been actually tested with archaeological excavations. This was the Dyar site, 9Ge5, which Smith excavated in 1977 and 1978 (Smith 1981). One important reason for initiating the excavations at Scull Shoals in 1983 was to understand its role in the Oconee Province. The 1983 work was designed more to map and test the village rather than to determine the beginning and ending dates of the site's occupation. The work for the 1985 season provided a better opportunity to determine this information.

### 1985 Chronology

In trying to fit the Scull Shoals ceramic data, particularly that from Excavation Unit 4, into the existing chronological framework for the Oconee valley, several observations are appropriate. First, there is no clear indication that sherds of the late Lamar Bell phase (Williams 1983) are present in the top of Excavation Unit 4, although a few people did live at or visit the site during this late period. Second, evidence for the presence of the early Lamar Duvall phase (Smith 1981) is minimal to absent at the site. Third, the material from the bottom of Excavation Unit 4 does not appear to be the same as the material defined by Smith as the late Etowah period Stillhouse phase (Smith 1981).

In the Dyar site report Smith says that the Stillhouse phase, as defined by him, lacks the filfot cross motif on the stamped sherds (Smith 1981:183). As discussed in the section on Excavation Unit 4, this motif is common in the early component at Scull Shoals. Smith also states that at least some Etowah sherds from the Stillhouse phase have fine lines. This is supported by the sherd illustrated in Plate 14, Row 2, Number 1 of his report. There were no sherds of this fine, classic Etowah type from Scull Shoals. Smith has also indicated (Personal Communication) that there were more rectilinear stamped sherds from the Stillhouse phase at Dyar than curvilinear stamped sherds. Although the ceramic charts from Dyar are a bit ambiguous on this point, Table 16 does show that the deepest level of Provenience 11 contains almost three times as much rectilinear as curvilinear stamped pottery (Smith 1981:136). At Scull Shoals, most of the early levels of Excavation Unit 4 have about equal proportions of curvilinear and rectilinear stamped pottery.

As has been pointed out before, there has been no Morgan Incised pottery found at Scull Shoals in the two seasons of work. This is very interesting since this type is found in small quantities in most of the proveniences at the Dyar site (Smith 1981). Smith states that: "The real marker of the Duvall phase is the type Morgan Incised..." (Smith 1981:185). The folded rim forms for the Duvall phase include mostly narrow folded forms (Rudolph 1979). These are not common at Scull Shoals. Taken together these data suggest that the Scull Shoals site was not occupied during the Duvall phase as so defined.

Based upon his excavations at 9Ge175, Shapiro believes that Morgan Incised is associated with the early portion of the Smith's Dyar phase (Personal Communication). Marvin Smith found Morgan Incised sherds in association with Lamar Incised sherds on the floor of Structure 2 at the

Dyar site (Smith 1981:96). He adds that: "While this might show contemporaneity of these types, the presence of 12 definitely earlier Etowah Complicated Stamped sherds casts doubt on any interpretation" (Smith 1981:96). The data from Excavation Unit 4 at Scull Shoals strongly suggests that there are diamond style stamped motifs, albeit fairly crude in execution, that continue well into the Lamar period. This tends to lend support to the validity of the assemblage from Structure 2 at Dyar. If this is true, it also supports the contemporaneity of Morgan Incised and early varieties of Lamar Bold Incised as believed by Shapiro. Indeed, Smith himself eventually concludes the same thing (Smith 1981:187). It should be noted, however, that none of this detracts from the association of Morgan Incised with the early Lamar period Duvall phase (Smith 1981:184).

The major portion of Excavation Unit 4 at Scull Shoals must have been deposited during the Dyar phase as defined by Smith (Smith 1981:186-189). From the first time this phase was defined, he began to discuss it in terms of an early and a late part. The early part had Morgan Incised sherds and the late did not. There was more complicated stamped pottery in the earlier than the later. Also, the folded rims were wider in the later part of the Dyar phase.

The data from Excavation Unit 4 at Scull Shoals also stratigraphically demonstrate the long suggested increase in number of incised lines on Lamar Incised vessels from the early to the late part of the Dyar phase (Smith 1981). This has been suggested from many other sites in the Oconee Valley and is clearly demonstrated in Table 16 herein. Finally, as has been discussed above, the Bell phase (Williams 1983) is not represented at Scull Shoals. The site must have been abandoned before this period.

With the above discussion in mind, it appears that the ceramic sequence for the Piedmont Oconee can now be broken into finer analytical units than are presently recognized through the addition of two new chronologically defined phase names. The chart on the following page defines the suggested new phases and compares them with those of the existing system.

	OLD	NEW
Estimate		
1650		
	Bell	Bell
1590		
	Dyar	Dyar
1530		
	Dyar	Iron Horse
1450		
	Duvall	Duvall
1375		
	Stillhouse	Scull Shoals
1300		
	Stillhouse	Stillhouse
1225		

### **Scull Shoals Phase**

The Stillhouse phase has been divided so that the later part of it is now named the Scull Shoals phase after the site itself. Scull Shoals phase pottery is sloppily stamped compared to Stillhouse phase ceramics. There are no typical neatly stamped sherds in Scull Shoals phase collections. The percentage of rectilinear to curvilinear stamped designs is almost equal in Scull Shoals phase pottery. The Stillhouse phase has more rectilinear motifs. The filfot cross motif is common in the Scull Shoals phase and rare in the Stillhouse phase. Cob marked sherds are present but rare in the Scull Shoals phase, but apparently absent in the Stillhouse phase. Burnished Plain and Red Filmed pottery are present in both phases, although the former is perhaps more common in the Scull Shoals phase. Rims of the Scull Shoals phase are mostly simple, but a few show slight modification to the lips as in rolling or notching. No folded rims are present in the Scull Shoals phase.

Sites of the Scull Shoals phase are known to occur north of 9Ge4, particularly in the Barnett Shoals area (Personal Communication, Jerald Ledbetter). Sites of this phase do not appear to be common in the Lake Oconee area, but reanalysis of some of these collections would probably reveal a few. The number of these sites in the valley as a whole is certainly less than the number during the Lamar period, however.

There are at least two possible reasons for this. The first is the strong likelihood that during the Stillhouse and Scull Shoals phases, the population in the Oconee Valley was not very large and was concentrated in a few towns rather than dispersed throughout the valley and adjacent hills. The second reason is that some of the ceramic differences between these phases and the Duvall phase are not easy to make with small collections of eroded sherds.

### **Iron Horse Phase**

The early part of the Dyar phase has been named the Iron Horse phase after an infamous art work known locally by that name. It is situated in the middle of a field on Highway 15 two miles from 9Ge4 on the western side of the Oconee River. The name has no intentional reference to DeSoto and his army, although they apparently appeared in the Oconee valley at the end of this phase. Estimated dates for the phase are from A. D. 1450 to 1530. The ceramic definition of the phase relies but little on the stamping. Certainly, stamping is present on a substantial portion of the pottery, but it is poorly done and identifiable designs are rare. The bold incised sherds apparently first appear in this phase and are characterized by only two or three lines in a simple scroll pattern below the rims of bowl form vessels. Folded rims are present on most jars and are only about 1 centimeter wide. Both pinching and cane punctating are used to modify the folded rims. Morgan Incised is apparently present on some Iron Horse phase sites. While there is clearly an Iron Horse phase occupation at Scull Shoals, no Morgan Incised was present on this site.

The reason for choosing to change the name of the early part of the Smith's Dyar phase is that most of the incised sherds illustrated in Plate 13 of the Dyar report (Smith 1981) are probably from the later part of the phase as defined by him. The vessel illustrated in Plate 20 of his report fits within what is now defined as the Iron Horse phase. There are many sites in both the valley and uplands that date to this phase. Certainly the Dyar site has a large component of the Iron Horse phase.

It is recognized that the addition of new phase names will make some previous research a bit confusing when read at this date, but this is held to be insufficient reason for not dividing the

old phases into finer units. As for the idea of using Early Dyar and Late Dyar as formal phase names, not only is there no precedent for this, but it would create much future confusion if further refinements of the chronology become possible. I doubt if further refinements in the Oconee chronology will be possible in the near future.

### **Implications**

The analysis of the Scull Shoals site, its comparison to the Dyar site, and the revised upper valley chronology outlined above present an interesting situation. Neither of the sites contains components of all the phases. It has been assumed for several years that both large sites were heavily occupied throughout the Lamar period and perhaps before. They both had large mounds that must have taken some time to build.

It appears that the Dyar site was occupied first, during the Stillhouse phase. It is possible that this site should be considered as part of the Cold Springs site (9Ge10) just opposite it on the eastern side of the Oconee River (Personal Communication, Marvin Smith). Although the mounds there are of woodland date, the site has an important early Etowah component (Armour phase) and was probably an important center in the Oconee valley then. Perhaps the river changed its course and the major occupation moved from Cold Springs to Dyar at the beginning of the Stillhouse phase. The lack of a report on the excavations at 9Ge10 makes this only speculative, however.

In any event, the center of activity moved from Cold Springs to Dyar at the beginning of the Stillhouse phase. It is also interesting that these two sites are in the middle of the largest stretch of floodplain on the piedmont Oconee, perhaps providing an explanation for the initial Mississippian settlement there. Scull Shoals was founded in the succeeding Scull Shoals phase. Most of Mound B apparently dates to this period. The Scull Shoals phase is here thought of as a phase of the Savannah period. The Dyar site was not heavily occupied during this time. Conversely, the Scull Shoals site was barely occupied during the early Lamar Duvall phase and the Dyar site had a heavy occupation then. It appears that both sites were occupied during the Iron Horse and the Dyar phases. Neither was much occupied during the historic Bell phase.

The kind of flip-flopping of occupation between two mound centers only 10 miles apart described here was unexpected. It seems likely that social-political-economic factors must be involved in the explanation of this pattern. Did both sites represent a single town that moved back and forth through time? If so, how does this affect the interpretation of the Oconee Province? Certainly, the assumed greater importance of the two mound Scull Shoals site relative to single mound Dyar site (Smith and Kowalewski 1981) must be called into question. What implications does this have for the rest of the Oconee Province? Perhaps the several mound centers in the valley, if they ever were a single political unit, actually were allied for only brief periods of time during the Lamar period. Work recently begun at the Shinholser site and future work at the Shoulderbone site should help to answer some of these questions.

## SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Four excavation units were opened in the 1985 season at Scull Shoals. These were all in the two mounds at the site. The major discoveries included chronological information that allowed for further refinement of the chronology of the upper Oconee valley and the determination of differential use for the two mounds. While no food remains at all were located in Mound B, Mound A had much animal bone on its summit. This material has not been analyzed for this report. It appears likely that there are gaps in the occupation at Scull Shoals. The most likely gap is in the early Lamar Duvall phase. Also the site was not established until the Scull Shoals phase.

Clearly Scull Shoals continues the pattern recognized by Smith (1981) of garbage dumps on the northeastern sides Lamar mounds. It is now known that this is also true for the Shinholser site south of Milledgeville, in addition to the Dyar site, the Tugalo Site, and the Estatoe site. Indeed, it appears that an important part of all future work at Lamar period mound sites should be a stratigraphic excavation on the northeastern edge of the large mound.

Future work at Scull Shoals should continue to work on questions raised earlier in this report. Most of these questions involve excavations in the village. In order to do this, earth moving equipment of some sort must be brought into the bottom at the site. Probably a small tractor equipped with a backhoe and a scoop loader would be adequate for initial testing in the village. Larger excavations would require larger and heavier equipment.

From the point of view of learning more about the Oconee Province, it is probably more important at this point to conduct research at sites other than the Scull Shoals site for a few seasons. In particular, basic work is needed at the Shoulderbone site in Hancock County and the Lingerlonger site (9Ge35) in Greene County. The questions to be answered in the village at Scull Shoals are more related to discovering how the site expanded or contracted through time and how life was lived at each period of occupation.

Future work on the mounds should center on defining what remains of the structures on their summits. This will require the complete stripping of the tops of the mounds and thus more intensive work than time permitted during the summer of 1985. There will be problems of dirt handling, particularly on the top of Mound A, if reconstruction after excavation is desired. Some trees may have to be removed from the mounds to accomplish this kind of excavation. The large pothole on the southeastern side of Mound A still needs to be stabilized, as it continues to erode and damage significant portions of intact mound stages. Scull Shoals is an important and beautiful archaeological site and it must be preserved for future generations to study and enjoy.

Finally, if this site is to be understood, it must not be viewed in isolation. As discussed in the beginning, the Scull Shoals site was likely part of a larger social-political system centered on the Piedmont Oconee River. Other sites up and down the Oconee River and neighboring drainages must be examined because the final story of the people who lived at the Scull Shoals mound site cannot be written without that critically important information. For now, however, the necessary work has begun and the story of these prehistoric societies is beginning to see the light of day once more.



## REFERENCES CITED

DePratter, Chester B.

1976 The 1974-75 Archaeological Survey in the Wallace Reservoir, Greene, Hancock, Morgan, and Putnam Counties, Georgia. Manuscript on file at the Department of Anthropology, University of Georgia, Athens.

Elliott, Daniel T.

1981 Finch's Survey. *Early Georgia* 9(1):14-24.

Fairbanks, Charles H.

1940 The Lamar Palisade. *Proceedings of the Society for Georgia Archaeology*. Volume 3, Number 1.

Hally, David J., and James L. Rudolph

1985 An Operating Plan for the Mississippi Period in the Georgia Piedmont. Manuscript on file at the Department of Anthropology, University of Georgia, Athens.

Hudson, Charles M., Marvin T. Smith, and Chester B. DePratter

1982 The Route of the DeSoto Expedition from Apalachee to Chiaha. *Southeastern Archaeology* 3:65-77.

Jones, Charles C.

1873 *Antiquities of the Southern Indians, Particularly of the Georgia Tribes*. D. Appleton, New York.

1878 Aboriginal Structures in Georgia. *Smithsonian Annual Report 1877*:278-279.

Kelly, Arthur R.

1938 A Preliminary Report on Archaeological Explorations at Macon, Georgia. *Bureau of American Ethnology, Anthropological Papers* 1.

Ledbetter, R. Jerald, Stephen A. Kowalewski, and Lisa O'Steen

1981 Chert of Southern Oconee County, Georgia. *Early Georgia* 9: 1-13.

Lee, Chung Ho

1977 Settlement Pattern Analysis of the Late Mississippian Period in Piedmont Georgia. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Georgia. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Rudolph, James L.

1980 Lamar Period Exploitation of Aquatic Resources in the Middle Oconee River Valley. Manuscript on file, Department of Anthropology, University of Georgia.

- Rudolph, James L., and David J. Hally  
1984 Archaeological Investigations of the Beaverdam Creek Site (9EB85), Elbert County, Georgia. U. S. National Park Service, Atlanta.
- Rudolph, James L., and Dennis B. Blanton  
1980 A discussion of Mississippian Settlement in the Georgia Piedmont. *Early Georgia* (1):14-37.
- Sears, William H.  
1958 The Wilbanks Site (9Ck5), Georgia. *River Basin Surveys Papers* 12. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C.
- Shapiro, Gary  
1981 Archaeological Investigations at Site 9Ge175. *Wallace Reservoir Project Contribution* 13. Department of Anthropology, University of Georgia.  
  
1983 Site Variability in the Oconee Province: A Late Mississippian Society of the Georgia Piedmont. Ph.D. Dissertation. Department of Anthropology, University of Florida. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- Shapiro, Gary, and Mark Williams  
1984 Archaeological Excavations at the Little River Site. Paper Presented at the 49th Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Archaeological Conference, Pensacola, Florida.
- Smith, Hale G., editor  
1973 *Analysis of the Lamar Site (2Bi7) Materials at the Southeastern Archaeological Center*. Xeroxed.
- Smith, Bruce D.  
1978 Variation in Mississippian Settlement Patterns. In *Mississippian Settlement Patterns*, edited by B. D. Smith, pp 479-504. Academic Press, New York.
- Smith, Marvin T.  
1978 The Development of Lamar Ceramics in the Wallace Reservoir: The View from the Dyar Site, 9Ge5. Paper presented at the 35th Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Archaeological Conference, Knoxville.  
  
1981 Archaeological Investigations at the Dyar Site, 9GE5. *Wallace Reservoir Project Contribution* 11. University of Georgia, Athens.
- Smith, Marvin T., and Stephen A. Kowalewski  
1981 Tentative Identification of a Prehistoric 'Province' in Piedmont Georgia. *Early Georgia* 8:1-13.

Trimble, Stanley W.

1974 *Man-Induced Soil Erosion on the Southern Piedmont, 1700-1970*. Soil Conservation Society of America.

Williams, Mark, and Gary Shapiro

1984 The Oconee Province Project: Social and Environmental Determinants of Settlement Location. Manuscript on file, Department of Anthropology, University of Georgia.

1985 Extra Environmental Factors of Settlement Location: The Little River Site in the Oconee Province. Paper Presented at the 50th Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, Denver, Colorado.

Williams, Mark

1983 *The Joe Bell Site: Seventeenth Century Lifeways on the Oconee River*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Georgia. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

1984 Indians Along the Oconee After DeSoto: The Beginning of the End. *Early Georgia* 10:27-39.

Williams, Marshall, and Liz Branch

1978 Tugalo. *Early Georgia* 6:32-37.

**APPENDIX 1  
PROVENIENCE AND LOT NUMBER CATALOG**

<b>Prov.</b>	<b>Lot</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Depth, Etc.</b>	<b>Date</b>
1	1	Excavation Unit 1	50-70	7-8-83
1	2	Excavation Unit 1	70-80	7-8-83
1	3	Excavation Unit 1	80-90	7-11-83
1	4	Excavation Unit 1	90-100	7-11-83
1	5	Excavation Unit 1	120-130	7-12-83
1	6	Excavation Unit 1	130-140	7-12-83
1	7	Excavation Unit 1	140-150	7-12/13-83
1	8	Excavation Unit 1	150-160	7-13-83
1	9	Excavation Unit 1	160-170	7-14-83
1	10	Excavation Unit 1	170-180	7-14-83
1	11	Excavation Unit 1	180-190	7-14-83
2	1	Excavation Unit 2	90-100	7-12-83
2	2	Excavation Unit 2	100-110	7-12-83
2	3	Excavation Unit 2	110-120	7-13-83
2	4	Excavation Unit 2	120-130	7-14-83
2	5	Excavation Unit 2	130-140	7-14-83
2	6	Excavation Unit 2	140(?)	7-13-83
2	7	Excavation Unit 2	Post mold 1	7-18-83
2	8	Excavation Unit 2	Post mold 2	7-18-83
2	9	Excavation Unit 2	Post mold 3	7-18-83
2	10	Excavation Unit 2	Post mold 4	7-18-83
2	11	Excavation Unit 2	Post mold 5	7-18-83
2	12	Excavation Unit 2	Post mold 6	7-18-83
3	1	Excavation Unit 3	55-65	7-13-83
3	2	Excavation Unit 3	65-72	7-13-83
3	3	Excavation Unit 3	72-82	7-13-83
3	4	Excavation Unit 3	82-90	7-14-83
3	5	Excavation Unit 3	90-100	7-14-83
3	6	Excavation Unit 3	100-110	7-16-83
3	7	Excavation Unit 3	120-130	7-20-83
3	8	Excavation Unit 3	Feature (?)	7-16-83
3	9	Excavation Unit 3	Posthole Test	7-12-83
4	1	Excavation Unit 4	0-5	7-16-83
4	2	Excavation Unit 4	50-60	7-16-83
4	3	Excavation Unit 4	50	7-20-83
4	4	Excavation Unit 4	55-70	7-25-83
4	5	Excavation Unit 4	60-70	7-19-83
4	6	Excavation Unit 4	70-80	7-19-83
4	7	Excavation Unit 4	73	7-19-83
4	8	Excavation Unit 4	80-90	7-20-83
4	9	Excavation Unit 4	90-100	7-20-83
4	10	Excavation Unit 4	100-102,SW	7-20-83
4	11	Excavation Unit 4	102-103,SW	7-21-83
4	12	Excavation Unit 4	100-105,S	7-21-83
4	13	Excavation Unit 4	105-110,S	7-21-83

<b>Prov.....</b>	<b>Lot.....</b>	<b>Location.....</b>	<b>Depth, Etc.....</b>	<b>Date</b>
4.....	14.....	Excavation Unit 4.....	105-110,SW.....	7-21-83
4.....	15.....	Excavation Unit 4.....	110-115,SW.....	7-21-83
4.....	16.....	Excavation Unit 4.....	115-120,SW.....	7-21-83
4.....	17.....	Excavation Unit 4.....	120,SE.....	7-20-83
4.....	18.....	Excavation Unit 4.....	120,S.....	7-20-83
4.....	19.....	Excavation Unit 4.....	110-120.....	7-22-83
4.....	20.....	Excavation Unit 4.....	120-130.....	7-22-83
4.....	21.....	Excavation Unit 4.....	130-140.....	7-25-83
4.....	22.....	Excavation Unit 4.....	135,S.....	7-25-83
4.....	23.....	Excavation Unit 4.....	130-135,S.....	7-25-83
4.....	24.....	Excavation Unit 4/5.....	Red Floor.....	7-27-83
4.....	25.....	Excavation Unit 4/5.....	Red Floor.....	7-27-83
4.....	26.....	Excavation Unit 4.....	120-130.....	7-25-83
5.....	1.....	Excavation Unit 5.....	55-70.....	7-25-83
5.....	2.....	Excavation Unit 5.....	70-80.....	7-25-83
5.....	3.....	Excavation Unit 5.....	80-90.....	7-25-83
5.....	4.....	Excavation Unit 5.....	90-100.....	7-25-83
5.....	5.....	Excavation Unit 5.....	100-110.....	7-26-83
5.....	6.....	Excavation Unit 5.....	110-120.....	7-26-83
5.....	7.....	Excavation Unit 5.....	120-130.....	7-26-83
5.....	8.....	Excavation Unit 5.....	130-135.....	7-27-83
5.....	9.....	Excavation Unit 5.....	135+.....	7-27-83
5.....	10.....	Excavation Unit 5.....	Deep Trench.....	7-28-83
5.....	11.....	Excavation Unit 5.....	Profiles.....	7-27-83
5.....	12.....	Excavation Unit 5.....	Clean-Up.....	7-26-83
6.....	1.....	Excavation Unit 6.....	85-100.....	7-26-83
6.....	2.....	Excavation Unit 6.....	100-110.....	7-26-83
6.....	3.....	Excavation Unit 6.....	110-120.....	7-27-83
6.....	4.....	Excavation Unit 6.....	120-130.....	7-27-83
6.....	5.....	Excavation Unit 6.....	130-140.....	7-27-83
6.....	6.....	Excavation Unit 6.....	140-150.....	7-27-83
6.....	7.....	Excavation Unit 6.....	150-160.....	7-28-83
6.....	8.....	Excavation Unit 6.....	160-175.....	7-28-83
6.....	9.....	Excavation Unit 6.....	175-180.....	7-28-83
6.....	10.....	Excavation Unit 6.....	180-190.....	7-28-83
6.....	11.....	Excavation Unit 6.....	190-200.....	7-28-83
6.....	12.....	Excavation Unit 6.....	200-210.....	7-28-83
6.....	13.....	Excavation Unit 6.....	210-220.....	7-29-83
6.....	14.....	Excavation Unit 6.....	220 Bottom.....	7-29-83

**POST HOLE TESTS**

<b>Prov.</b>	<b>Lot</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Date</b>
7	1	199N, 350W	6-30-83
7	2	199N, 400W	6-30-83
7	3	199N, 500W	6-30-83
7	4	249N, 300W	6-28-83
7	5	249N, 400W	6-30-83
7	6	249N, 450W	6-30-83
7	7	300N, 357.5W	7-5-83
7	8	317.5N, 429.7W	7-5-83
7	9	349N, 400W	7-5-83
7	10	349N, 500W	7-5-83
7	11	349N, 550W	6-27, 7-5-83
7	12	349N, 600W	6-27, 7-5-83
7	13	350N, 615W	7-25-83
7	14	349N, 650W	7-6-83
7	15	375N, 475W	7-26-83
7	16	399N, 500W	6-27-83
7	17	399N, 550W	6-27-83
7	18	399N, 600W	7-25-83
7	19	399N, 650W	7-7-83
7	20	400N, 566W	7-25-83
7	21	425N, 475W	7-27-83
7	22	449N, 450W	6-30, 7-1-83
7	23	450N, 501W	6-30-83
7	24	449N, 550W	6-28-83
7	25	449N, 600W	7-7-83
7	26	464N, 470W	7-22-83
7	27	478N, 479.5W	7-26-83
7	28	499N, 450W	6-27-83
7	29	499N, 500W	6-24-83
7	30	499N, 550W	6-28-83
7	31	499N, 600W	6-27-83
7	32	509.7N, 490W	7-21-83
7	33	518.2N, 560W	7-26-83
7	34	523.4N, 496.7W	7-21-83
7	35	532.7N, 458.3W	7-11-83
7	36	536.4N, 462W	7-12-83
7	37	540.4W, 464.1W	7-5, 7-11-83
7	38	541.1N, 464.1W	7-5-83
7	39	542.7N, 461.5W	7-22-83
7	40	543.6N, 467.5W	7-12-83
7	41	544.7N, 567W	7-22-83
7	42	546N, 469W	7-21, 7-22-83
7	43	547.6N, 496.7W	7-21-83
7	44	548N, 565.7W	7-22-83
7	45	548N, 485W	7-21, 7-22-83
7	46	549N, 500W	6-27-83
7	47	599N, 350W	7-6-83
7	48	649N, 500W	7-1-83

## SOIL SAMPLES

Prov. . Lot.....	Location.....	Depth
8..... 1.....	Excavation Unit 1.....	0-12
8..... 2.....	Excavation Unit 1.....	12-47
8..... 3.....	Excavation Unit 1.....	47-60
8..... 4.....	Excavation Unit 1.....	60-69
8..... 5.....	Excavation Unit 1.....	69-81
8..... 6.....	Excavation Unit 1.....	81-99
8..... 7.....	Excavation Unit 1.....	99-117
8..... 8.....	Excavation Unit 1.....	117-123
8..... 9.....	Excavation Unit 1.....	123-127
8..... 10.....	Excavation Unit 1.....	127-145
8..... 11.....	Excavation Unit 1.....	145-158
8..... 12.....	Excavation Unit 1.....	158-189
8..... 13.....	Excavation Unit 1.....	189
8..... 14.....	Excavation Unit 2.....	10-14
8..... 15.....	Excavation Unit 2.....	14-99
8..... 16.....	Excavation Unit 2.....	110-116
8..... 17.....	Excavation Unit 2.....	116
8..... 18.....	Excavation Unit 3.....	0-6
8..... 19.....	Excavation Unit 3.....	6-42
8..... 20.....	Excavation Unit 3.....	42-55
8..... 21.....	Excavation Unit 3.....	55-73
8..... 22.....	Excavation Unit 3.....	73-85
8..... 23.....	Excavation Unit 3.....	73-85
8..... 24.....	Excavation Unit 3.....	86-115
8..... 25.....	Excavation Unit 3.....	115
8..... 26.....	299N, 450W .....	0-4
8..... 27.....	299N, 450W .....	4-18
8..... 28.....	299N, 450W .....	18-38
8..... 29.....	299N, 450W .....	38-50
8..... 30.....	299N, 450W .....	50-60
8..... 31.....	349N, 550W .....	Stratum 3
8..... 32.....	349N, 550W .....	Stratum 4
8..... 33.....	349N, 550W .....	Stratum 5
8..... 34.....	449N, 450W .....	Stratum 1
8..... 35.....	449N, 450W .....	Stratum 4
8..... 36.....	449N, 450W .....	Stratum 5
8..... 37.....	449N, 450W .....	Stratum 5
8..... 38.....	449N, 450W .....	Stratum 5
8..... 39.....	349N, 600W .....	Stratum 1
8..... 40.....	349N, 600W .....	Stratum 2
8..... 41.....	349N, 600W .....	Stratum 3
8..... 42.....	349N, 600W .....	Stratum 4
8..... 43.....	349N, 600W .....	Stratum 5
8..... 44.....	450N, 501W .....	Stratum 3
8..... 45.....	450N, 501W .....	Stratum 4
8..... 46.....	299N, 600W .....	135
8..... 47.....	299N, 500W .....	?
8..... 48.....	299N, 550W .....	145
8..... 49.....	249N, 450W .....	?
8..... 50.....	399N, 550W .....	Stratum 6

8..... 51.....	649N, 500W .....	?
8..... 52.....	399N, 500W .....	?
8..... 53.....	599N, 450W .....	250
8..... 54.....	399N, 500W .....	?
8..... 55.....	499N, 600W .....	?
8..... 56.....	Post 2 West of Mound B...	58-68
8..... 57.....	Excavation Unit 2, Center	119
8..... 58.....	Post 2 West of Mound B...	14
8..... 59.....	Post 2 West of Mound B...	0-5
8..... 60.....	Post 2 West of Mound B...	5-14
8..... 61.....	Excavation Unit 3.....	65-72
8..... 62.....	Excavation Unit 3.....	55-65
8..... 63.....	349N, 600W .....	150
8..... 64.....	399N, 600W .....	Stratum 5
8..... 65.....	VOID	
8..... 66.....	399N, 550W .....	Stratum 7
8..... 67.....	540.4N, 464.1W .	175
8..... 68.....	Excavation Unit 6.....	85-95
8..... 69.....	450N, 410.7W ....	?
8..... 70.....	Excavation Unit 5.....	97
8..... 71.....	Excavation Unit 5.....	97-98



**MOUND B -- UNIT 2**

<b>Prov.....</b>	<b>Lot.....</b>	<b>Location.....</b>	<b>Date.....</b>	<b>Comments</b>
9.....	1.....	Back dirt, Northern Side.....	6-19-85	
9.....	2.....	General Cleanup.....	6-20-85	
9.....	3.....	Top Blue Clay, Southern Extension.....	6-21-85	(4)
9.....	4.....	General Back dirt.....	6-21-85	
9.....	5.....	Post Hole 2.....	6-21-85	Daub, Charcoal (8)
9.....	6.....	General.....	6-24-85	
9.....	7.....	Level 6.....	6-24-85	(18)
9.....	8.....	Level 6.....	6-24-85	Carbon Sample (18)
9.....	9.....	Level 4, Brown Layer.....	6-24-85	(7)
9.....	10.....	Western Side.....	6-19-85	Daub, Charcoal
9.....	11.....	Level 6, Brown Sand.....	6-25-85	E Wall (8)
9.....	12.....	Level 6, Brown/Grey Sand.....	6-25-85	W Wall (8)
9.....	13.....	Back Dirt.....	6-25-85	
9.....	14.....	General.....	6-26-85	
9.....	15.....	VOID		
9.....	16.....	Level 6.....	6-27-85	(18)
9.....	17.....	General.....	6-27-85	
9.....	18.....	General.....	6-28-85	
9.....	19.....	General.....	6-28-85	Charcoal Sample
9.....	20.....	Level 8, Grey Sand.....	7-3-85	(37)
9.....	21.....	Top, Lowest Brown Sand.....	7-1-85	(42)
9.....	22.....	Level 8, Grey Sand.....	7-1-85	(37)
9.....	23.....	Dark Brown Sand under Mound 1.....	7-2-85	(42)
9.....	24.....	Level 8, Grey Sand Part 1.....	7-2-85	(37)
9.....	25.....	Level 8, Grey Sand.....	7-2-85	(37)
9.....	26.....	General.....	7-2-85	Single sherd
9.....	27.....	Bottom Sand Outside Mound 1.....	7-2-85	(41)
9.....	28.....	Banded Brown Sand.....	7-2-85	(27)
9.....	29.....	Level 7, Top of Brown Sand.....	7-3-85	(27)
9.....	30.....	Hard Clay above Brown Sand.....	7-3-85	Charcoal
9.....	31.....	Level 7, Top of Brown Sand.....	7-3-85	(27)
9.....	32.....	Level 8, Grey Sand, Part 2.....	7-3-85	(37)
9.....	33.....	Level 8, Grey Sand, Part 1.....	7-3-85	Pipe Stem (37)
9.....	34.....	Level 8, Grey Sand, Part 2.....	7-3-85	(37)
9.....	35.....	Level 10, Brown Sand.....	7-3-85	(42)
9.....	36.....	Red Clay Lumps.....	7-3-85	???
9.....	37.....	Level 10, Brown Sand.....	7-3-85	(42)
9.....	38.....	Level 8, General.....	7-5-85	(37)
9.....	39.....	Level A.....	7-8-85	Soil Sample
9.....	40.....	Level B.....	7-8-85	Soil Sample
9.....	41.....	Level C.....	7-8-85	Soil Sample
9.....	42.....	Level D.....	7-8-85	Soil Sample
9.....	43.....	Level E.....	7-8-85	Soil Sample
9.....	44.....	Level F.....	7-8-85	Soil Sample
9.....	45.....	Level G.....	7-8-85	Soil Sample
9.....	46.....	Level H.....	7-8-85	Soil Sample
9.....	47.....	Level I.....	7-8-85	Soil Sample
9.....	48.....	Level J.....	7-8-85	Soil Sample
9.....	49.....	Level K.....	7-8-85	Soil Sample
9.....	50.....	Level L.....	7-8-85	Soil Sample

9.....	51.....	Level M.....	7-8-85.....	Soil Sample
9.....	52.....	Level N.....	7—8-85.....	Soil Sample
9.....	53.....	Level O.....	7—8-85.....	Soil Sample
9.....	54.....	Level P.....	7—8-85.....	Soil Sample
9.....	55.....	Level Q.....	7—8-85.....	Soil Sample
9.....	56.....	Level R.....	7-8-85.....	Soil Sample
9.....	57.....	Level S.....	7—8-85.....	Soil Sample
9.....	58.....	Level T.....	7-8-85.....	Soil Sample
9.....	59.....	Level U.....	7—8-85.....	Soil Sample
9.....	60.....	Level V.....	7-8-85.....	Soil Sample
9.....	61.....	Level W.....	7—8-85.....	Soil Sample
9.....	62.....	Level X.....	7—8-85.....	Soil Sample
9.....	63.....	Level Y.....	7—8-85.....	Soil Sample
9.....	64.....	Level Z.....	7—8-85.....	Soil Sample
9.....	65.....	Level A1.....	7—8-85.....	Soil Sample
9.....	66.....	Level B1.....	7-8-85.....	Soil Sample
9.....	67.....	Level C1.....	7—8-85.....	Soil Sample
9.....	68.....	Level D1.....	7—8-85.....	Soil Sample
9.....	69.....	Level E1.....	7-8-85.....	Soil Sample
9.....	70.....	Level F1.....	7—8-85.....	Soil Sample
9.....	71.....	Level G1.....	7—8-85.....	Soil Sample
9.....	72.....	Level H1.....	7-8-85.....	Soil Sample
9.....	73.....	Level I1.....	7-8-85.....	Soil Sample
9.....	74.....	Level J1.....	7—8-85.....	Soil Sample
9.....	75.....	Level K1.....	7—8-85.....	Soil Sample
9.....	76.....	General Back Dirt.....	7-1-85.....	
9.....	78.....	.....	7-2-85.....	Charcoal

**MOUND A -- UNIT 3**

<b>Prov.....</b>	<b>Lot.....</b>	<b>Location.....</b>	<b>Date.....</b>	<b>Comments</b>
10.....	1.....	Eastern Extension .....	6-26-85	
10.....	2.....	0-10 centimeters.....	6-27-85	
10.....	3.....	0-10 centimeters.....	6-27-85	
10.....	4.....	0-10 centimeters.....	6-27-85	
10.....	5.....	10-20 centimeters .....	6-27-85	
10.....	6.....	10-20 centimeters .....	6-27-85	
10.....	7.....	General .....	6-27-85	
10.....	8.....	General .....	6-27-85	
10.....	9.....	20-30 centimeters .....	6-28-85	
10.....	10.....	20-30 centimeters .....	6-28-85	
10.....	11.....	20-30 centimeters .....	6-28-85	
10.....	12.....	30-40 centimeters .....	6-28-85	
10.....	13.....	30-40 centimeters .....	6-28-85	
10.....	14.....	30-40 centimeters .....	6-28-85	
10.....	15.....	30-40 centimeters .....	6-28-85	
10.....	16.....	40-50 centimeters .....	6-28-85	
10.....	17.....	40-50 centimeters .....	6-28-85	
10.....	18.....	Finishing Southern Half .....	6-28-85	
10.....	19.....	Cleaning Profiles .....	7-1-85	

**MOUND A -- UNIT 4**

<b>Prov.....</b>	<b>Lot.....</b>	<b>Location.....</b>	<b>Date.....</b>	<b>Comments</b>
11	1	Surface	6-28-85	
11	2	Surface	6-28-85	
11	3	0-10 centimeters	7-1-85	
11	4	10-20 centimeters	7-1-85	
11	5	20-30 centimeters	7-1-85	
11	6	30-40 centimeters	7-1-85	
11	7	30-40 centimeters	7-2-85	
11	8	1st Digging Platform	7-2-85	
11	9	40-50 centimeters	7-2-85	
11	10	50-60 centimeters	7-2-85	
11	11	2nd Digging Platform	7-2-85	1 of 2
11	12	2nd Digging Platform	7-2-85	2 of 2
11	13	60-70 centimeters	7-3-85	
11	14	70-80 centimeters	7-3-85	
11	15	3rd Digging Platform	7-3-85	
11	16	80-90 centimeters	7-3-85	
11	17	80-90 centimeters on Eastern Wall	7-3-85	Pipe
11	18	80-90 centimeters	7-3-85	Bone
11	19	90-100 centimeters	7-3-85	
11	20	90-100 centimeters	7-3-85	Pipe
11	21	4th Digging Platform	7-3-85	
11	22	100-110 centimeters, Eastern Wall	7-5-85	
11	23	110-120 centimeters, Eastern Wall	7-5-85	
11	24	5th Digging Platform	7-5-85	
11	25	120-130 centimeters, Eastern Wall	7-5-85	
11	26	Feature 1	7-5-85	
11	27	6th Digging Platform	7-8-85	
11	28	Feature 2	7-8-85	Cane and Wood
11	29	Feature 2	7-8-85	
11	30	Beneath Feature 2	7-8-85	
11	31	165-175 centimeters, Eastern Wall	7-8-85	
11	32	175-180 centimeters, Eastern Wall	7-8-85	
11	33	Eastern 1/3, at Mound Base	7-8-85	
11	34	Eastern 1/3, 1st Premound Level	7-8-85	
11	35	Level 1 into Premound	7-8-85	
11	36	0-10 centimeters below Flat Level	7-8-85	Carbon Sample
11	37	185-195 centimeters, Eastern Wall	7-9-85	Level 1 premound
11	38	185-195 centimeters, Eastern Wall	7-9-85	Level 1 premound
11	39	Level 2 into Premound	7-9-85	
11	40	Level 3 into Premound	7-9-85	
11	41	Level 4 into Premound	7-9-85	
11	42	Level 5 into Premound	7-9-85	
11	43	Level 6 into Premound	7-9-85	Bag 1
11	44	Level 6 into Premound	7-9-85	Bag 2
11	45	Level 6 into Premound	7-9-85	Bag 3
11	46	Level 6 into Premound	7-9-85	Bag 4
11	47	Level 6 into Premound	7-9-85	Bag 5
11	48	Level 6 into Premound	7-9-85	Bag 6
11	49	Level 7 into Premound	7-9-85	Bag 1
11	50	Level 7 into Premound	7-9-85	Bag 2

Prov.....	Lot .....	Location.....	Date.....	Comments
11	51	Level 7 into Premound	7-9-85	Bag 3
11	52	Level 7 into Premound	7-9-85	Bag 4
11	53	Level 7 into Premound	7-9-85	Bag 5
11	54	Level 7 into Premound	7-9-85	Bag 6
11	55	Level 7 into Premound	7-9-85	Bag 7
11	56	Level 7 into Premound	7-9-85	Bag 8
11	57	Level 7 into Premound	7-9-85	Bag 9
11	58	Level 7 into Premound	7-9-85	Bag 10
11	59	Level 7 into Premound	7-9-85	Bag 11
11	60	Level 7 into Premound	7-9-85	Bag 12
11	61	Level 8 into Premound	7-9-85	Bag 1
11	62	Level 8 into Premound	7-9-85	Bag 2
11	63	Level 8 into Premound	7-9-85	Bag 3
11	64	Level 8 into Premound	7-9-85	Bag 4
11	65	Level 8 into Premound	7-9-85	Bag 5
11	66	Level 8 into Premound	7-9-85	Bag 6
11	67	Cleaning Profiles	7-9-85	

#### MOUND B--UNIT 1

Prov. ...	Lot .....	Location.....	Date.....	Comments
12	1	Unit 1B	6-19-85	
12	2	Unit 1A	6-19-85	
12	3	Unit 1A	6-19-85	
12	4	Unit 1B	6-20-85	
12	5	General	6-21-85	
12	6	Unit 1B, SW, below Grey Level	6-21-85	Charcoal
12	7	Unit 1A, Posthole 1	6-21-85	Charcoal
12	8	Unit 1B, Posthole	6-24-85	in Profile
12	9	General	6-24-85	
12	10	General	6-25-85	
12	11	Unit 1B	6-24-85	Lawn Chair
12	12	General	6-26-85	
12	13	Unit 1A, Posthole B	6-26-85	in N Profile
12	14	Unit 1A, Northeastern Corner	6-19-85	Pepsi Bottle
12	15	Surface	6-18-85	
12	16	Unit 1A	7-1-85	Water Screened
12	17	Unit 1A, Northwestern Corner	7-5-85	Charcoal
12	18	Back Dirt on Top	6-26-85	

**APPENDIX 2**  
**STAMPED SHERD DESIGN CODES**

<b>NAME OR DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>CODE</b>
1 bar diamond .....	D.1.0
1 bar cross diamond.....	D.1.1
1 bar diamond with a short vertical line .....	D.1.1S
2 bar diamond .....	D.2N.0
2 bar diamond with 1 vertical line .....	D.2N.1
2 bar diamond with 1 short vertical line that does not bisect the horizontal lines .....	D.2N.1S
2 bar diamond with 1 vertical line that bisects the horizontal lines .....	D.2N.1V
2 bar diamond with 1 short vertical line that bisects the horizontal lines .....	D.2N.1SV
3 bar diamond .....	D.3N.0
1 bar circle .....	C.1.0
1 bar cross circle.....	C.1.1
Circle with 1 short horizontal and 1 short vertical line.....	C.1S.1S
2 bar circle.....	C.2N.0
2 bar ladder-base circle.....	C.2C.0
Circle with 2 horizontal and 2 vertical lines that do not cross the horizontal lines.....	C.2N.2N
Circle with 2 horizontal lines and 2 vertical lines that cross each other .....	C.2N.2NV
Circle with 2 short horizontal lines and 1 short vertical line that does not bisect them.....	C.2NS.1S
3 bar cross circle.....	C.3N.3C
Concentric circles .....	C
Line block .....	LB
Filfot cross .....	F
Figure 8.....	8
Figure 9.....	9
Oval .....	OVAL
Eye.....	EYE
Keyhole.....	KH
Herringbone.....	H
Circle in a box .....	CB